

можливості її реалізації. Ігнорування національної держави, її суверенітету – це помилковий шлях, що веде до конфліктів. Жодна глобальна система не буде життєздатною, якщо не буде відкритою національним інтересам, не буде побудована на взаємодії національних держав. Тим більше, що сам національний інтерес не виступає чимось чужорідним глобальному, оскільки є синтезом внутрішніх і зовнішніх факторів. В основі глобальної відповідальності суб'єктів міжнародних відносин знаходиться облік і реалізація національних інтересів. Тільки таким методом може бути переборена їх “анархія”. Глобалізація і національні інтереси держав і їх суверенітет, – не взаємовиключні, а взаємодоповнюючі структурні елементи глобального міжнародного порядку. Зміцнення позицій держави в системі міжнародних відносин є неминучим, оскільки і в умовах високорозвиненого громадянського суспільства її існування є необхідним.

### СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Falk R.* The Changing Structure of International Law. International Law: A Contemporary Perspective. 2005. 234 p.
2. *Flechtheim O.K.* History and futology. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016. 134 p.
3. *Held D. and Mc Grew A.* Political Power and Civil Society: A Reconfiguration? The Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate. Cambridge, 2013. P. 124.
4. *Gray J.* False dawn: The delusions of global capitalism. L., 2008. 222 p.
5. *Donnelly J.* Realism and International relations. Cambridge, 2010. P. 12.
6. *Bell D.* The World and the United States in 2013. Daedalus, 2013. Vol. 116, № 3. P. 11–30.
7. *Thurrow L.* Le capitalisme a-t-il un avenir? Politique intern. 2008. Vol. 7, № 81. P. 87–121.
8. *Wallace W.* The Sharing of Sovereignty: The European Paradox. Political Studies. 2019. Vol. 47, № 3. P. 503–521.
9. *Moreau D.* Les relation internationales dans le monde d'aujourd'hui. Entre globalization et fragmentation. Paris: CIC, 2011. 156 p.
10. *Sachs J.* International economics: Unlocking the mysteries of globalization. Foreign Policy. 2017. Vol. 76, № 6. P. 98–132.
11. *Walker N.* Late Sovereignty in the European Union. Sovereignty in Transition. Oxford: Hart Publishing. 2013. P. 3–32.
12. *Beyer P.* Globalizing systems, global cultural models and religions. Intern, sociology. L., 2018. Vol. 13, № 1. P. 79–94.
13. *Arrighi G.* The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times. L.: Sage, 2014. 186 p.
14. *Dunn J.* Introduction: Crisis of the nation state? Contemporary crisis of the nation-state. Oxford etc., 2015. P. 3–15.
15. *Joxe A.* Representation des alliances dans la nouvelle strategie americaine. Politique etrangere. 2007. № 2. P. 12–34.

### REFERENCES

1. *Falk, R.* (2005) The Changing Structure of International Law. International Law: A Contemporary Perspective. 234 p. [in English].
2. *Flechtheim, O.K.* (2016) History and Futology. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 134 p. [in English].
3. *Held D. and Mc Grew A.* (2013) Political Power and Civil Society: A Reconfiguration? The Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate / Ed. by D. Held, and A. McGrew. Cambridge, P. 124 [in English].
4. *Gray, J.* (2008) False dawn: The delusions of global capitalism. 222 p. [in English].
5. *Donnelly J.* (2010) Realism and International relations / J. Donnelly. Cambridge. P. 12. [in English].

6. *Bell D.* The World and the United States in 2013 // *Daedalus*, 2013. – Vol. 116, № 3. – P. 11–30 [in English].
7. *Thurrow L.* (2008) Le capitalisme a-t-il un avenir? // *Politique intern.* – Vol. 7, – № 81. – P. 87–121 [in French].
8. *Wallace, W.* (2019) The Sharing of Sovereignty: The European Paradox. *Political Studies*. Vol. 47. N 3. P. 503–521 [in English].
9. *Moreau, D.* (2011) Les relation internationales dans le mond d'aujourd'hui. Entre globaliza-tion et fragmentation. Paris: CIC. 156 p. [in French].
10. *Sachs, J.* (2017) International economics: Unlocking the mysteries of globalization. *Foreign Policy*. Vol. 76. No 6. P. 98–132 p. [in English].
11. *Walker, N.* (2013) Late Sovereignty in the European Union. *Sovereignty in Transition* / ed. N. Walker. Oxford: Hart Publishing. P. 3–32 [in English].
12. *Beyer, P.* (2018) Globalizing systems, global cultural models and religions. *Intern, sociol-ogy. L.* Vol. 13. No 1. P. 79–94 [in English].
13. *Arrighi, G.* (2014) *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times*. L.: Sage. 186 p. [in English].
14. *Dunn, J.* (2015) Introduction: Crisis of the nation state? *Contemporary crisis of the nation-state* / Ed. by Dunn J. Oxford etc. P. 3–15 [in English].
15. *Joxe, A.* (2007) Representantion des alliances dans la nouvelle strategie americaine. *Politique etrangere*. No 2. P. 12–34 [in English].

UDC 316.32

**Aliexsieienko Iryna,**

Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor,

Head of the Department of International Relations and Tourism,  
Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Dnipro, Ukraine,  
ORCID ID 0000-0002-6873-003X

### CONCEPTS OF CIVILIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: CONTRADICTION OF POLITICAL, LEGAL AND MANAGEMENT TENDENCIES

Research article examines modern political, legal and administrative processes taking place in the international space. It is proved that the integration, fragmentation, globalization and “territorialization” of the world are interdependent and are the part of one process. The political and legal characteristics of transformational changes in the state’s sovereignty are revealed.

In many respects, the idea of the crisis of the nation-state and the institution of sovereignty is based not on their real weakening, but primarily on their inconsistency with the growing demands of the globalization era. However imperfect they may be, from the point of view of globalization processes, globalization does not give rise to any alternative tools that are better adapted to solving modern problems.

Globalization, developing from a national source, cannot but serve it, enriching the political, economic, technical, spatial and organizational possibilities of its realization. Ignoring the nation state, its sovereignty is a wrong path that leads to conflicts. No global system will be viable if it is not open to national interests, isn’t built on the interaction of nation states. Moreover, the national interest itself is not alien to the global, as it is a synthesis of internal and external factors. At the heart of

© Aliexsieienko Iryna, 2021

DOI (Article): [https://doi.org/10.36486/np.2021.1\(51\).1](https://doi.org/10.36486/np.2021.1(51).1)

Issue 1(51) 2021

<http://naukaipravookhorona.com/>

the global responsibility of the subjects of international relations is the accounting and implementation of national interests. Only in this way can their “anarchy” be overcome. Globalization and the national interests of states and their sovereignty are not mutually exclusive, but complementary structural elements of the global international order. Strengthening of the position of the state in the system of international relations is inevitable, because even in a highly developed civil society, its existence is necessary.

**Keywords:** sovereignty, national interest, state, world management, integration, fragmentation, globalization, territorialization.

Отримано 16.04.2021