

24. *Why we need a Digital Single Market*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/sites/digital-agenda/files/digital_single_market_factsheet_final_20150504.pdf
25. A Digital Single Market Strategy for Europe. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, to the Council of Europe, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions*. Retrieved from <http://g8fip1kplyr33r3krzx5b97d1.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Digital-Single-Market-Strategy.pdf>
26. Gates, B. (2001). *Business at the speed of thought*. Moscow: Eksmo-Press (in Rus).
27. Levinson, P. (2013). *New New Media*. 2nd. Ed. London, New York: Academics.
28. Zernetska, O.V. (2017). Creating a digital single market for Europe (civilizational breakthrough). *Zovnishni spravy (UA Foreign Affairs)*, 7, 40-44 (in Ukr.)

УДК 321.011

Lakishyk D.M.*,
Ph.D. in History,
Senior Research Fellow,
The State Institution «Institute of World History of
the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine»,
Kyiv, Ukraine. lakishik@ukr.net

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY IN THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF FOREIGN POLICY OF THE MODERN STATE

Abstract. *The relevance of the topic of the study is determined by the inevitable change in the place of the institute of the national state in the modern system of international relations and the dependence of the subsequent evolution of this institution on a number of system characteristics (first of all, international integration and collective security) of modern world politics. In today's international society, states still play a key role in structuring, but the question remains which of their historical form they will take. In addition, the stratification bundle of the modern interstate system is evident, its vertical polarization — the strengthening of the international position of a small number of superpower states and the emergence of ineffective and dependent states and the failed states at the other poles (the lowest levels of the world stratification hierarchy). In the modern system of international relations, state-building processes are continuing, which objectively actualizes the question of determining their specifics.*

Over the past century, the problem of nation and national state has traditionally been one of the key issues for social and humanitarian disciplines. This, above all, is due to the fact that these institutions play the role of the system-forming element and the basic political structure in international politics both locally and globally. The nation state appears as a social institution, which at the same time is both a means of violence and a means of realizing the «common good» of a national society. An inverse proportional relationship between these two opposite qualities is established, that is, the more activity of the national state corresponds to the «general good» of the national society, and the less is the need to resort to violence.

The main criteria for the effectiveness and success of the national state in the international arena are its ability to carry out independent foreign policy and foreign economic strategies and the ability to survive outside of the systems of collective security and regional integration associations.

Keywords: *national sovereignty, national state, nation, globalization, democracy.*

* Лакішик Д.М., кандидат історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник, ДУ «Інститут всесвітньої історії НАН України», Київ, Україна. lakishik@ukr.net НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ СУВЕРЕНІТЕТ В ТЕОРІЇ ТА ПРАКТИЦІ ЗОВНІШНЬОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ СУЧАСНОЇ ДЕРЖАВИ

Анотація. Актуальність теми дослідження зумовлена неминучою зміною місця інституту національної держави в сучасній системі міжнародних відносин та залежністю подальшої еволюції цього інституту від низки системних характеристик (передусім, міжнародної інтеграції і колективної безпеки) модерної світової політики. У сучасному міжнародному суспільстві держави все ще відіграють ключову структуротворчу роль, однак, актуальним залишається питання, якої історичної форми вони набудуть. Крім того, очевидним є стратифікаційне розширення сучасної міждержавної системи, її вертикальна поляризація — зміцнення міжнародних позицій незначної кількості надпотужних держав та поява на іншому полюсі (найнижчих щаблях світової стратифікаційної ієрархії) малоєфективних і залежних держав, а також держав, що зазнали краху. У сучасній системі міжнародних відносин тривають державотворчі процеси, що об'єктивно актуалізує питання з'ясування їх специфіки.

