

МІЖНАРОДНІ ВІДНОСИНИ: ІСТОРИЧНІ ЕТАПИ, ПРОЦЕСИ, ВИКЛИКИ

Історико-політичні проблеми сучасного світу:
Збірник наукових статей. – Чернівці:
Чернівецький національний університет,
2021. – Т. 43. – С. 9-21
DOI: 10.31861/mhpi2021.43.9-21

Modern Historical and Political Issues:
Journal in Historical & Political Sciences. – Chernivtsi:
Chernivtsi National University,
2021. – Volume. 43. – pp. 9-21
DOI: 10.31861/mhpi2021.43.9-21

УДК 327:321

© Borys Humeniuk ¹

Transformation of the State-Centric Model of the International Order in the 21st Century

It is proved that state and non-state participants of international relations create regional and global networks of interaction, which are developing dynamically. However, the destruction of national sovereignty on a global scale cannot be stated nowadays. It has been stated that the strengthening of the sovereignty of the world's leading states and its weakening in the periphery. Sovereignty in the countries of the world periphery was transformed, and political power was reconfigured precisely because of the growing dependence of peripheral states on transnational participants in international relations, international organizations, institutions and leading countries of the world. In contrast to peripheral countries, the countries of the “centre” have strong legitimate control over what happens in their territories. However, there is an increase in the powers of institutions of international governance, requirements and obligations of international law. This is especially true in the EU, where sovereign power is divided between international, national and local authorities, while the same trend can be seen in the activities of intergovernmental organizations such as the WTO. Global financial and economic crises and pandemics are forcing states to resort to protectionist measures, which has sparked a scientific debate on strengthening sovereignty and strengthening state borders. These arguments strengthen the positions of the representatives of the realistic paradigm and weaken the positions of the representatives of the liberal-idealist paradigm.

Keywords: state, nation, sovereignty, desovereignization, system of international relations, world order, globalization, participants of international relations.

Трансформація державоцентричної моделі міжнародного порядку у XXI ст.

Доведено, що державні та недержавні учасники міжнародних відносин створюють регіональні та глобальні мережі взаємодії, що динамічно розвиваються. Однак на сьогодні не можна казати про руйнацію національного суверенітету в планетарних масштабах. Констатується посилення суверенітету провідних держав світу і його послаблення в державах периферії. Суверенітет в країнах світової периферії трансформувався, а політична влада реконфігурувалася саме з-за посилення залежності держав периферії від транснаціональних учасників міжнародних відносин, міжнародних організацій, інституцій та провідних країн світу. На відміну від периферійних країн, країни «центру» мають сильний легітимний контроль над тим, що відбувається на їх територіях. Однак констатується збільшення повноважень установ міжнародного управління, вимог та зобов'язань міжнародного права. Зазначене особливо стосується ЄС, де суверенна влада поділена між міжнародними, національними та місцевими владними органами, водночас та сама тенденція простежується і в діяльності міждержавних організацій, таких як СОТ. Глобальні фінансово-економічні кризи та пандемії змушують держави вдаватися до протекціоністських заходів, що викликало наукову дискусію щодо укріплення суверенітету та зміцнення державних кордонів. Зазначені аргументи посилюють позиції представників ре-

¹ Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Head of the Chair of Public Administration and International Relations of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Ukraine. E-mail: b.gumeniuk@gmail.com.

алістичної парадигми та послаблюють позиції представників ліберально-ідеалістичної парадигми.

Показано, що транснаціональна структура міжнародного порядку зменшує державний контроль громадян країни. Вона визначає взаємозалежність учасників міжнародних відносин, які не можуть самостійно вирішувати глобальні проблеми чи ефективно використовувати широкий набір державних функцій, що спонукає їх до консолідації. Держава взаємопов'язана з національними, міждержавними і транснаціональними акторами. Вона більше не в змозі повністю контролювати та визначати все, що відбувається в межах її територіальних кордонів. Тому комплексні глобальні системи, від фінансових до екологічних, поєднують окремі локальні спільноти в єдину структурно-функціональну мережу. Глобальна інформаційно-комунікативна та транспортна інфраструктура створює нові форми політичної та соціально-економічної організації, які не прив'язані до певних національних кордонів. Сучасне територіальне суверенне право часто суперечить транснаціональній організації багатьох аспектів політичного, економічного та соціального життя. У міжнародному праві наявні два засадничі та взаємовиключні принципи: принцип територіальної цілісності держави та право нації на самовизначення, що нерідко дозволяє маніпулювати даними принципами.

Ключові слова: держава, нація, суверенітет, десоверенізація, система міжнародних відносин, світовий порядок, глобалізація, учасники міжнародних відносин.

The problem formulation. Nowadays, the transformation of the nation state's institution confront the background of the pandemic of the coronavirus "COVID-19", which significantly affects it. Measures aimed at combating the pandemic lead to the disintegration and protection of national economies, which will result in the reconfiguration of the system of international relations and a change in the vector of transformation of the international order. In connection with the pandemic, the processes of deglobalization and the popularization of globalist ideologies are expected to intensify. Today, the institution of the traditional state comes to the fore, while the supranational institutions of the European Union have not yet been able to demonstrate their effectiveness in a pandemic. In the near future, states will consider not only cyber wars, but also biological attacks of any origin among the priority security threats. To meet these challenges, first of all, developments in the field of artificial intelligence will be used.

