

МІЖНАРОДНІ ВІДНОСИНИ: ІСТОРИЧНІ ЕТАПИ, ПРОЦЕСИ, ВИКЛИКИ

Історико-політичні проблеми сучасного світу:
Збірник наукових статей. – Чернівці:
Чернівецький національний університет,
2021. – Т. 44. – С. 9-16
DOI: 10.31861/mhpi2021.44.9-16

Modern Historical and Political Issues:
Journal in Historical & Political Sciences. – Chernivtsi:
Chernivtsi National University,
2021. – Volume. 44. – pp. 9-16
DOI: 10.31861/mhpi2021.44.9-16

УДК 327:341:061.1

© Mykola Getmanchuk¹

© Olena Straikher²

Peculiarities of the Concepts of International and World Order Interpretation in Modern International Relations

The article is dedicated to the important scientific problem – the interpretation of the concepts of international and world order. Particular attention is paid to the conceptual approaches in the studying of the concepts of world and international order and legitimacy, as main condition for their formation. It is emphasized that international order is viable only if it is accepted voluntarily if not by all, but at least by the majority of international actors. It is studied that the concept of “world order” reflects the growing awareness of the common responsibility of people and nations for the state of our planet. Approaches to the world order formation and development in the XXI century are analyzed, the ideological sphere of the new world order, which is seen in globalization processes in the world, the concentration of world capital, the formation of special public opinion through the media. The authors consider the issue of a just and democratic world order, in this context, a special resolution of the UN General Assembly “Promoting Democracy and a Fair International Order” is mentioned. The article considers the concept of the famous American political scientist S. Hoffman, who proposes to distinguish between an international order that can exist without a world order and a world order that cannot be established without an international order. The types of international order are studied, in particular: competitive order, coordination order, subordination order, hegemonic order, imperial order, condominium order. The authors note the position of the American researcher and politician H. Kissinger, who argues that every world order is an expression of the desire for permanence, stability, foreign policy balance. However, all the elements that make it up are constantly changing, and this has the effect of reducing the duration of international systems. The article also considers the ideas of the collective world order of the American political scientist Z. Brzezinski. The authors highlight the views of the Club of Rome on the formation of international and world order.

Key words: order, international order, world order, formation of international order, international actor, democratic world order, coordination order.

Концептуальні підходи щодо порівняльного аналізу міжнародного та світового порядку в сучасних міжнародних відносинах

Стаття присвячена важливій науковій проблемі – тлумаченню понять сучасного міжнародного і світового порядку. Особливу увагу приділено концептуальним підходам дослідження понять світового та міжнародного порядку і легітимності, як основній умові їх формування. Наголошено, що міжнародний порядок є життєздатним за умови, коли буде добровільно прийнятий якщо не всіма, то, принаймні, більшістю міжнародних акторів. Показано, що поняття «світовий порядок» відображає зростаюче усвідомлення спільної відповідальності людей і народів за стан нашої планети. Висвітлено підходи до становлення та розвитку світового по-

¹ Doctor of Political Sciences, professor with the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine. E-mail: hetmanchukm@ukr.net; <https://orcid.org/0000-002-2627-8161>.

² Assistant of the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine. E-mail: olena.a.shtraikher@lpnu.ua; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8493-1563>.

рядку у ХХІ ст. та досліджено ідеологічну сферу нового світового порядку, яку вбачають у світових глобальних процесах, концентрації світових капіталів, формуванні особливої громадської думки за допомогою засобів масової інформації. Звернуто увагу на проблему справедливого та демократичного світового порядку у контексті спеціальної резолюції Генеральної Асамблеї ООН «Сприяння демократії і справедливому міжнародному порядку». Особлива увага звертається на концепцію відомого американського політолога С. Хоффмана, який пропонує розрізняти міжнародний порядок, що може існувати без наявності світового порядку, і світовий порядок, який не може бути встановлений без міжнародного порядку. Досліджуються типи міжнародного порядку: конкурентний порядок, порядок координації, порядок субординації, гегемоніальний порядок, імперський порядок, порядок кондомініуму. Відзначено позицію американського дослідника Г. Кіссінджера, який стверджує, що кожний світовий порядок є виразником прагнення до постійності, стабільності, зовнішньополітичного балансування, однак всі елементи, що його формують, постійно змінюються, а це впливає на скорочення тривалості міжнародних систем. У статті проаналізовано ідеї колективного світового порядку американського політолога З. Бжезінського і висвітлено погляди представників Римського клубу на питання формування міжнародного та світового порядку.