Впродовж останніх століть проблема нації та національної держави традиційно постає одним з ключових питань для суспільно-гуманітарних дисциплін. Це, передусім, пов'язано із тим, що ці інститути відіграють роль системоутворюючого елементу і базової політичної структури в міжнародній політиці, як на локальному, так і на глобальному рівні. Національна держава постає як соціальний інститут, котрий водночас є і засобом насильства, і засобом втілення «загального блага» національного суспільства. Встановлено обернено пропорційну залежність між цими двома протилежними якостями, тобто чим більше діяльність національної держави відповідає «загальному благу» національного суспільства, тим меншою є необхідність звернення до насильства. Основними критеріями ефективності її успішності національної держави на міжнародній арені є її спроможність здійснювати незалежні зовнішньополітичні й зовнішньоекономічні стратегії та здатність до виживання поза межами систем колективної безпеки і регіональних інтеграційних об'єднань.

Ключові слова: національний суверенітет, національна держава, нація, глобалізація, демократія.

Анотація. Актуальность темы исследования обусловлена неизбежной сменой места института национального государства в современной системе международных отношений и зависимостью дальнейшей эволюции этого института от ряда системных характеристик (прежде всего, международной интеграции и коллективной безопасности) современной мировой политики. В современном международном обществе государства все еще играют ключевую структурообразующую роль, однако актуальным остается вопрос, какую историческую форму они приобретут. Кроме того, очевидно стратификационное расслоение современной межгосударственной системы, ее вертикальная поляризация — укрепление международных позиций незначительного количества сверхмощных государств и появление на другом полюсе (низких ступенях мировой стратификационной иерархии) малоэффективных и зависимых государств, а также государств, которые потерпели крах. В современной системе международных отношений продолжают процессы государственного образования, что объективно актуализирует вопрос выяснения их специфики.

На протяжении последних веков проблема нации и национального государства традиционно является одним из ключевых вопросов для общественно-гуманитарных дисциплин. Это, прежде всего, связано с тем, что эти институты играют роль системообразующего элемента и базовой политической структуры в международной политике, как на локальном, так и на глобальном уровне.

Национальное государство выступает как социальный институт, который одновременно является и средством насилия, и средством воплощения «общего блага» национального общества. Установлено обратную пропорциональную зависимость между этими двумя противоположными качествами, то есть чем больше деятельность национального государства отвечает «общему благу» национального общества, тем меньше необходимость обращения к насилию. Основными критериями эффективности и успешности национального государства на международной арене является ее способность осуществлять независимые внешнеполитические и внешнеэкономические стратегии и способность к выживанию вне систем коллективной безопасности и региональных интеграционных объединений.

Ключевые слова: национальный суверенитет, национальное государство, нация, глобализация, демократия.

Formulation of the problem. In the current context, the intensification of the globalization process, the reaction to which was the intensification of international

terrorism, international crime, regional conflicts, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as the main world threats. Some of the representatives of political thought turned out to be false, who predicted that in the 21st century the massive, if not self-liquidation of many state formations, will begin, at least, the loss of their ability to control and protect the political, military, socio-economic and cultural aspects of citizens' lives in the traditional sense. In the context of growing interdependence in modern international relations, the role of the national state is predominantly increasing, since this institution is the main means of avoiding periphery and protecting its own national interests and the political interests that are in line with these interests. So far-reaching conclusions about the «decline of the national state» are either a projection of the great-power propaganda of the leading countries of the world, or relate exclusively to specific «failed states», namely the use of the terms «state» and «nation» in relation to which it seems highly doubtful.

Analysis of previous studies and publications. In political science, it is to some extent understood that «the doctrine of national sovereignty is out of date», which requires a comprehensive rethink and reappraisal of the notion of «sovereignty» (J. Armstrong, E. Gellner, A. Oslander, A. Bredikhin, A. Moiseev) as in connection with the emergence of the world political community, and with the specification of the limits of private sovereignty, the principles of their combination with each other and the construction of their hierarchy, as well as in connection with the actions of various other actors such as TNCs and non-state organizations (S. Krasner, A. Sergunin, V. Gapotiy, O. Babiy). However, most researchers still underestimate the seriousness of changes in sovereignty and the need to revise the very concept. So, the state still remains (and will be so long) the highest institution of historical and political life (V. Lipkan, A. Tyurina, O. Skrypnyuk, S. Chernychenko). However, nowadays there are new powerful factors, which, as a result, lead to the fact that the state ceases to be the limit of expression of will, yielding this borderline by a large supranational entity and this tendency will increase (L. Grinin, Y. Bytyak, I. Yakovuk, Y. Baydin). On the other hand, it is a multi-faceted process, and although sovereignty will be restricted to some extent, but at the same time will remain stable. Therefore, the national state will play a leading role in the modern international system for a long time (T. Biersteker, C. Weber). In addition, as some researchers rightly point out, a sharp decline in sovereignty and traditional functions of the state can create chaos (S. Wolford, T. Rider, A. Utkin).

