

Transformation of state stability amid globalisation

Трансформація стійкості держави в умовах глобалізації світу

Iryna Aliksieienko ^A

Dr of Political Sciences, Professor, e-mail: ppvch@ukr.net, ORCID: 0000-0002-6873-003X

Liudmyla Kovalyshyn ^A

Candidate of Political Sciences, Associate Professor, e-mail: k.liudmyla2000@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-1521-8577

Ірина Алексєєнко ^A

д.політ.н., професор, e-mail: ppvch@ukr.net, ORCID: 0000-0002-6873-003X

Людмила Ковалишин ^A

к.політ.н., доцент, e-mail: k.liudmyla2000@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-1521-8577

^A Yevhenii Bereznyak Military Academy, Kyiv, Ukraine

^A Воєнна академія імені Євгенія Березняка, м. Київ, Україна

Received: September 16, 2024 | Revised: October 21, 2024 | Accepted: October 31, 2024

DOI: 10.33445/sds.2024.14.5.2

Purpose: is to analyse the modern process of forming state stability in the conditions of the transformation of the international political security space.

Method: The research was conducted using a neo-institutional approach, historical and systemic methods, a comparative approach, and a functional method.

Findings: Determination of the conceptual foundations of the formation of state stability in the conditions of a crisis international security environment.

Theoretical implications: It consists in forming a holistic view of modern theories of the institution of the state and the factors that ensure its stability against the background of the aggravation of contradictions in the international political and security environment caused by Russia's aggression against Ukraine.

Practical implications: The main political, economic and security factors were analysed, and a model was formed based on the neo-institutional approach to ensure the stability of the state institution in the conditions of worsening globalisation threats and the formation of a new architecture of the international security environment. This study can be a valuable resource for professional researchers, analysts in geopolitics and geostrategy, security and defence sector representatives, international organisations, and state and local authorities.

Originality: It consists of applying a neo-institutional approach to ensuring the stability of the state institution in the context of the crisis of the international political and security environment triggered by Russia's aggression against Ukraine.

Paper type: theoretical, practical.

Мета роботи: проаналізувати сучасний процес формування стійкості держави в умовах трансформації міжнародного політичного простору безпеки.

Метод: неоінституційний підхід, історичний, системний методи; компаративістський підхід, функціональний метод.

Результати дослідження: Визначення концептуальних засад формування стійкості держави в умовах кризового міжнародного безпекового середовища.

Теоретичні висновки: полягає у формуванні цілісного уявлення про сучасні теорії інституту держави та фактори, що забезпечують формування її стійкості на тлі загострення протиріч в міжнародному політичному та безпековому середовищі, спричиненому агресією росії проти України.

Практичні наслідки: Проаналізовано основні політичні, економічні й безпекові фактори та сформовано на основі неоінституційного підходу модель забезпечення стійкості інституту держави в умовах загострення глобалізаційних загроз, та формування нової архітектури міжнародного безпекового середовища. Запропоноване дослідження може бути корисним фаховим дослідникам, аналітикам в царині геополітики та геостратегії, представникам сектору безпеки і оборони, міжнародним організаціям, органам державної та місцевої влади.

Оригінальність: полягає в застосуванні неоінституційного підходу до процесу забезпечення стійкості інституту держави в контексті кризи міжнародного політичного і безпекового середовища, тригером якої стала агресія росії проти України.

Тип статті: теоретичний, практичний.

Key words: stability of the state, sovereignty, international security environment, national security, geopolitics, national stability, armed aggression against Ukraine, threats of globalisation.

Ключові слова: стійкість держави, суверенітет, міжнародне безпекове середовище, національна безпека, геополітика, національна стійкість, збройна агресія проти України, загрози глобалізації.

Introduction

The significant transformation that the political, economic, legislative, security, social and other spheres of state regulation have undergone in the process of globalisation, the high level of interaction of the state with different actors of the international political system require the study of a wide range of issues of ensuring the stability of the state in the context of the transformation of the global security space. This issue is closely related to the neo-institutional approach to the institution of the state – the leading actor in the international political space, which is undergoing significant changes under the conditions of globalisation.