Ключові слова: порядок, світовий порядок, міжнародний порядок, гібридний світовий порядок, новий міжнародний порядок.

Formulation of the research problem and its significance.

In the modern world, along with existing states, the new sovereign states with their own values and needs, which they can not satisfy without interacting with other states, constantly continue to appear. Significant increase in the number of actors of international relations causes them to be interested in ensuring that their interaction is not destructive and subversive. That is why in the international system, which they create by a fact of their existence, actions, ties and influences, often there is a need for normalization of the states' actions in the external environment. While investigating in the field of international cooperation, domestic and foreign researchers most often use the terms of the world order, international order and global order. It should be emphasized that in the conceptual context, the problem of world and international order is not sufficient and requires further research.

Authors of the article **aimed** to analyze the conceptual approaches to the interpretation of the concepts of world and international order in the works of domestic and foreign researchers, to show their identity and differences. The article outlines a number of tasks, namely to determine the main conceptual approaches to the interpretation of the concepts of "international order" and "world order"; to distinguish between the interpretation of the concepts in the works of domestic and foreign researchers; to indicate common and distinctive features between both; to identify the main factors that affect the studied phenomena.

Recent researches and publications overview. The terms "international order" and "world order" were introduced to the scientific language at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This was related to the title of the book by a member of the Fabian Society, H. Wales, who advocated an approach to political action based on the need for its rational planning³. The problem of forming a "new world order" began to be actively studied in scientific environment only after the Kuwait crisis of 1990-1991 and the collapse of the Soviet Union⁴. In the theory of international relations, the concept of "world order" reflects the growing awareness of the joint responsibility of people and nations for the condition of our planet⁵. Most researchers of international relations note that modern international or world order began to be formed at the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union. For several decades after the Second World War, the world order was mainly considered as a horizontal time cut of international relations, an objectively specified condition that was established through the ratio of potentials of the largest states⁶. In addition to the above mentioned

³ Маклін, І. and Макмілан, А. ред., 2006. Короткий Оксфордський політичний словник. Київ: Основи, с. 715-716.

⁴ Коппель, О. and Кісільова, З., 2009. Новий міжнародний порядок: структурні характеристики та особливості формування. *Політичні проблеми міжнародних відносин*, 87(2), с. 12.

⁵ Бучин, М., Гетьманчук, М., Ільницька, У. and Кучма, Л., 2010. *Основи теорії міжнародних відносин*. Львів: Академія сухопутних військ, с. 241-242.

⁶ Арон, Р., 2000. *Мир і війна між націями; пер. з фр.* Київ: МП Юніверс.

scientists, issues of “international” and “world” order were studied by H. Kissinger, Z. Brzezinski, H. Bull, S. Hoffman, G. Ikenberry, M. Heidegger, S. Shergin and others.

Main part. Today there is a large number of theories devoted to the formation and development of the world order of the 21st century. The most famous among them are neo-realism, neoliberalism, transnationalism, constructivism, postmodernism, neoconservatism, etc. Most of them argue that a new reality changed the system of international relations based on the principles of balance of powers and confrontation of two superpowers. In this case, the role and importance of geopolitical confrontation increases, as the force factor that forms and modifies the modern world order and acts as an integral part of social relations and interactions⁷. In the formation of a new global order, many events are determined with the participation of influential groups of international state figures, bankers, large businessmen, media – magnates and other persons affecting the policy of individual countries. The ideological side of the new world order lays in the world globalization processes, the concentration of world capital, the formation of a special public opinion through the media.