The purpose of the article is to examine the concept of «sovereignty», with particular attention to the issue of the ownership of sovereignty (whether it belongs to the population or territorial formation), the criteria of a sovereign state, as well as the challenges of the traditional idea of sovereignty, which may require revision of the concept of sovereignty itself.

Main results of the study. The idea of national sovereignty is a traditional fundamental value base for the formation of the foreign policy of the state. Understanding the nation as a political community, its own purpose, role and values contributes to conducting an effective game in the spaces of international interactions, increases the degree of realism of the latter. From the theoretical standpoint, the term «sovereignty» is interpreted as the existence of an absolute (on which all depends) and indivisible power (which does not depend on anyone except itself). Sovereignty is at the same time a supreme authority and at the same time a primary source of

authority. Since the time of Hobbes, the issue of sovereignty has been debated within the framework of two leading concepts. The first is the concept of national sovereignty, based on the notion of «nation», which offers its understanding as an indivisible and distinct collective entity of the individuals that make up the latter. The second is the concept of popular sovereignty, where the people of sovereignty are considered as a concrete community of citizens, which are combined with relations in relation to a joint social contract. Both options are interpreted from the point of view of the definition of the representational essence. The first position implies the interpretation according to which sovereignty belongs to a nation. That is, the abstract essence of the people who live in this area at the given time and maintain the connection of generations. The second position emphasized the expediency of using the concept of «people». People's sovereignty is interpreted as belonging to a people — a real entity, defined as a group of people living in this territory. In the first version, the direct action of direct democracy is impossible. In the second one, it is theoretically possible, but complicated from the standpoint of practice. Therefore, from a functional point of view, preference is given to a representative form of democracy.

At the same time, it should be noted that the distinction between the two options is often interpreted in modern democracies (in particular, in France) as unfair. Accordingly, the compromise consists in the following definition: national sovereignty belongs to the people. The connection of national sovereignty with national identity traditionally causes a reflection on the factors of the territorial integrity and independence of the nation as the basis of national statehood. Hugo Grotius among the first experts has determined that the sovereign is a territorial order free from external control. Too long historical period of domination of the Westphalian model of the world order, this statement did not raise serious objections, but modern world space is represented not only by classical national states, but also by integrating entities that do not correspond to the classical political-territorial sample. Effective filling of international interactions takes place both at the expense of traditional actors and new non-traditional players. In practice, this process leads to a reduction in the actions of these actors of reflection on the vertical authority of the state over its own territory in favor of transnational forces. That is, the emphasis shifts toward horizontal power. Thus, now it makes sense to talk about a new extraterritoriality of power and mobility as a decisive strategic factor in the struggle for power. In the hierarchy of global capacities, top performers are those actors whose level of organization reduces dependence on space. Actors, not so tied to the place, are free to place their power potential. On the other hand, a certain «virtue» does not relieve national actors from traditional functions, primarily the protection of the territory. Therefore, the concept of space is specified both through territorial and political dimensions. Together with the network characteristics of the system of global interactions, there are also tendencies towards system hierarchy. The use of the spatial-organizational approach makes it possible to capture the isolation of social practices from the territory as a fundamental feature of the age of globalization. The result of its manifestation at the practical level of international contacts appears in the form of a problem of organization of global power and its deficit, and squeezing space and time opens the boundaries, changing contact mechanisms. A more radical territorial than post-territorial space appears as an area of political opportunity, where the practice of direct participation of citizens in social interaction becomes an alternative

to global politics. Consequently, in the formation of foreign policy strategies, the establishment should take into account that the implementation of «sovereign» power is impossible without the possession of resources for its implementation. The smaller the latter, the greater is the nominal sovereignty [1].