In a pandemic, a state will assume additional control functions and will have to maintain a certain balance of relations between society and the power elements of a state, including cybercontrol, after the end of the epidemic. The processes of virtualization of population life, virtual reality and information and communication systems, including online services, will develop quite rapidly. Now the transformation of the structure of production relations in favour of remote activity is stated. The pandemic has severely affected traditional education systems around the world –with the orders of the governments of most countries of the world there was a mass closure of schools and universities. At the same time, the mass introduction of distance learning for schoolchildren and students with the use of the latest online technologies has begun. There are also growing contradictions between the participants in the system of international relations, in particular due to the closure of borders and insufficient assistance to each other on a number of issues.

Previous researches analysis. In the context of our study, it should be noted that the problems of transformation of the institution of nation-states, de-sovereignization, and the erosion of sovereignty were dealt with mainly by representatives of Western scientific thought. Among the most notable ones we can distinguish such foreign scientists as J. Aikenberry, G. Almond, H. Bull, Z. Brzezinski, S. Huntington, R. Gilpin, S. Hoffman, R. Inglehart, R. Keohane, G. Kissinger, J. Cohen, R. Cox, G. Morgenthau, J. Nye, J. Rosenau, K. Waltz, W. Thomson, J. Ferguson, R. Folk, F. Fukuyama, R. Haas, O. Young and others played a significant role in the development of problems of political development, transformation, adaptation, and the formation of a new international order and the changing role of a nation-state institute.

Among the representatives of Ukrainian political thought, the theoretical work deserves special attention, which is a serious basis for the development of the domestic school in the above areas of research, namely the work of O. Zernetskaya, E. Kaminsky, O. Koppel, O. Matvieva, M. Malsky, M. Matyakha, I. Y. Pavlenko, M. Fesenko, V. Khonin, I. Troyan, S. Sherhin and others.

Despite the interest and special relevance of the theory and political science of international relations, Ukraine does not yet have an extensive scientific school for the study of international relations. There is a significant lack of domestic empirical research and theoretical research of the middle level. There is a lack of a new scientific paradigm that could effectively replace the Marxist one, which has long served the needs of Soviet society. Numerous theories and concepts borrowed from the West are not always an adequate reflection of international political reality and, most importantly, poorly adapted to the cultural, historical and national-political traditions of Ukrainian society. Thus, overcoming the syndrome of methodological secondaryness and theoretical stereotypes accumulated in the ideological past and liberalized present, becomes an important task for domestic international political science, which is designed to become an intellectual tool to adapt to global conditions.

We have to state that the participation of the domestic scientific community in the strategic analysis and formation of the conceptual foundations of Ukraine's foreign policy, in particular the development of appropriate analytical programs and measures, is still quite limited and not systematic. In this context a well-known Ukrainian political scientist S. Sherhin notes, "Joint and well-coordinated efforts of the state and the scientific community are needed to carry out theoretical and applied research in the field of international systems and global development"².

Purposes and objectives of the research. The purpose of the article is to determine the objective causes and consequences of de-sovereignization process and to outline the prospects for the transformation of the institute of a nation-state in the conditions of the new international order formation.

Main material presentation. In world and domestic science it is believed that the "classical" international relations originated in the period of formation of nation-states in Europe. The beginning of the countdown is considered to be the end of the Thirty Years' War in Europe and the conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. The basis of the Westphalian system was the consolidation of a dominant role for sovereign states. According to the principle of sovereignty, the internal affairs and institutions of one state cannot fall within the sphere of influence of others. This system is divided into several subsystems: the Anglo-French rivalry in Europe and the struggle for colonies in the XVII-XVIII centuries; the system of the "European Concert of Nations", or the Congress of Vienna in the XIX century; Versailles-Washington system (between world wars); the Cold War system (Yalta-Potsdam); post-bipolar system of international relations.

The driving force of the Westphalia system, according to the most scholars, were disputes between states: some tried to expand their influence, while others – to prevent it. The national interests of states of different basic parameters often came into conflict. The outcome of the confrontation usually depends on the balance of power between the states or alliances in which they joined to pursue their foreign policy goals. Establishing a balance, usually as a result of war, opened the way for peaceful relations. The imbalance of forces led to war, and after its end – to its resumption, but on the basis of increasing the influence of some states at the expense of others.

The present-day state of the international system is characterized by serious changes in the international political and socio-economic spheres of social interaction, as well as a qualitative transformation of the Westphalian system of international relations. In this situation, uncertainty in research stimulates scientific efforts and is the basis of a new conceptual framework.

Thus, taking into consideration the above mentioned we can state that the system of international relations acquired a truly global character of contemporary states in the late twentieth century, when their number increased several times compared to the beginning of the century, which contributed to the spread of new multilateral forms of international cooperation and cooperation with international organizations and new international regulatory mechanisms such as universal human rights.

The place, role and functions of a state as a major actor in the international arena are now more relevant than ever. The formation of the Ukrainian state and its foreign policy institutions requires the development of thorough knowledge of the theory and political science of international relations, which will be based on a solid foundation of contemporary concepts and theories. This will make it possible to more effectively analyze current transformational processes at the global level in order to improve Ukraine's foreign policy, security and ensure a worthy place of our state in the international arena.

² Шергін, Сергій (2008) Парадокси і проблеми глобалізації. *Зовнішні справи*. 5 : 42–46.

Globalization leads to a revision of the connection between a separate territory and the socio-economic and political global space. The fact that the economic, social and political activities of an individual state are increasingly spreading across regional and national borders poses a threat to the territorial principle on which it is based. Thanks to the latest technologies, infrastructure development and transport, the activities of the state go beyond national borders, which causes scientific discourse about its desovereignization.