The basis of the new world order are the goals and principles of the United Nations Charter. It should be emphasized that they are often not fulfilled and even ignored, the evidence of this is shown through the numerous violations of international law, human rights, domination of power factors in international relations (annexation of Crimea and occupation of Donbas by the Russian Federation, etc.). In this context, it is necessary to indicate a special resolution of the UN General Assembly “Promoting democracy and fair international order”. It states that “everyone has the right to democratic and equitable international order”. To fulfil this, it is necessary to include both politics and global instruments to enhance the role of international institutions and mechanisms in the global economy that meet the needs of countries. It is in this one of the manifestations of just and democratic world order⁸.

In this regard, it is necessary to note the position of the famous American researcher and politician H. Kissinger, who argues that every world order is an desired expression of permanence, stability, foreign policy balance. However, all elements that form it are constantly changing, and this affects the reduction of the length of international systems⁹. The world order in this sense, as H. Kissinger emphasizes, must be built and not imposed. The duration and sustainability of any system of world order will depend on whether it is perceived fair not only by the leaders of states, but also by citizens. It should reflect two truths: 1) order without freedom in the end creates its own opposite; 2) freedom is impossible to be provided and hold without a framework that retains peaceful existence. The order and freedom, which are sometimes referred to as opposite poles, should be understood as interdependent. In this context, H. Kissinger highlights three levels of order: 1) “World Order” – the concept relating to the nature of fair agreements and distribution of power for the whole world; 2) “International order” – the practical application of this concept on a large part of the globe is enough to influence the global balance of forces; 3) “Regional order” – applies to a certain geographic area. Each of these systems is based on two components: legitimacy – a set of generally accepted rules that determine the limits of permissible actions; balance of forces – forces for restraint in case of violation of the rules, prevents the conquest of one political unit of all other¹⁰.

The famous American political scientist Z. Brzezinski developed the idea of collective world order, the creation of “Community of Developed Countries” under the ideological and political leadership of the United States¹¹. Within the framework of a number of researchers established in the 60's and 80's of the twentieth century. Abstract models of world order embodied the basic universal values: peace, welfare, social and political stability, self-realization of personality, etc.¹². However, the modern vision of the world order and the nature of international relations comes from the fact that the geopolitical space is not much divided between the major states with the spheres of their influence, but

⁷ Хайдеггер, М., 2003. *Время и бытие: Статьи и выступления*. Москва: Фолио, с. 258.

⁸ Документи 55 сесії ООН. 2000. *Резолюція ООН 55/107*. [online] Available at: <<http://http://daccess-ods.un.org/TMT/5306985.97431183>> [Accessed 10 August 2021].

⁹ Киссенджер, Г., 2003. *Новый мировой порядок. Философия политики*. 4th ed. Київ: Знання України, с. 29-80; Киссенджер, Г., 1997. *Дипломатия*. Москва: Ладомир, с. 734.

¹⁰ Киссенджер, Г., 2018. *Світовий порядок. Роздуми про характер націй в історичному контексті*. Київ: Наш формат, с. 12-13.

¹¹ Бжезінський, З., 2000. *Велика шахівниця*. Львів–Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ, с. 24-29.

¹² Шергін, С., 1997. *Світовий порядок: концепції і реальність. Політика і час*, 1, с. 16.

rather between the internal lines of the tension between the stability zone, where the law and international law are dominated by the human rights, and the sphere of uncertainty, characterized by disdain to the law, numerous local conflicts – to all of the security, stability and development of human civilization threats.

Significant contribution to the development of concepts and models of the world order was introduced by the scholars of the Club of Rome, who are the founders of the world futurological thought. The Club of Rome was established on the initiative of A. Peccei and A. King in 1968. In the framework of the world order, the Club members developed a strategy of “global equilibrium”, and subsequently arose the theory of Mesarovic and E. Pestel – the formation of a new economic order. Within these studies, possible ways of restructuring of international economic order were substantiated. These studies take into account the current trends in human development, qualitative and quantitative indicators of the world economy and aim to develop methods of overcoming the negative phenomena of the global economy. Ukrainian political scientist S. Shergin pays attention to the delineation and ratio of the concepts of international and world order. He believes that the nucleus of the world order is international order, but these concepts should not be identified and absolutized¹³.