In the domestic dimension, sovereignty is presented as the idea of ultimate and absolute power in the political community. Here, sovereignty and the state are inextricably linked. The external dimension of sovereignty is determined, first of all, as constitutional independence, as the power, the source of which is the constitution of the state. So, sovereignty is expressed in legal, not in physical reality. In fact, the researchers of the two dimensions come to the conclusion that the central role of sovereignty as an organizing principle in the system of international relations, in essence, remains unchanged. Perhaps, however, this provision requires evidence. On the other hand, sovereignty is no longer perceived as something given, fixed, inviolable. The theme of change (blurring, disappearance) of national sovereignty is considered mainly within the framework of the study of globalization and the process of the formation of a new world order, as well as in connection with military actions against individual countries. However, the reasons for the transformation of sovereign prerogatives of the state are not sufficiently deep and complete. Transformation of national sovereignty is presented as a process under the influence of powerful supranational forces. But this aspect also matters: sovereignty is greatly reduced voluntarily by national states themselves. Thus, it makes sense to fix the bilateral nature of the transformation of sovereignty in a globalized world. On the one hand, factors aggravate the nomenclature and the volume of sovereign powers of the states is intensifying, on the other hand, most states voluntarily go on limiting their sovereignty [2].

From the standpoint of international political practice under sovereignty in political science is understood the most important sign of the state, which is expressed in its complete independence, the rule of internal and independent in foreign policy. The first interpretations of this notion, in particular, as a permanent and absolute power of the state, appeared at the beginning of the New Age. The practical meaning of the concept of «sovereignty» has constantly changed, depending on who was the supreme sovereign — the feudal monarch, an enlightened absolute monarch, who spoke on behalf of the people, or the nation itself. With the approval of the Westphalian system of international relations, the principles of sovereignty of states were recognized in the whole of Europe. Inclusion in the UN Charter and other provisions of international instruments on sovereign equality of states and on the right of nations to self-determination contributed to strengthening the idea of national sovereignty in international relations. In particular, this was embodied in the rejection of the world community of any aggression and violation of state sovereignty in order to achieve ideological goals. The need for a comprehensive rethinking and reappraisal of the practical content of the concept of «sovereignty» at the present-day historical stage is conditioned by the emergence of a world political community, specifying the principles of private sovereignty, the principles of their combination with each other and the construction of their hierarchy, as well as actions on the international scene of new actors — rivals of the state (TNCs, non-governmental organizations and supranational structures). Technologies, trade, transport, international capital spill over the world with new network connections and make the borders of the states

transparent. As a result, the scope of national sovereignty is reduced and the status of the state as the main subject of international relations is undermined. Thus, changes in productive forces lead to changes in all other spheres of life, including the political sphere. Transformations take place in models of behavior of states, corporations and groups, as well as a man as a carrier of political culture and participant in global communicative processes [2].

Reducing the scope of sovereign prerogatives of the state has both positive and negative consequences. At the same time, the balance of positive and negative is different for different countries, regions, territories and even layers of society. Hence, there is the ambiguous attitude to globalization, the emphasis on its chaos. By creating contours of the new order, globalization breaks the former ones, and the rate of destruction of old relations is often very ahead of the erection of new ones. In particular, in a number of countries this is clearly manifested in the breakdown of the traditional ideology based on the sacralization of the homeland and the nation through the spread of alternative national preferences and identities. However, an effective replacement of ideologies has not yet taken place. One of the main causes of global-system instability is that political institutions are lagging behind the economy that has grown beyond the boundaries of national borders, requiring supranational planning and joint control over the sources of market fluctuations. The direction, shape and effects of world processes will depend on the changing balance of power, on the strategy chosen by certain countries and associations, from different geopolitical factors and combinations. Accordingly, those who seek to take significant positions in an interconnected and changing world must predict and anticipate trends, using them in their own interests.