Theoretical background

The question of the future of the institution of the state in a rapidly changing world is becoming central in the strategic research papers of scientists, political and military experts. Based on research from previous decades, political scientists are looking at the future of the leading political institutions in light of new trends in the world economy and global security. This problem acquires special significance in light of the close relationship between the democratic political system and the sovereign state acting as its guarantor. The question of the further fate of the institution of the state is thus transformed into a question of the stability of the state, and this explains its relevance in the context of the analysis of the international security space. The diagnosis of the incapacity and inefficiency of the state institution in the realities of a highly integrated society of the 21st century was made back in the 20th century. It is being rethought. Global political studies in this context have become one of the most critical tasks of modern political science and national security, as the period of uncertainty requires immediate responses to the threatening challenges of the time to avoid even greater instability in the future. At the end of the 20th century, the trends towards further democratisation and liberalisation of developing countries should have led to the gradual smoothing of international conflicts. Still, political and security globalisation processes have become much more complex and ambiguous. Direct analogies between economic and political integration were not as good as they seemed before. The discrepancy between the formed single world market and the nation-states that continue to exist requires a new rethinking in the conditions of military globalisation. What will happen in the process of globalisation with the institution of the state, with its monopoly right on legal violence, and with internal and external sovereignty? These are the main questions scientists of the world's leading research centres face today.

Statement of the problem

A thorough study of issues based on the neo-institutional approach related to the functioning of the state institution, the formation and ensuring of its stability, the global management of the international political system of tomorrow, the reconceptualisation of the international security space in the context of military challenges and threats acquires a new sound today in the light of military globalisation.

Results

Scientists note that at the end of the 20th century, the political hierarchy was gradually simplified: from the "concert of states" of the 19th century to the opposing "axes" of the first half of the 20th century, from the rigid bipolarity of the Cold War to the "unipolar world". The international Yalta-Potsdam order, in its modified form, which was based on the balance of power between a group of states, was hierarchical.

The hierarchy of the world order ended with the exhaustion of the opportunities it provided. Unification efforts have had the opposite effect – different nations seek to emphasise their identity and originality. At the same time, globalising countries are trying to maintain the former dominance of uniform norms and rules introduced in the international system after the Cold War by forceful methods. All this is happening against the background of the achieved balance of benefits from globalisation.

The end of the Cold War did not lead to the end of history. The thaw that began in the late 1980s accentuated Europe's long-standing animosity. We never entered unipolarity. It would be a big mistake to think that defending the mantras of globalisation and the market in the 21st century makes national security subject to global theory. The world must solve the unfinished problems of the past.

Therefore, the main reason for the current state conflict and confrontation is to preserve the elements of the former world order within the framework of the ongoing transformational processes. At the same time, a noticeable role in the change of the international security space is played by the intermediate hedging of states, aligning them with each other with an eye on the future. This process is inevitable and requires a new strategy and tactics of states in the modern international security environment, especially when it comes to considerable nuclear powers, as the risks to the security of all humanity are growing.

One of the main parameters of the modern security space of international relations is its structure. It looks like it was formed on the basis of agreements between the victorious countries in the Second World War.

In addition to the institutional framework, the architecture of international relations requires a balance of forces that affect state interaction dynamics.

In modern political realities, the concept of "rule-based order" is being actively implemented, which makes states' freedom to defend and promote their national interests increasingly conditional. This concept resonates with the theory of structural realism, which states that the realisation of national interests should be carried out within the established structure of international relations and not go beyond it.