Today, humanity is facing the challenge of hybrid wars, which give rise to the new hybrid world order formation. Ukrainian researchers emphasize that the starting point for the formation of a hybrid world order was the aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine. In the XXI century aggression is manifested not only in context of hostilities. Kremlin does not plan to destroy millions of people, as the bloody dictators did, but aims to redraw the political map of the continent, to bring the format of international relations closer to the bipolar world¹⁴. In the new conditions the authority of the Russian Federation set such goals: 1) from the geostrategic point of view – to destroy the existing world order of domination of Western countries on the world stage, to regain the status of “great power”; 2) from the geohistorical point of view – to return the world to the reality in the middle of the twentieth century, to the period of rhetoric of classical political realism (“zones of influence”, “struggle of systems”, “balance of power and balance of interests”)¹⁵. According to the authors of the article, the new hybrid world order that is being formed is a new reality that cannot be extrapolated to the realities of the past era.

The famous American political scientist and sociologist F. Fukuyama draws attention to the fact that the process of destruction of the existing world order and the issues that arise differ depending on the region. In Eurasia, he notes, two large and centralized authoritarian states, Russia and China, again demonstrate the determination to make territorial claims, ignoring the interests of the neighbours¹⁶. In this context, another well-known American political scientist S. Huntington emphasizes that the difference between democracies and dictatorships is less important than between those countries where political life is built on consensus, unity, legitimacy, organization, efficiency and stability, and the countries that lack these characteristics¹⁷. New realities that arise in the process of forming a hybrid world order create conditions for strong refusals of the usual typical decisions in the field of international relations and respond adequately to hybrid challenges.

The order's concept and phenomenon is the characteristic which is imminent to society and reflects a certain level of organization in the community, its orderliness. This characteristic is acquired, and not predetermined. Social order is a certain organization of society, its regulation based on certain norms and general values. The concept of “international order” was firstly mentioned by the US President George H. W. Bush as a special kind of public order and relates to the global social community – the world community, formed by a set of different social entities (actors) acting and interacting on the world arena. This community is regulated by certain state-legal, international, moral norms and general national, cultural, moral and ethical values. Often international order is considered as a set of legal norms, identifying it with the legal order, legitimacy that is not entirely correct from

¹³ Бебик, В., Шергін, С. and Дегтярова, Л., 2003. *Сучасна глобалістика: провідні концепції і модерна практика*. Київ: Університет «Україна», с. 93.

¹⁴ Магда, Є., 2017. *Гібридна агресія Росії: уроки для Європи*. Київ: КАЛАМАР, с. 10.

¹⁵ Горбулін, В., 2017. *Світова гібридна війна: український фронт*. Харків: Фоліо, с. 7-9.

¹⁶ Фукуяма, Ф., 2019. *Політичний порядок і політичний занепад. Від промислової революції до глобалізації демократії; пер. з англ.* Київ: Наш формат, с. 542.

¹⁷ Гантінгтон, С., 2020. *Політичний порядок у мінливих суспільствах; пер. з англ.* Київ: Наш формат, с. 20.

the conceptual-categorical point of view. Certain researchers associate international order with the preservation of stability, a certain status quo in the relations between the states. However, the vast majority of scholars use the term “international order” in the meaning which covers the entire system of international relations and determines the behaviour of world policy entities¹⁸.

Thus, “international order” is such an organization of international and interstate relations, which is opposite to anarchy and provides the existence of joint institutions, norms and values that create conditions for the existence, security and development of states, their interaction on the international arena¹⁹. In this sense, the concept of “world order” is also used. But those who use the term “world order”, as evidenced by practice, mean the “international order”. An important condition for the formation of “international order” is its legitimacy. It is viable only if it is voluntarily accepted by, at least, the majority of international actors, or imposed to the world community by actors that dictate their rules of the world²⁰. According to researchers, our era is an epoch of transition from an international order based on the sovereignty of the nations which reflects their needs in existence, to the global order regulated by institutions, in favour of which all the participants in international relations voluntarily alienate ever-increasing part of their sovereignty in order to protect fundamental interests of mankind – survival and well-being²¹.