One of the modernized directions of modern research is the interconnection of globalization, sovereignty and nationalism. In practice, sovereign rights and powers of states and nations have always been limited by various factors. Today, the statement about the full freedom of action of the states is wrong even in theory. The volume of internal sovereignty has narrowed significantly *de jure* — thanks to international agreements, *de facto* — due to established traditions. The right to impose a duty, prohibit or encourage the importation or exportation of goods (capital), print money, take loans and borrow, proclaim or restrict political freedom, establish rules for holding elections, apply the death penalty and conduct military action — has ceased to be determined only by the wishes of the states themselves. It can be stated that the sphere of internal competences of the state, which is regulated only by national law and customs, is narrowing, and international law is expanding. So, according to S. Strange, there was almost no scope for government bureaucracy to interfere. Social-political processes never go unilaterally and in only one direction. The general vector is always a complex balance of multidirectional changes, and the weakening of the system is usually accompanied by an increase in its individual aspects. In the modern world there is no single state, national or national sovereignty. Sovereignty is increasingly divided between supranational, national, regional, and sometimes regional and municipal units [3].

A number of factors influence the process of transformation of national sovereignty: technological and economic changes, global humanity problems, regional integration, the desire to avoid military confrontation, and the growth of the number of democratic regimes. At the same time, the factor of voluntarism in reducing the

volume of sovereign powers of the state — among them one of the most important. It does not exclude the influence, sometimes quite severe, on countries violating international rules and arrangements, as well as direct interference in the affairs of those states that are unable to resolve internal conflicts. Similar actions of the international community or individual countries and blocs also influence the transformation of sovereignty, creating precedents for the future. The world's public opinion plays an important role in this process: the wider the circle of countries that knowingly limit their sovereignty to raise prestige and obtain realistic benefits, the more effective the policy of states that do not go to such restrictions. The processes of internationalization have reached a qualitatively new level. The greatest sovereignty, that is, the least restrictive use of sovereign rights, is now ideologically and economically closed by the state (China, Iran, Saudi Arabia, some other Muslim countries, North Korea, Cuba). Often, precisely because of the existence of their «sovereign rights» (including the right to create nuclear weapons), there are sharp conflicts in the world. In general, even their sovereignty begins to narrow. In the case of developed countries, the tendency to delegate their authority to regional and global organizations is evident. The exception is the United States, which allows themselves to put their own national interests above the world and allies at a time [4].

Consequently, under the influence of powerful factors, the state gradually gives way to large, in particular, supranational, formations and structures. In the future, this trend, in our opinion, will only intensify. However, it is also clear that, in some areas, sovereignty will narrow (for example, in the questions of economic strategy), and some will be consolidated. In particular, ethnic, cultural and social functions of the state will grow. Sovereignty will remain one of the most important principles of international relations. Within the states themselves, different political forces have different meanings of national goals, and the interpretation of common goals may differ. Against the backdrop of a decrease in the volume of national sovereignty, the tendency of the growth of nationalism, which is embodied in the desire of even the smallest peoples of the world to obtain its own national sovereignty, can be traced [4].

Note that, however soft the external influence on countries that do not have the resources for independent transformation, it will affect their sovereignty. Restriction of sovereignty takes place on two levels: the regional (developing countries are united in regional communities to defend their own interests together) and global — within the confrontation between developed and developing countries (the North-South problem). Only a certain institutional solution will, ultimately, lead to the establishment of a new, more or less stable world order. In order for such a world order to become a reality, a deep revolution in the worldview of the elites and peoples must take place, as a result of which national problems will be considered through the prism and in the context of general (regional and world) tasks and problems.

From the point of view of conducting practical policies, it is more important that sovereignty carries such a feature as functionality, since it provides an appropriate level of political freedom within the state and its independence from external pressure. Architecture of the Westphalian Treaty, which is the basis of the modern system of international interactions, has defined the basic unit of international relations and the embodiment of the supreme power of a sovereign state. In the external dimension, such sovereignty, first of all, is aimed at regulating the use of military force. From where the popularity of the interpretation of the war as a policy

tool, which applies only in the event of conflict between sovereign states. That is, because of the presence of external, but not internal interest.