The benefits of globalisation have led many countries to gradually limit their sovereignty and place the responsibility of ensuring welfare on the powerful core of the emerging world and the supervision of world order on the "American world policeman". Several global crises, the main one being the full-scale aggressive war unleashed by Russia against Ukraine, outlined the shortcomings in approaches to the system of governance at the national and global levels. The inevitable result of the failures faced by the liberal world order was the disenchantment of the world's majority, both with hegemony and its universalist values and principles. Unsurprisingly, many countries find themselves in turbulent waters: deprived of the opportunity to act independently, they seek to defend their ideas, ideals and identity.

The response to crises arising in the modern globalised political environment is the return of states to their basic ideological principles, which contribute to increasing their resistance to globalisation challenges. Rising tensions, outbreaks of violence, and uncontrolled escalation around the world characterise the resulting global chaos. The fragmentation of the world economy is fuelled by protectionist measures taken by countries that play a crucial role in its development. These challenges are exacerbated against the backdrop of a decline in the ability of states to act together, as was the case in the past.

Despite the lingering problems, the political process is happening, and the global landscape is becoming more colourful and complex. In international politics, actors appear to bring new global issues, and temporality is changing, characterised by the transition from post- to metamodernism, virtualisation, and accelerated diversification rates. In light of these developments, the world's return to ideological uniformity or bipolar logic becomes impossible. In the conditions of ideological diversification, the logical approach to transforming global chaos into a transitional phase is to strengthen states' subjectivity. The ability to solve their problems independently and collectively is essential for countries. This point of view, which finds more and more support in the international expert environment, is fully shared by supporters of a multipolar world.

For many years, Western politicians opposed monopolarity as the dominant principle of the global system. They argued that reducing the amount of power in the hands of numerous actors minimises the ability of international and regional players to solve the problem of a "war of all against all" in the struggle for dominance. According to this view, total peace can only be achieved when a single authoritative structure maintains order, preventing a return to the "jungle". Even in the American National Security Strategy of 1993, it was noted that the USA had no choice but to provide such a vision for the whole world. In theory, this concept seems well-founded, but practice

shows that the liberal world order led by the USA often required military interventions to accelerate transformations to "democratise" regimes or to support a balancing strategy in foreign countries [1]. According to Thomas Hobbes, its weakening will lead to the renewal of the power struggle. And today, political experts and scientists see the first manifestations of these forecasts in the full-scale war that the aggressor Russia is waging against Ukraine.

A common belief in contemporary political science is that Western values can become the basis of lasting peace worldwide, provided global players who have previously behaved aggressively abandon their deep-rooted identities. Because modern states cannot and do not want to take responsibility for the entire global system, it can be assumed that by the end of the 21st century, the world will rely on several regional systems for maintaining international security and order. Multipolarity does not mean a return to a world characterised by the presence of states, as in the 20th century. It also does not mean that in the 21st century, there will be many actors in the world, and the concept of the state, as it was once predicted, will disappear as such.

The parameters of military globalisation are determined by the crisis of the potential of individual states, the growth of global problems, the role of regional associations, military alliances, international organisations, and the emergence of a new political culture. The study of the processes of "erosion" and "devaluation" of the status of a sovereign state and the weakening of centralised institutions of state power has practically become an independent field of research today. First, researchers note several trends that indicate the gradual "eroding" of sovereignty in its traditional sense. From the point of view of the problem of state sovereignty, the main consequence of the processes of military globalisation is the contradiction between the growing economic, political and security interdependence of countries and peoples, on the one hand, and the preservation of the state's right to solve its problems independently and at its discretion, on the other. The consequence of this process is the loss by the state of a number of its functions in the international arena and the appearance of a significant number of new actors in it – regional associations of states, military alliances, international governmental organisations, international non-governmental organisations, transnational corporations, which take on several functions that they delegated by individual states, thereby actually limiting their external sovereignty. The reverse side of globalisation and the emergence of supranational authorities is ethnic separatism, the strengthening of local power, which also leads to the "devaluation" of internal sovereignty. Thus, researchers note two seemingly mutually exclusive processes – integration and decentralisation, each of which does not contribute to preserving the status quo of state power. In addition, recent events in the international arena have shown that several states that do not possess real political power are partially losing their main feature – the monopoly on legal violence on their territory due to the spread and approval of the universal ideology of human rights, which are often placed above state interests and is the reason for the sanctioned, by international structures, invasion of these countries. In contrast to the previous period of dominance of the information society theory, researchers of military globalisation refuse the method of linear extrapolation and apologise for this process, pointing to its internal contradictions and the emergence of new conflicts due to unresolved previous ones. Researchers of global political and security processes faced the problem of revising the critical provisions of science of earlier decades. Several antinomies can be pointed out between the predictions of scientists of the 20th century and the realities of today's political and military globalisation process. The prophecies of the Club of Rome members about the imminent demise of sovereign states and the emergence of new multiple centres of power at the global, local and intermediate levels have not justified themselves. However, we are witnessing a crisis and weakening of the state with tendencies towards decentralising power. International organisations, which were assigned the role of leading actors in the system of international relations and a dominant position over national organisations, still have a relatively weak political weight despite the rapid growth of their number. The forecast regarding the nature of international relations, which