The international system of contemporary states acquired a global character only at the end of the twentieth century. The number of states recognized by the world community has more than doubled between 1945 until nowadays, and now numbers 195 states. In turn, the intensification of this process was facilitated by the parallel spread of new multilateral forms of international cooperation and interaction developed by international organizations, as well as new international regulatory mechanisms, such as the universal human rights system.

Conclusions on considerations of international relations, which recognize the state as a key element of policy, were studied more systematically in the direction of political “realism” and “neorealism” within the science of international relations.

Among the representatives of the school of political realism can be identified such scientists as R. Niebuhr, N. Spikeman, G. Morgenthau, D. Kennan, A. Walfers, R. Aron, G. Kissinger, Z. Brzezinski, R. Osgood, R. Strauss-Hupe and others. It can rightly be called the Anglo-American school because in Britain it developed not only under the influence of G. Morgenthau, but also had a national tradition.

Neorealism, which developed primarily through the works of K. Waltz, R. Gilpin and K. Kinderman, J. Grice, J. Mearsheimer, aimed to combine the principles of classical realism with the theory of international systems. The international system, which is seen as a structure of relations between states, is the main category of neorealism, along with such categories as “conflict”, “cooperation”, “norm”, “advantage”, “interest”, “perception”, “reality”, “decision”. That is why neorealism is sometimes called structural realism, the formation of the foundations of which is associated with the name of Professor K. Waltz of the University of California³.

In the context of the universal system of states, realism views the state as a monolithic organism whose main purpose is to support and protect national interests. In general, a realistic position is a vision in a state of an instrument that protects national and international order by resorting to national force. To survive and thrive, states have to compete in an uncertain and competitive environment. Accordingly, realism argues that the system of sovereign states is essentially full of anarchism, that is, the absence of legal power at the global level. This forces all states to pursue a policy of force to defend their vital interests in the absence of a supreme arbiter who would monitor moral conduct and compliance with international norms⁴.

States have a monopoly on legitimate domestic violence, but there is no single centre in international relations that has the right to use violence to resolve conflicts. This fact allows us to talk about the anarchic nature of international relations. When each state cares only about its own interests, the anarchy of the international environment becomes especially important, and therefore a state can only rely on its own forces to defend its interests. In such circumstances, it becomes important to increase the power to influence other actors in international politics, including military and economic, in order to ensure security, prosperity, the spread of their ideological attitudes and values.

The international order, from the point of view of “realism”, is created exclusively by the strongest states. Understanding this reinforces scepticism about the statement that even in a system of independent states, there could always be real global interaction and stable international agreements. This scepticism is based on the state-centric concept of order as an interstate order: states are the main actors on the world stage. Global politics and economic conditions are also influenced by other actors, but within the limits set and controlled by states⁵. In addition, international organizations are seen as either ineffective or devoid of autonomous power. The state weighs more than any other political organization, and the world order is formed mainly under the influence of the strongest states.

³ Waltz, Kenneth. (1979). *The Theory of International Politics*. New York : Addison-Wesley. 251 p.

⁴ Фесенко, Микола. (2012). Трансформація суверенітету в умовах глобалізації. *Дослідження світової політики*. 4 (61) : 80-92.

⁵ Waltz, Kenneth. (1979). *Op. cit.*

Ukrainian researcher O. Koppel notes that “traditionally, the concept of “international order” is associated with interstate relations, which does not involve state interference in the internal affairs of other states, in particular in the context of human rights. The world order is most often seen as a system accepted by all, which arose as a result of the renunciation of absolute sovereignty in order to take into account universal interests and values, as the legal system of the world through political form. Under such conditions, an “international” (interstate) order can exist without a world order”⁶. It will pass into a qualitatively new state of “world order” only when absolutely all participants of the international system will be involved in the process of order formation, and relations between them will be regulated by uniform norms, rules and mechanisms for maintaining this order on the basis of criteria meeting all international system participants' needs⁷.

But the Ukrainian researcher Y. Kaminsky understands the international order as the organization of interstate relations aimed at meeting the needs of the main international actors, and the world order – the organization of international relations aimed at ensuring the hegemony of one of the international actors.⁸

Proponents of a state-centric approach are sceptics of globalization. They believe that national governments will continue to play a leading role in managing the world economy, because only they have the formal political power to regulate economic activity. With most states now dependent on changing levels of trade and financial flows in an effort to strengthen economic growth, the boundaries that limit the autonomy and independence of national economies are becoming increasingly clear, especially in democracies. If we do not take into account the fact that economic interdependence inevitably destroys the autonomy or independence of the national economy, it can be argued that it expands the potential of many states. Openness to world markets, as many economists point out, guarantees much greater opportunities for long-term economic growth. As the experience of the East Asian “tigers” shows, global markets coexist harmoniously with strong state power.

The position of scepticism is confirmed by the fact that the first manifestations of the global crisis have shown that transnational corporations have proved to be much less viable than those nation-states, to which the collapsing financial empires began to cry. It also turned out that all of them, including their owners, have very specific national “residence addresses” and often, if they did not fulfil a certain “state order”, at least acted as “agents” of state influence. Thus, according to the professor of the University J. Mason (Washington, USA) J. Goldstone, business develops in response to the impulses that govern governments⁹.

However, even in a period of economic recovery, most global problems are at the same time clearly defined territorial nature: financial, human and information flows, crossing state borders, fall into the territory of national legal systems and are regulated by them. At the national sovereign level, key human rights issues are regulated – social protection and family law. Undoubtedly, the speed and volume of growing cross-border flows are becoming a challenge for contemporary states, forcing the latter to constantly (and often quite successfully) seek and find new answers to these challenges, but it is hardly appropriate to see each new challenge as a symptom of desovereignization.