The state-centered approach, which became the most popular in the middle of the twentieth century on the theoretical basis of realism, demonstrates an attempt to combine all the basic elements of sovereignty in a single actor — a sovereign state. Thus, K. Waltz argues that a sovereign state means independence of the latter in solving internal and external problems, in essence — the absence of supreme international power. The classical point of view, embodied in realist and neo-realist developments, implies understanding of sovereignty as a fixed and exogenous attribute, as an absolute principle. From a practical point of view, special attention is paid here to the systematic violation of the achievements of Westphalian sovereignty. External sovereignty implies that each state remains independent, formally equal to a number of others. The de facto practical dimension of global interactions shows a certain hierarchy. Non-realists pay attention to the problems through analysis of the relations of world powers that are sovereign and in anarchy relations with each other, while international structures are determined from the standpoint of the main political unit of the era. Those actors that do not fit into the classical scheme are considered through the dependence on the leading players. Critics of this approach rightly point out the fact that the state is no longer the only actor of international interactions, but is included in the system of interdependence with transnational actors and organizations. Such shifts require a systemic re-conceptualization [5, p. 79–128].

Academic studies of sovereignty in the age of globalization have raised the issue of «new sovereignty». The principal attention of scientific experts is focused on the following areas of analysis: the fundamental nature of sovereignty, the revision of the classical perspective, the rise of a constructivist alternative, attention to the hierarchy in international engagements, the implementation of forms of mixed or limited sovereignty. A comprehensive analysis of relevant research suggests that sovereignty is much more problematic than in the age of classic models dominance. As one of the types of power relations, sovereignty retains the characteristics of the interconnection of internal and external dimensions. According to S. Krasner, a leading specialist on this issue, the internal dimension reflects the need for effective control over the territory of the state, while the external dimension is a prerequisite for international recognition and provides for formal equality in the international arena. From the standpoint of practice, the last moment is interpreted in the sense of the right of management (K. Waltz), as legal sovereignty (R. Jackson), as international legal sovereignty (S. Krasner) [6, p. 179–210].

Another direction in identifying the effective essence of sovereignty is in a characteristic of relations between states. For example, D. Lake fixes the internal hierarchy and external anarchy with two faces of the «new sovereignty» of modern times. Constructivist studies maintain the fundamental criticism that an effective way of interpreting reality offers an approach to the latter as an echo of social facts and social structures that are brought to action through the practice of states. So, J. Raggi very rightly points out the fundamental lack of classical approaches to sovereignty that is the lack of a generating principle. C. Tilly, A. Wendt emphasize that sovereignty in the external and internal dimensions is socially conditional feature. So, sovereignty is not exogenous in relation to the system, but is reproduced on the basis of practice [7; 8].

It is the understanding of sovereignty as a socially constructed one that opened new horizons for analyzing the parameters of foreign policy in the age of globalization, since sovereignty itself arises to a large extent depending on other social norms and practices. For example, C. Reus-Smit conceptually presented the interpretation of sovereignty as one of the three elements of the international community: the constitutional system, the moral goals of the state, reflecting the rules of lawfulness of action, sovereignty. Consequently, from the standpoint of practical involvement in international-political analysis, this approach represents a qualitatively new understanding of national sovereignty as a dynamic and socially constructed one. Sovereignty can indeed be presented as a social structure that changes over time, but its perception as a system-wide attribute of a state is a constant [9]. For example, A. Moravcsik, defining the dominant intergovernmental approach, establishes that the behavior of the state in the international arena is due to the ratio of interests of various social groups and business circles [10].