were supposed to become flexible and polycentric, also did not come true. The leading role, as before, continues to be played by solid states – globalists, who dictate the rules of the game in the international arena. All these facts could not help but affect the development of political research at the turn of the millennium, forcing us to look for new approaches to analysing global political and security processes of our time and determining trends in their development. Studying the scale of the crisis of the international political system, the international space of security and searching for ways to overcome it is becoming the master direction of specialists in global military and political forecasting. Most scholars agree that the idea of the demise of the nation state and the demise of nation-state sovereignty is a gross exaggeration. However, the restructuring of state institutions is evident. One of the most important reasons for the high level of conflict in globalisation processes is fundamental differences in the socio-economic, political, and security development of human communities, in the way of life, and the main problems of existence. The unevenness of globalisation processes in various spheres of public life creates inconsistencies in the relations between its subjects.

The most widespread opinion is about preserving the dominant position of the state institution as the leading actor in the international arena. It concerns significant, economically and strategically vital states that will continue the struggle for leadership at the beginning of the third millennium without demanding restrictions on the interests of small sovereign states. In this context, the debate is primarily about whether the world will be unipolar or whether several centres of power will still be capable of influencing world processes.

This point of view is also held by representatives of left-wing organisations that have recently sufficiently declared themselves under the banner of “anti-globalism”. Criticising neoliberal ideology, they seek to prove that the US is not losing its position as a world leader and is not renouncing its sovereignty, but, on the contrary, is using the slogans of democratisation and liberalisation to strengthen its world domination. In this connection, the “golden billion” concept is gaining particular popularity, according to which only one billion of the planet's population will enjoy all the advantages of modern civilisation. Other inhabitants of the earth are assigned the role of service personnel and suppliers of cheap labour and raw materials for developed countries. Since this situation causes discontent, which will only intensify with the growth of the population in poor countries, it will be increasingly difficult for the countries of the West to restrain this pressure. The confrontation will result in a West-Non-West conflict and threaten the entire planet's stability. That is why, according to representatives of radical attitudes, the USA invented a neoliberal ideology that proclaims the inevitable strengthening of interdependence and integration on a global scale [11]. A globalised economy should gradually equalise the economic and cultural differences between different regions and the level of inequality. This will hurt the status of a sovereign state, which will be challenging to maintain with almost complete transparency of borders and the inefficiency of state institutions in general. Therefore, power will gradually pass into the hands of supranational organisations that will implement a unified coordination policy. According to the radicals, this model of the “new world order” is a fiction that representatives of the financial and political circles of the West impose on the rest of the world to suppress its resistance to the growing inequality between different regions of the planet [12].

Of course, a sovereign state will continue to play a leading role in international relations in the XXI century. Still, new actors will appear whose influence on political processes will grow. Today, we are observing the formation of a transnational world in which states and peoples will retain a significant role, levers, and functions.