The argument against globalization of the political sphere is that today, as before, not only international law affects national, but also the national law influences on the formation of international law, as they are produced as a result of problems common to a number of states. Regarding their implementation in the system of national legislation, that is the implementation by certain state norms of international law by including them into national law, it should be noted that, first, it is not only an objective process, but also a manifestation of the subjective political will of the leadership of such a state, and secondly, under objective conditions it happens today almost more often than, for instance, in the

⁶ Коппель, Олена (2009). Концепції організації міжнародних систем, *Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка*. 37 : 4–8. <http://journals.iir.kiev.ua/index.php/knu/article/view/1979>.

⁷ Там само.

⁸ Камінський, Євген (2008) *Світ переможців і переможених. Міжнародні відносини і українська перспектива на початку XXI ст.* Київ : Центр вільної преси.

⁹ Голдстоун, Джек. (2009). Где искать источники экономического роста в нашем изменчивом мире? *Международная конференция «Возвращение политэкономии : к анализу возможных параметров мира после кризиса»*. Москва, 11–12 сентября 2009. Стенографический отчет. http://www.inop.ru/files/polit_teor_st_1.doc.

XVII century. It should be recalled that when the rules formed the Westphalian system, the Osnabruck and Munster treaties became a part of the constitutional law of the Holy Roman Empire.

The global financial and economic crisis of 2008-2009 provides many arguments for scholars who defend the state-centric model of the world and are skeptics of globalization. The recent crisis has shown that states have tried to defend themselves through protectionist economic measures, which has sparked a discourse on strengthening state borders and sovereignty. This is confirmed, for example, by anti-crisis measures of some economies in the EU.

The state-centric model of the world order presented above, based on the views of political “realism”, is denied by the transnationalist model, which is based on the views of “liberalism” and “neoliberalism” within the science of international relations. Among the representatives of this area should be noted such scientists as H. Alker, R. Keohane, J. Nye, J. Rosenau, N. Weller, T. Dan, F. Kratochvil, S. Mendlovitz, J. Ruggy, J. Ferguson, R. Folk, F. Fukuyama etc.

From the point of view of this approach of globalists, the traditional concept of the state in which it acts as the basic unit of a world order proceeds from its relative homogeneity. In other words, it is a unitary phenomenon with a set of characteristic goals. But the rise of international and transnational associations and organizations, from the United Nations and its specialized agencies to international influential groups and social movements, has changed the form and dynamics of both state and civil society. The state has become a fragmented political-oriented arena, covered by transnational networks (state and non-state), as well as local authorities and various political and civic movements.

Transnationalism was based on the fact that the ideas of political realism no longer correspond to the nature and current trends of international relations. From the point of view of transnationalists, the state oppresses many different actors and is no longer the only or even central actor in international relations. International relations go far beyond traditional interstate interactions based on national interests and power struggle. The state loses its monopoly, and international communication acquires a different meaning, turning from interstate to transnational.

It is now stated that the widespread penetration of transnational forces into civil society has changed its form and dynamics. Due to high-speed communications, political actions and decision-making are connected in a complex network of political interaction. This “stretching” of politics is associated with the intensification or deepening of global processes, so “action at a distance” penetrates into the social conditions and areas of knowledge specific to certain places or communities¹⁰.

Nations, ordinary people and organizations are equally interconnected through new ways of communication beyond national borders. The digital revolution in microelectronics, information technology, and computing has established high-speed communications around the world that, combined with television, cable, satellite communications, and jet communications, have radically changed the nature of political interaction.

These facts show that most of the traditional spheres of activity and responsibility of a state (defence, economic management, health care and law enforcement) can no longer develop without institutionalized multilateral forms of cooperation. In the post-war period, demands on the state increased significantly, and it faced a number of political problems that could not be solved without cooperation with other countries and non-governmental organizations¹¹. Globalization, according to its supporters, deprives the state of the opportunity to act independently to achieve goals in domestic and foreign policy: the role of government and the territorial state is transformed.

Accordingly, individual states can no longer be considered as political formations acceptable for solving key political problems or effectively managing a wide range of state functions. A contemporary state is increasingly entangled in a web of regional and global ties that spread through national, interstate and transnational forces and can no longer determine its own destiny. It is noted that this also complicates the sovereignty and legitimacy of states.

In the context of the global communication revolution, an increasing number of participants in the system of international relations are using new, more effective ways to organize regardless of the national borders and participate in the management of global events. Many scholars see this as a global

¹⁰ Giddens, Antony. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge : Polity, 188 p.

¹¹ McGrew, Antony. (1997). *The Transformation of Democracy? Globalization and Territorial Democracy*. Cambridge : Polity Press. 254 p.

communications revolution, where civic, local, and private interests come together to influence global governance.

For most international diplomacy of the twentieth century, relations between the countries were the main ones, so the existence of supranational organizations, such as the UN or the WTO, created new realities, where the voice of the people plays a significant role. However, the lack of transparency and accountability of supranational authorities is one of the key factors limiting their effectiveness and legitimacy. Non-state governance is a specific feature of contemporary political life, as it arose from the functional advantages that in interdependent states and communities can be realized through the strategic coordination of their policies and activities. Supranational institutions play a significant role because they provide important benefits to states and their citizens, and their lack can undermine human well-being and security. Accordingly, they “empower governments more than bind them”¹². In addition, they diminish the effects of power policy by creating specific forms of multilateral, supranational and transnational policies.