Famous American political scientist S. Hoffman offers to distinguish international order that may exist without the existence of a world order, and a world order that cannot be established without international order. According to the researcher, the international order as more or less orderly system of international relations existed always at all stages of the history of international relations, and the world order is only formed²². Thus, the world order is such an order of the world that provides the basic needs of state nations, regional associations, as well as all other legitimate international organizations and institutions that are capable of creating and maintaining their existence and development. The content of the world order is formed by the fundamental needs of mankind, as survival, welfare, justice, while international order reflects the needs of states in providing their sovereignty. It can be argued that the international and world order, having common roots, strengthen and cement the human community into a single whole.

According to the criteria for organizing the interaction between international actors and the goals they pursue, researchers distinguish several types of international order:

- 1) a competitive order with the dominance of the international actors own interests;
- 2) the order of coordination, which provides for the creation of a balance of forces between the interests of international actors;
- 3) the order of subordination, the formation of which indicates the development of international relations in the direction of subordination of interests of individual actors to the interests of the international community;
- 4) hegemonial order, which provides for an undeniable advantage of one of the international actors;
- 5) the imperial order formed within the hegemonial one and meaning the power of one force over the united territories;
- 6) the order of the condominium, characterized by power equilibrium of two superpowers, interacting, creating stable international systems²³.

Researchers claim that it is especially important that in all measurements of the international order the force, first of all the military force, was the main means of its support at various stages of international relations development, due to which international interactions are stabilized or destabilized.

The concept of the classics of the modern school of international relations H. Bull is fundamental in the study of world and international phenomena. He was one of the first scholars paying attention to the globalization in international order, when the state should get rid of its selfish national interests for

¹⁸ Мальський, М., 2011. *Теорія міжнародних відносин*. Київ: Знання, с. 352.

¹⁹ Гетьманчук, М., Дорош, Л., Здоровега, М. and Івасечко, О., 2015. *Основи теорії міжнародних відносин*. Львів: Видавництво Львівська політехніка, с. 191.

²⁰ Громько, А., 2005. *Мировой порядок или беспорядок*. Москва: Институт Африки (РАН), с. 106.

²¹ Цыганков, П., 2004. *Теория международных отношений*. Москва: Гардарики, с. 41-42.

²² Бучин, М., Гетьманчук, М., Ільницька, У. and Кучма, Л., 2010. *Основи теорії міжнародних відносин*. Львів: Академія сухопутних військ, с. 165.

²³ Шепелев, М., 2004. *Теорія міжнародних відносин*. Київ: Вища школа, с. 417.

the general good, forced to build a relations with consideration of the other members of the international community interests²⁴. The scholar argues that the relations between dozens of sovereigns have an anarchic nature, and the international procedure is possible if international relations are built not on the principles of the world community (with the sovereignties' conflict of interests), but according to the model of world society, in which constructive interaction prevails over destructive confrontation. Under the "world order" H. Bull understands those samples of human activity aimed at supporting the elementary or primary objectives of the social life of all mankind, whose purpose should be the order of general well-being, and this will distinguish the "international" and "world" order concepts²⁵.

In the study of the ratio of both concepts it is important to pay attention to the work of the American political scientist J. Eikenberry, one of the leading researchers of the world political order. In his writings, the scientist argues that the central problem of international relations is the problem of order, how it has been built and how it is restored after destruction. He believes that the notion of order should be considered to a greater extent as a decision procedure than as a situation procedure. That is, the concept of international order includes not only a component of the hierarchy (which provides order), but also the rules according to which this order is carried out. In this case, the scholar notes that in the analysis of the concept of international order, attention should be paid to the following aspects:

- 1) the presence of a hierarchy in the system of international order;
- 2) a set of rules and principles of international actors behaviour;
- 3) decision-making system in context of international cooperation;
- 4) the mechanism of representing the interests of the lower members in the hierarchy;
- 5) a set of sanctions in case of international order violation;
- 6) methods and forms of support for international order²⁶.