In general, the picture of the future world order appears to modern researchers to be quite controversial and not conflict-free compared to the previous era. Therefore, the search for alternative development methods is becoming a significant direction of political science and

forecasting. This also applies to the problem of the transformation of sovereignty, which is gaining a pronounced ideological dimension and the related security problems of our time.

In a world with growing competition for resources and influence without a hegemonic state, sovereignty will become a scarce commodity for states, so scientists are convinced that in 2040, the state will be assigned a new role. This shift would see the state viewed as a privilege rather than an automatic right in the passing Westphalian world. If the people of Russia, China, Iran, Turkey, Saudi Arabia and India still prefer public administration, then in Western countries, people's trust in the state has recently fallen to a historic low. This makes it possible to assume that some state-centric entities will remain active subjects in the emerging world order, while others will be transnational associations with blurred borders, thereby creating competition between sovereign states.

Conclusions.

Thus, the concept of the modern state, formed under the profound influence of the ideas of T. Hobbes and J. Locke, will retain its relevance in the future, contributing to the revival of movements for the protection of the sovereignty of states led by both global powers (USA, Russia and China) and regional players (EU, Turkey, Iran and Saudi Arabia). These countries will shape the landscape of globalisation, strengthening and establishing strong ties within specific geographic boundaries [13].

A group of political experts believes that international actors, disappointed by the failure of Pax Americana in the 2020s, will prioritise the sovereignty of their regions, which will lead to the formation of comprehensive techno-economic blocs in which they will have political power [14]. During the development of globalisation, deprived areas of sovereignty will become the arena of competition between these blocs. Citizens who have abandoned the principle of belonging to one state or another will prefer global civil societies and populate these spaces, taking advantage of the blocs' political and economic benefits. The question is whether they will be able to provide financial, food and physical security, which is usually guaranteed by the state.

Funding

This study received no specific financial support.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Leonard M. The age of unpeace: how connectivity causes conflict. London: Bantam press. 2021.240 p.
2. Hasenclever A., Mayer P., Rittberger V. Integrating Theories of International Regimes. *Review of International Studies*. 2000. Vol. 26. No. 1. P. 3-33.
3. Anghel S., Immenkamp B., Lazarou E., Saulnier J., Wilson A. On the path to strategic autonomy. The EU in an evolving geopolitical environment. European Parliamentary Research Service. PE 652.096. September 2020. Available from : [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/652096/EPRS_STU\(2020\)652_096_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/652096/EPRS_STU(2020)652_096_EN.pdf).
4. O'Neill A. European Union: share in global gross domestic product based on purchasing-power-parity from 2018 to 2028. Statista. New York.28.04.2023. Available from : <https://www.statista.com/statistics/253512/share-of-the-eu-in-the-inflation-adjusted-global-gross-domestic-product/>.

5. Hemmer C., Katzenstein P. J. Why Is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Multilateralism. *International Organization*. 2022. Vol. 56. No. 3. P. 575-607.
6. Pugliese G. A Global Rorschach test: Responding to China's Belt Road Initiative. Defense Strategic Communication. The Official Journal of the NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence 2019. Vol. 7.
7. Panda J.P. EU's global gateway strategy and building a global consensus vis-a-vis BRI. Ordnungspolitische Diskurse. No. 2022.10. Ordnungspolitisches Portal. 2022. Available from : <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/266145/1/1820680134.pdf>.
8. Manners I. Normative power Europe: a contradiction in terms? J. of common market studies. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.2022. Vol. 40. Issue 2. P. 235 – 258.
9. Sjöholm F. Navigating the new normal: the European Union's changing stance on globalization in the era of trade conflicts. IFN. Stockholm. 2023. 21 p. Available from : <https://www.ifn.se/media/p34dyzls/wp1466.pdf>.
10. Lohmann S. European strategic autonomy: the test case of Iran. *European review of international studies*. Hague: Brill.2021. Vol. 8. Issue 3. P. 443-477.
11. Initiative pour l'Europe: discours d'Emmanuel Macron pour une Europe souveraine, unie démocratique. Élysée. Paris. 26.09.2017. Available from : <https://www.elysee.fr/emmanuel-macron/2017/09/26/initiative-pour-l-europe-discours-d-emmanuel-macron-pour-une-europe-souveraine-unie-democratique>.
12. Kamphof R., Wessel R. Analysing shared competences in EU external action: the case for a politico-legal framework . Europe and the world: a law review. UCL. London: UCL press. 2018. Vol. 2. N 1. P. 38–64.
13. Strategic Plan 2020–2024. DG Research and Innovation. European Commission. Available from : https://commission.europa.eu/system/files/2020.1/rtd_sp_2020_2024_en.pdf
14. Adler E. Europe as a civilizational community of practice. Civilizations in world politics: plural and pluralist perspectives. P.J. Katzenstein (Ed). New York: Routledge.2019. 248 p.