Effective political power, according to globalists, should no longer be localized only in national governments. Effective power is concentrated and distributed by various powers and structures at the national, regional and international levels. Many of today's global problems, from the organization of world trade to global warming, remain outside the reach of certain nation-states, which cannot solve them on their own.

The political world at the beginning of the XXI century distinguishes the emergence of new significant problems, the so-called “border problems”. In the past, nation-states have resolved their disputes over border areas in principle, guided by “state considerations”, based on diplomatic initiatives and, ultimately, by power. However, this logic is extremely inadequate and inappropriate when it comes to performing many complex tasks, from economic regulation to resource depletion and environmental degradation, which are a condition for successful development at the national level. In a world where transnational actors and powers transcend national communities in different ways, the question of who should report to whom and on what basis is not easy to answer. The political space for the development and implementation of effective governance and the responsibilities of government are no longer associated with limited political territory. Today, forms of political organization involve comprehensive deterritorialization and reterritorialization of political power¹³.

Having analyzed the positions of representatives of state-centric and transnational paradigms within the science of international relations, the author came to some preliminary conclusions. Thus, there are many good reasons to question the theoretical and empirical basis of the thesis that states lose their significance under the influence of globalization. This is evidenced by the arguments of both globalists and sceptics. Regional and global networks are developing and strengthening, affecting different countries in many ways. Moreover, national sovereignty, even in regions of intense interpenetration and divided power structures, has not been completely destroyed. In such regions, sovereignty has simply been transformed into an unlimited, indivisible, and exclusive form of state power, embodied in a single country and implemented through a system of complex, often unified centres of power and interdependent spheres of influence. In other words, there was a reconfiguration of political power.

We call such a change in power not globalist and not sceptical, but transformational one. It can be explained by a modified version of globalist argumentation, emphasizing that contemporary models of global political, economic and communicative flows are historically unprecedented, so their direction remains unclear, because globalization is an unpredictable historical process accompanied by conflict and tension. As a result, we have a dynamic and open concept that defines globalization as a major direction and describes the new kind of world order it can lead to. Compared to sceptical or globalist views, the transformational position does not make statements about the future direction of globalization and does not assess its current state in comparison with a single, ideal “globalized world”, regardless of whether it is a global market or a global civilization. This position emphasizes globalization as a long-term historical process that has certain problems and is significantly determined by a number of factors.

¹² Messner, Dirk. (2001). World society: structures and trends. External Publications in: Paul Kennedy / Dirk Messner / Franz Nuscheler (ed.), *Global Trends and Global Governance*, London. 22-64.

¹³ Rosenau, James. (1997). *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

There is no doubt that many states still have strong legitimate control over what is happening in their territories. The transformational position states that this needs to be compared and considered on a par with the growing powers of international governance institutions and the requirements and obligations of international law. This is especially true in the EU, where sovereign power is divided between international, national and local authorities, but the same applies to the activities of intergovernmental organizations such as the WTO.

However, even if sovereignty remains effective, states can no longer be the only ones who control and determine everything that happens within their territorial borders. Integrated global systems, from financial to environmental, combine the fate of individual local communities with the fate of communities in different regions of the world. Moreover, global communications and transport infrastructures support new forms of economic and social organization that transcend national borders. Government institutions and subjects of power can be located literally on the other side of the ocean. In such circumstances, the notion of the nation-state as a self-governing autonomous unit already belongs to the category of normative requirements, rather than to descriptive statements. Contemporary territorial sovereign law is becoming obsolete along with the transnational organization of many aspects of up to date political, economic, and social life¹⁴.

Realistic concepts consider the state as a key element of world politics. Therefore, the problems associated with the transformation of the institution of the nation-state are studied within this area of the science of international relations more systematically. The main goal of the state as the most powerful and influential actor in the system of international relations is to defend national interests. The system of sovereign states is anarchic, so states are forced to pursue a policy of power to defend their vital interests.

Within the framework of political realism, the state-centric concept of the international order is defended. The main argument of the realists is based on a premise that everything that happens outside the state borders is controlled by the state. New transnational actors in the system of international relations are owned and controlled by a particular state. International organizations do not have sufficient power potential and states have more leverage to influence the development of the international system. However, it is recognized that the increase in the number of new transnational actors undoubtedly affects the socio-political and economic development of states.

Instead, within postmodernist approaches, the transnationalization of the system of international relations, manifested in a rapid increase in cross-border trade, international services, movement of people, information, finance, energy, pollutants, etc., is changing the functions of state borders. They are becoming more “transparent” and are losing some of their barrier functions, which is evidence of the transformation of the Westphalian system of nation-states.

In this context, the problem of identity has a special place. It is inextricably linked to the analysis of the functions of the state, which is a political-territorial unit with clear and internationally recognized borders, within which the population has a certain political identity. It is formed, as a rule, by a state itself and nationalist-oriented political elites. One of the main elements of ethnic and political identity are certain geographical boundaries, so in the absence of a stable political identity there are no stable borders, stable territory, and therefore no stable state or other political unit.

If nation-states lose their prerogatives, territorial units emerge that acquire them. The Japanese scholar, publicist, and businessman K. Ohmae believes that “the boundaries that divide territories make sense if we relate them to what I call regions-states”. The size of the regions-states facilitates their integration and cooperation with other participants of international relations. They are ready to partner with anyone at home and abroad if it benefits them. Nation-states, according to K. Ohmae, should serve as effective catalysts for regional activities¹⁵.