Conclusions. Taking into account all previously reflected information, it can be stated: first, nowadays there is no unambiguous understanding and clear distinction between the interpretation of the concepts of "international" and "world" order in the works of both Ukrainian and foreign researchers; secondly, this situation exists due to the fact that today the international system is in turbulence, when the world order formed after the Second World War had collapsed, and the new one, due to the complexity of transformation processes is only at the initial stage of its formation; thirdly, the study of conceptual approaches to the world and international order interpretation suggests that the "international order" is a state of the international relations system, which is determined by the structure of the international system over time and determines the relationship of power / subordination between elements of this system (subjects) and makes the relations more established and orderly; fourth, the world order is a system that must ensure the support and implementation of the primary goals of human social (political) existence, the general order of the system.

Список джерел

1. Арон, Р., 2000. *Мир і війна між націями; пер. з фр.* Київ: МП Юніверс.
2. Бебик, В., Шергін, С. and Дегтярова, Л., 2003. *Сучасна глобалістика: провідні концепції і модерна практика.* Київ: Університет «Україна».
3. Бжезінський, З., 2000. *Велика шахівниця.* Львів–Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ.
4. Бучин, М., Гетьманчук, М., Ільницька, У. and Кучма, Л., 2010. *Основи теорії міжнародних відносин.* Львів: Академія сухопутних військ.
5. Гантінгтон, С., 2020. *Політичний порядок у мінливих суспільствах; пер. з англ.* Київ: Наш формат.
6. Гетьманчук, М., Дорош, Л., Здоровега, М. and Івасечко, О., 2015. *Основи теорії міжнародних відносин.* Львів: Видавництво Львівська політехніка.
7. Горбулін, В., 2017. *Світова гібридна війна: український фронт.* Харків: Фоліо.

²⁴ Гетьманчук, М., Дорош, Л., Здоровега, М. and Івасечко, О., 2015. *Основи теорії міжнародних відносин.* Львів: Видавництво Львівська політехніка, с. 36.

²⁵ Bull, H., 1977. *The Anarchical Society. A Study of Order in World Politics.* N.J.: Columbia University Press, p. 20.

²⁶ Eikenberry, G., 2001. *After Victory. Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars.* Princeton: NJ, p. 22.

8. Громыко, А., 2005. *Мировой порядок или беспорядок*. Москва: Институт Африки (РАН).
9. Документи 55 сесії ООН. 2000. *Резолюція ООН 55/107*. [online] Available at: <<http://daccess-ods.un.org/TMT/5306985.97431183>> [Accessed 10 August 2021].
10. Киссенджер, Г., 1997. *Дипломатия*. Москва: Ладомир.
11. Киссенджер, Г., 2003. *Новый мировой порядок. Философия политики*. 4th ed. Київ: Знання України.
12. Киссенджер, Г., 2018. *Світовий порядок. Роздуми про характер націй в історичному контексті*. Київ: Наш формат.
13. Коппель, О. and Кісільова, З., 2009. Новый міжнародний порядок: структурні характеристики та особливості формування. *Політичні проблеми міжнародних відносин*, 87(2), с. 11-17.
14. Магда, Є., 2017. *Гібридна агресія Росії: уроки для Європи*. Київ: КАЛАМАР.
15. Маклін, І. and Макмілан, А. ред., 2006. *Короткий Оксфордський політичний словник*. Київ: Основи.
16. Мальський, М., 2011. *Теорія міжнародних відносин*. Київ: Знання.
17. Фукуяма, Ф., 2019. *Політичний порядок і політичний занепад. Від промислової революції до глобалізації демократії; пер. з англ.* Київ: Наш формат.
18. Хайдеггер, М., 2003. *Время и бытие: Статьи и выступления*. Москва: Фолио.
19. Цыганков, П., 2004. *Теория международных отношений*. Москва: Гардарики.
20. Шергін, С., 1997. Світовий порядок: концепції і реальність. *Політика і час*, 1, с.14-21.
21. Шепелев, М., 2004. *Теорія міжнародних відносин*. Київ: Вища школа.
22. Bull, H., 1977. *The Anarchical Society. A Study of Order in World Politics*. N.J.: Columbia University Press.
23. Ikenberry, G., 2001. *After Victory. Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton: NJ.
24. Schmidt, F. and Oh, I., 2016. The crisis of confidence in research findings in psychology: Is lack of replication the real problem? Or is it something else? *Archives of Scientific Psychology*, 4(1), pp.32-37. doi: 2016-28881-001.