Список використаних джерел

1. Leonard M. The age of unpeace: how connectivity causes conflict. London: Bantam press. 2021.240 p.
2. Hasenclever A., Mayer P., Rittberger V. Integrating Theories of International Regimes. *Review of International Studies*. 2000. Vol. 26. No. 1. P. 3-33.
3. Anghel S., Immenkamp B., Lazarou E., Saulnier J., Wilson A. On the path to strategic autonomy. The EU in an evolving geopolitical environment. European Parliamentary Research Service. PE 652.096. September 2020. URL : [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/652096/EPRS_STU\(2020\)652_096_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/652096/EPRS_STU(2020)652_096_EN.pdf).
4. O'Neill A. European Union: share in global gross domestic product based on purchasing-power-parity from 2018 to 2028. Statista. New York.28.04.2023. URL : <https://www.statista.com/statistics/253512/share-of-the-eu-in-the-inflation-adjusted-global-gross-domestic-product/>.
5. Hemmer C., Katzenstein P. J. Why Is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Multilateralism. *International Organization*. 2022. Vol. 56. No. 3. P. 575-607.
6. Pugliese G. A Global Rorschach test: Responding to China's Belt Road Initiative. Defense Strategic Communication. The Official Journal of the NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence 2019. Vol. 7.

7. Panda J.P. EU's global gateway strategy and building a global consensus vis-a-vis BRI. Ordnungspolitische Diskurse. No. 2022.10. Ordnungspolitisches Portal. 2022. URL : <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/266145/1/1820680134.pdf>.
8. Manners I. Normative power Europe: a contradiction in terms? J. of common market studies. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.2022. Vol. 40. Issue 2. P. 235 – 258.
9. Sjöholm F. Navigating the new normal: the European Union's changing stance on globalization in the era of trade conflicts. IFN. Stockholm. 2023. 21 p. URL : <https://www.ifn.se/media/p34dyzls/wp1466.pdf>.
10. Lohmann S. European strategic autonomy: the test case of Iran. *European review of international studies*. Hague: Brill.2021. Vol. 8. Issue 3. P. 443-477.
11. Initiative pour l'Europe: discours d'Emmanuel Macron pour une Europe souveraine, unie démocratique. Élysée. Paris. 26.09.2017. URL : <https://www.elysee.fr/emmanuel-macron/2017/09/26/initiative-pour-l-europe-discours-d-emmanuel-macron-pour-une-europe-souveraine-unie-democratique>.
12. Kamphof R., Wessel R. Analysing shared competences in EU external action: the case for a politico-legal framework . *Europe and the world: a law review*. UCL. London: UCL press. 2018. Vol. 2. N 1. P. 38–64.
13. Strategic Plan 2020–2024. DG Research and Innovation. European Commission. URL : https://commission.europa.eu/system/files/2020.1/rtd_sp_2020_2024_en.pdf
14. Adler E. Europe as a civilizational community of practice. *Civilizations in world politics: plural and pluralist perspectives*. P.J. Katzenstein (Ed). New York: Routledge.2019. 248 p.