It is difficult to disagree with the British scholar R. Cox, who believes that “the old system of states is transformed into a complex of political and economic communities: micro-regions, traditional states, macro-regions with institutions of greater or lesser functional scale and more or less formal power. Cities of world importance are becoming control panels for the global economy. There are

¹⁴ Матвеева, Олена. (2015). Виклики національній державі в умовах глобалізації. *Зовнішні справи*. 15 : 54-56.

¹⁵ Ohmae, Kenichy (1995). *The end of the nation state: the rise of regional economies*. London : Harper Collins, p. 80.

counter-processes of formation of ideologies, which are aimed at hegemony and counter-hegemony. Conciliation and Coordination Institutions are the links between powerful states and macro-regions. Conflicts are regulated through multilateral processes, peace is maintained, and services in various fields are provided. The overall picture is more like the multilevel order of medieval Europe than the Westphalian model of a system of sovereign independent states, which until recently remained a paradigm of international relations”¹⁶.

W. Reinecke Sr., a researcher at the Brookings Institution in the United States, associates the impact of globalization and growing interdependence with the limitation of nation-state sovereignty, which narrows the day-to-day running of nation-states, although not legally. W. Reinecke believes that the concept of “sovereignty” has two dimensions, internal and external. Internal sovereignty is determined by the nature of the relationship between the state and civil society. External sovereignty is manifested in the relations between the member states of the international system. A distinctive feature of these relations is that they are not regulated by a single central government¹⁷.

NGOs are becoming more influential and are driving further global political transformations. They take over some functions of international actors, which limits the independence of nation-states. Globalization processes contribute to the “erosion” of the borders of sovereign states, which for the sake of stable socio-economic and political development must interact with international organizations and comply with international law.

However, despite the transformation of the institution of the nation-state, the level of state control over the life of societies and the functioning of economies has never been stronger than at the beginning of the XXI century. It can be assumed that government agencies will create much stricter rules aimed at solving the main public tasks, ensuring stable economic growth, preventing the destructive technologies and weapons from falling into questionable hands, for which appropriate strategies will be developed and control bodies will be created.

Professor P. Hirst at the University of London, and G. Thompson, editor-in-chief of the British journal *Economics and Society*, are not adherents of the concept of globalization as determinants of world development. The authors proceed from the indisputable fact of changing the potential and functions of the state in the contemporary world, but do not agree that it has exhausted its role, despite the reduction of its leadership potential. The emergence of new telecommunications networks, the expansion of global and regional markets limits the exclusive control of the state over its own territory. However, the state still retained considerable control over the population and has the right to act on its behalf¹⁸.

The state may place part of its functions to supranational or subnational bodies, but only it ensures the legitimacy of the disposal of the delegated powers, as only the state has the “exclusive right to vote” on behalf of its population. It has a monopoly on the development, adoption and implementation of laws in the territory under its control. In the foreign policy aspect, the role of a state is also growing. If the system of global economic, social and environmental management is formed, the scope of application of international law is expanded, in accordance with which interstate agreements and supranational organizations must be concluded.

From the fact that the a state remains the main subject and object of the world order and the struggle for geopolitical hegemony, it follows that the border as a fundamental geopolitical category does not disappear –just as they have not disappeared before in the conditions of weakening of a state and respectively, the strengthening of nationalist and ethno-confessional tendencies. As the political history of states shows, the weakening of the political centre on the border periphery leads to the restoration of the former administrative, ethnic, religious, linguistic and other borders, each of which the regional (ethnic, religious) centre seeks to grant state status. This in turn suggests that the category of the border itself reflects the most important aspect of the perception of territoriality (and states as a form of existence in a given territory) at the level of individual and collective consciousness.

¹⁶ Cox, Robert. (1996). Global «perestroika». *Approaches to world order*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 296–313.

¹⁷ Reinecke, W. (1997). Global Public Policy. *Foreign Affairs*. Nov.-Dec., 127–140.

¹⁸ Hirst, Paul & Tohmpon, Graham. (1995). Globalization and the future of the nation state. *Economy and society*. London. 24 (3) : 408–442.

The current stage of global change is transforming the very foundations of the world order through the reconstruction of traditional forms of sovereign state, political community and international governance. However, these processes are neither inevitable nor completely safe. Globalization is moving from a pure one-state policy to a new and more complex form of multilevel global policy. This is the basis for the implementation of political regulatory mechanisms. As a result, the contemporary world order is easier to understand as a complex, interconnected order, where the state is integrated into a developed system of multilevel regional and global governance.

American researcher J. Rosenau notes that the political structure of the world in the XXI century is most likely to resemble a network organized by type of Internet, with numerous nodes and plexuses – state, interstate, non-state and mixed nature. This is still a very vague structure, but already now, according to J. Rosenau, the very concept of “international relations” loses its earlier meaning. To describe the new phenomenon, he suggests using the term “post-international relations”. However, along with the systems in which state and non-state actors are active, forming a “polycentric world” in which they act as centres, there is also a “state-centric world”¹⁹.