References

1. Aron, R., 2000. *Мир и война между нациями; пер. с фр.* Kyiv: МР Yunivers.
2. Bebyk, V., Sherhin, S. and Dehtiarova, L., 2003. *Suchasna hlobalistyka: providni kontseptsii i moderna praktyka*. Kyiv: Universytet «Ukraina».
3. Bzhezynskyi, Z., 2000. *Velyka shakhivnytsia*. Lviv–Ivano-Frankivsk: Lileia-NV.
4. Buchyn, M., Hetmanchuk, M., Ilnytska, U. and Kuchma, L., 2010. *Osnovy teorii mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn*. Lviv: Akademiia sukhopotnykh viisk.
5. Hantinton, S., 2020. *Politychnyi poriadok u minlyvykh suspilstvakh; per. z anh.* Kyiv: Nash format.
6. Hetmanchuk, M., Dorosh, L., Zdroveha, M. and Ivasechko, O., 2015. *Osnovy teorii mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn*. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Lvivska politehnika.
7. Horbulin, V., 2017. *Svitova hibrydna viina: ukraïnskyi front*. Kharkiv: Folio.
8. Hromyko, A., 2005. *Myrovoi poriadok yly bezporiadok*. Moskva: Ynstytut Afryky (RAN).
9. Dokumenty 55 sесii OON. 2000. Rezoliutsiya OON 55/107. [online] Available at: <<http://daccess-ods.un.org/TMT/5306985.97431183>> [Accessed 10 August 2021].
10. Kyssendzher, H., 1997. *Dyplomatyia*. Moskva: Ladomyr.
11. Kyssendzher, H., 2003. *Novyi myrovoi poriadok. Fylosofyia polityky*. 4th ed. Kyiv: Znannia Ukrainy.
12. Kissindzher, H., 2018. *Svitovyi poriadok. Rozdumy pro kharakter natsii v istorychnomu konteksti*. Kyiv: Nash format.
13. Koppel, O. and Kisilova, Z., 2009. Novyi mizhnarodnyi poriadok: strukturni kharakterystyky ta osoblyvosti formuvannia. *Politychni problemy mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn*, 87(2), pp. 11-17.
14. Mahda, Ye., 2017. *Hibrydna ahresiia Rosii: uroky dlia Yevropy*. Kyiv: KALAMAR.
15. Maklin, I. and Makmilan, A. red., 2006. *Korotkyi Oksfordskyi politychnyi slovnyk*. Kyiv: Osnovy.
16. Malskyi, M., 2011. *Teoriia mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn*. Kyiv: Znannia.

17. Fukuiama, F., 2019. *Politychnyi poriadok i politychnyi zanepad. Vid promyslovoi revoliutsii do hlobalizatsii demokratii; per. z anhl.* Kyiv: Nash format.
18. Khaidehher, M., 2003. *Vremia y bytye: Staty y vystupleniya.* Moskva: Folyo.
19. Tsyhankov, P., 2004. *Teoryia mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenyi.* Moskva: Hardaryky.
20. Sherhin, S., 1997. Svitovyi poriadok: kontseptsii i realnist. *Polityka i chas*, 1, pp.14-21.
21. Shepeliev, M., 2004. *Teoriia mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn.* Kyiv: Vyscha shkola.
22. Bull, H., 1977. *The Anarchical Society. A Study of Order in World Politics.* N.J.: Columbia University Press.
23. Ikenberry, G., 2001. *After Victory. Institutins, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebulding of Order After Major Wars.* Princeton: NJ.
24. Schmidt, F. and Oh, I., 2016. The crisis of confidence in research findings in psychology: Is lack of replication the real problem? Or is it something else? *Archives of Scientific Psychology*, 4(1), pp.32-37. doi: 2016-28881-001.