There are many predictions about global political transition, or transit. This “global transit” is often described as an era of uncertainty or a break. J. Rosenau uses a metaphor from physics, calling it a period of turbulence and especially distinguishes the “bifurcation point” (in which further development can occur in completely different directions). During this period, the laws cease to operate with the same obviousness as before. As a result, the situation is poorly predictable, with various possible consequences. Tensions are growing, habitual relationships are being transformed, which often leads to paralysis of decision-making processes. The contradiction of this period is that, on the one hand, the old laws and norms continue to operate, on the other hand, new ones appear at the same time. At present, we can state the onset of changes in state sovereignty in the form of loss of some and the emergence of new functions, in the role of non-governmental actors, as well as the degree of interdependence, which allows states to respond more actively to events in other countries, especially if they are related to conflicts. At the same time, interference in internal affairs (for example, the Iraq crisis and the US attempt to resolve it by force) is forcing other states, even those that have not been subjected to violence, to seek to preserve their sovereignty in various ways. This can take many different and very dangerous forms. For example, to encourage non-nuclear states (North Korea) to develop programs for the development and production of their own nuclear weapons. In a more economical way, they can focus on the use of chemical weapons²⁰.

We note that today a state is forced to pay more and more attention, on the one hand, to international organizations and institutions (resulting in the restriction of sovereignty “from above”), on the other – to its domestic regions, which actively enter the international arena, developing trade, cultural and other relations (restriction of sovereignty “from below”). In addition, a state is forced to take into account other participants in international political processes, such as transnational corporations and non-governmental organizations.

Following the erosion of state sovereignty, the norms and principles of international law being one of the components designed to stabilize world development and order, are eroding. In practice, these norms and principles increasingly contradict each other. For example, the right of nations to self-determination, on the one hand, and the preservation of the integrity of a state, on the other; the principle of non-interference in internal affairs and the provision of humanitarian assistance; respect for human rights and violent intervention in the conflict in order to preserve peace (UN Charter, Chapter VII), as well as the nature of this intervention (the presence of UN sanctions, the possibility of using the Air Force, Navy, such actions as “displacement” of armed groups, preventive self-defence”, Ensuring the delivery of humanitarian goods, peace enforcement). One of the most striking examples of identifying these and other contradictions is the violent intervention in internal conflicts at the end of the twentieth century, for example in Kosovo, and at the beginning of the 21st century in Iraq.

The weakening of a “state” identity is accompanied by a loss of self-identification. The conflicts that arose in the 1990s were called “identity conflicts”. In its brightest form, it is a conflict, where the basis for identification is belonging to a certain civilization, as described in the hypothetical scenario

¹⁹ Rosenau, James (2006). *The Study of World Politics. Volume 1 : theoretical and methodological challenges*. London – New York : Routledge, p. 39.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 89.

of S. Huntington. Ultimately, numerical identification can lead to the identification of the highest level, which includes all these communities, or to global or cosmopolitan self-identification. However, today such a cosmopolitan identity, i.e. a sense of belonging to the world, has not yet been formed.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. The spheres of activity of all participants in international cooperation are wonderfully intertwined. Paradoxically, if earlier, for example, domestic regions tried to influence only the domestic political processes of their country, and international organizations – on issues that were limited to the foreign policy sphere (which seemed logical), now everything has changed. Intergovernmental organizations and institutions are increasingly interfering in such domestic political issues as the settlement of internal conflicts (in particular, NATO, OSCE, UN), respect for human rights, and the definition of financial policy of states (IMF). At the same time, domestic regions tend to the external sphere of activity, sometimes on a par with a state, which often causes concern and confusion for the central government.

Previously, the international sphere was limited to interstate cooperation. Changing the number of participants in international cooperation and the nature of their relations leads to complications in world politics. In the era of the classical Westphalian model of the world, the amount of participants in international interaction and relations was quite limited, and today their number has increased significantly, which has led to a complication of relations between actors in international relations.

In the context of changing the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of relations between the participants of international cooperation, there is an acute problem of responsibility of actors in international relations for their actions on the world stage. A number of states do not pay enough attention to the possible side effects of their activities on the sustainable development of the international system. In other cases, participants of international relations even set themselves destructive goals (for example, international terrorist organizations). Today, non-state actors perform on the world stage as participants with the limited liability, and in this sense they appear as quasi-subjects. That is why changes in the quantitative and, most importantly, in the qualitative composition of participants in contemporary world political processes cause fundamental changes in the world political structure.

Thus, the analysis of the transformation of the institution of a nation-state and sovereignty in the formation of the contemporary international order in the late XX – early XXI centuries, proves the indisputable fact that the processes of globalization and the associated number of participants are a factor in changing the political structure. The Westphalian system of the world began its existence with the fact that the participants of international cooperation were only states that act independently or form coalitions to solve certain problems. At the end of the XX – beginning of the XXI century it became obvious that other, very influential actors were entering the world arena. Together with states, various intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations, transnational corporations and domestic regions are making contribution into contemporary transformation of the system of international relations. All these actors have very different goals: some positive ones, aimed at supporting stable world development; others, such as terrorist organizations, see their task as destabilizing the existing world order.

Список джерел

1. Голдстоун, Джек. (2009). Где искать источники экономического роста в нашем изменчивом мире? *Международная конференция «Возвращение политэкономии : к анализу возможных параметров мира после кризиса»*. Москва, 11–12 сентября 2009. Стенографический отчет. http://www.inop.ru/files/polit_teor_st_1.doc.
2. Камінський, Євген (2008) *Світ переможців і переможених. Міжнародні відносини і українська перспектива на початку XXI ст.* Київ : Центр вільної преси.
3. Коппель, Олена (2009). Концепції організації міжнародних систем, *Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка*. 37 : 4–8. <http://journals.iir.kiev.ua/index.php/knu/article/view/1979>.
4. Матвеева, Олена. (2015). Виклики національній державі в умовах глобалізації. *Зовнішні справи*. 15 : 54-56.
5. Уолтс, Кенет. (2002). Человек, государство и война: теоретический анализ теории международных отношений. *Хрестоматия*. П.А. Цыганков (ред.). Москва : Гардарики.
6. Фесенко, Микола. (2012). Трансформація суверенітету в умовах глобалізації. *Дослідження світової політики*. 4 (61) : 80-92.

7. Шергін, Сергій (2008) Парадокси і проблеми глобалізації. *Зовнішні справи*. 5 : 42–46.
8. Cox, Robert. (1996). Global «perestroika». *Approaches to world order*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 296–313.
9. Giddens, Antony. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge : Polity, 188 p.
10. Hirst, Paul & Thompson, Graham. (1995). Globalization and the future of the nation state. *Economy and society*. London. 24 (3) : 408–442.
11. Kiljunen, K. (1999). *Global governance*. Helsinki : Inst. Of development studies, 218 p.
12. Mackinder H. (1982). *Geography as an Aid to Statecraft*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 295 p.
13. McGrew, Antony. (1997). *The Transformation of Democracy? Globalization and Territorial Democracy*. Cambridge : Polity Press. 254 p.
14. Messner, Dirk. (2001). World society: structures and trends. External Publications in: Paul Kennedy / Dirk Messner / Franz Nuscheler (ed.), *Global Trends and Global Governance*, London. 22-64.
15. Ohmae, Kenichy (1995). *The end of the nation state: the rise of regional economies*. London : Harper Collins. 214 p.
16. Reinecke, W. (1997). Global Public Policy. *Foreign Affairs*. Nov.-Dec., 127–140.
17. Rosenau, James. (1997). *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
18. Rosenau, James (2006). *The Study of World Politics. Volume 1 : theoretical and methodological challenges*. London – New York : Routledge. 301 p.
19. Waltz, Kenneth. (1979). *The Theory of International Politics*. New York : Addison-Wesley. 251 p.

References

1. Holdstoun, Dzhek. (2009). Hdie iskat istochniki ekonomicheskoho rosta v nashem izmenchivom mirie? [From Rus.:Where to look for sources of economic growth in our volatile world?] *Miezhdunarodnaia konfierientsiia “Vozvrashchieniie politekonomii : k analizu vozmoznykh paramietrov mira poslie krizisa”* [From Rus.: *International conference “The return of political economy: to the analysis of possible parameters of the world after the crisis”*]. Moskva, 11–12 sentiabria 2009. Stienohrafichieskii otchiet, http://www.inop.ru/files/polit_teor_st_1.doc.
2. Kaminskyi, Evhen (2008) *Svit peremozhstv i peremozhnykh. Mizhнародni vidnosyny i ukrainska perspektyva na pochatku XXI st.* [From Ukr.: *The world of winners and losers. International relations and the Ukrainian perspective at the beginning. XXI century*]. Kyiv : Tsentri vilnoi presy.
3. Koppel, Olena (2009). Kontseptsii orhanizatsii mizhнародnykh system [from Ukr.: Concepts of organization of international systems], *Journal of International Relations of KNU*, 37 : 4–8. <http://journals.iir.kiev.ua/index.php/knu/article/view/1979>.
4. Matvieieva, Olena. (2015). Vyklyky natsionalnii derzhavi v umovakh hlobalizatsii [From Ukr.: Challenges to the nation state in the context of globalization.]. *Zovnishni spravy* [From Ukr.: Foreign Affairs]. 15 : 54-56.
5. Waltz, Kenneth. (2002). Cheloviek, hosudarstvo i voina: teoriichieskii analiz teoriii miezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii. *Khriestomatiia* [From Rus.: Man, state and war: a theoretical analysis of the theory of international relations. Reader]. P. A. Cygankov (ed). Moskva: Gardariki, 2002.
6. Fesenko, Mykola. (2012). Transformatsiia suverenitetu v umovakh hlobalizatsii [From Ukr.:Transformation of sovereignty in the context of globalization.]. *Doslidzhennia svitovoi polityky* [From Ukr.: *Study of World Politics*]. 4 (61) : 80-92.
7. Sherhin, Serhii (2008) Paradoksy i problemy hlobalizatsii [From Ukr.: Paradoxes and problems of globalization. *Foreign Affairs UA*. 5 : 42–46.
8. Cox, Robert. (1996). Global “perestroika”. *Approaches to world order*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 296–313.
9. Giddens, Antony. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge : Polity, 188 pp.
10. Hirst, Paul & Thompson, Graham. (1995). Globalization and the future of the nation state. *Economy and society*. London. 24 (3) : 408–442.
11. Kiljunen, K. (1999). *Global governance*. Helsinki : Inst. Of development studies, 218 p.
12. Mackinder H. (1982). *Geography as an Aid to Statecraft*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 295 p.

13. McGrew, Antony. (1997). *The Transformation of Democracy? Globalization and Territorial Democracy*. Cambridge : Polity Press. 254 p.
14. Messner, Dirk. (2001). *World society: structures and trends. External Publications* in: Paul Kennedy / Dirk Messner / Franz Nuscheler (ed.), *Global Trends and Global Governance*, London. 22-64.
15. Ohmae, Kenichy (1995). *The end of the nation state: the rise of regional economies*. London : Harper Collins. 214 p.
16. Reinecke, W. (1997). Global Public Policy. *Foreign Affairs*. Nov.-Dec., 127–140.
17. Rosenau, James. (1997). *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
18. Rosenau, James (2006). *The Study of World Politics. Volume 1 : theoretical and methodological challenges*. London – New York : Routledge. 301 p.
19. Waltz, Kenneth. (1979). *The Theory of International Politics*. New York : Addison-Wesley. 251 p.