In the discourse of alternative approaches, some time was preceded by two concepts — economic interdependence and interethnic relations. In the first approach, the national state is conceived as a specific economic entity and is explained as the result of a political choice. Here, interdependence is not a limitation of sovereignty, but becomes its expression. The second alternative emphasizes the theory of dependence, where there is structural inequality between states. Here the dependence appears to be a condition, but it is not a choice. The basic practical occurrence of inequality occurs in market processes, but not in power relations. At the same time, under the conditions of globalization, strength and power are understood as synonyms. However, the practical economic success of the East Asian states did not allow completely verifying the provisions of the theory. The first alternative in practice worked more efficiently. Thanks to the benefits and structural upgrades, the countries enlisted in the semi-periphery overcame the gap in the pace of development. Thus, high efficiency in theory does not always explain non-typical conceptual design of constructs that in practice become more frequent [11].

Influential approaches remain with an emphasis on the factor of sovereignty of the nation. The political interpretation of the nation implies its understanding as the majority of the political population of the country, the people living on the territory of the state, a bearer of national sovereignty. Here, the only source of state sovereignty is a nation, filed as a community of major political entities on the state territory, participating in political control procedures. An alternative understanding of the nation from these positions can be interpreted as an ethnically homogeneous group in imperial entities that has the right to self-determination and to create its own state.

Internationally, sovereignty means that nothing can be done about a state without its consent. International legal standards are based on the principle of sovereign equality of states. However, in practice, this status of sovereignty remains extremely relational, if not dialectical, because state sovereignty not only depends on the state's willingness to be sovereign, but also on the degree of sovereignty that can protect against the sovereign power of others. From this point of view, the limitation of state sovereignty logically follows from the fact of the existence of other sovereign states.

In the field of international relations, the clearly contradictory positions of the theory show how difficult it is to rely on the equality of sovereignty and national policy. With the awareness of the theorists of this contradiction, the theory of «the right to intervene» was born. The latter's adherents also argue that the restrictions on

political sovereignty are based on legal norms and, in the end, return to the values of «morality». Recent research shows that «ethics of sovereignty» is a new way of thinking about sovereignty, which implies the right to foresee goals that are contrary to fundamental freedoms and human rights. Such provisions are regularly used to justify «humanitarian wars». In parallel, the question arises as to who must or who is able to actually fulfill the limitations of political sovereignty of states or peoples. By definition, they can exercise the «right to intervene» to those who have the resources and means to intervene. But then the law is subject to authority, which is the opposite of the above-mentioned goals. De facto, political sovereignty here becomes the privilege of those who claim to obey the law. Critics of liberal concepts of sovereignty, in which the state is under the rule of law, while the public life is clearly separated from the «private life», is too depoliticized. In particular, C. Schmitt notes that, by definition, standards and procedures are powerless to determine who should decide the fate of people when they themselves cannot already do it.

The real power of a sovereign actor is not always «sovereign» for formal right or status. Hegemony, which is carried out in connection with the effects of power, often acts outside the law, although they are also in the form of sovereign. Thus, sovereignty remains a leading mechanism for protecting national interests in the real world, but the parameters of its practical discovery are changing.

A comprehensive analysis of modern approaches within the framework of applied analysis of the foreign policy of the state makes it possible to assert: the Western expert community has no unified view of the role of sovereignty in contemporary political practice. Principal positions are presented by supporters of the traditional approach and supporters of the last update. The first position is characterized as the position of successive sovereignists. For example, the American political scientist M. Walzer, argues that sovereignty comes from the right of the people to self-determination. It embodies history, culture and social peculiarities. The state's task is to maintain a political space, and external forces must respect the political process. Intervention in the space of other actors is seen only possible in the form of time limited, goals and means of a «just war».

The opposite view, first of all, is presented by the development of specialists in international legal issues. In particular, the American lawyer F. Theon justifies the need to limit sovereignty as not meeting the moral requirements put forward by political institutions. As a result, international law is devoid of adequate support. Well-known political scientists M. Hardt and A. Negri argue that sovereignty is inseparable from the current political context. Namely — the global state of war, a situation in which violence can take place at any moment. Consequently, classical sovereignty is no longer able to protect against violence and ceases to be a sufficient basis for formatting international relations. The new sovereignty must be in line with the imperative of democracy, which implies, in practical terms, the reform of the United Nations in the nationwide electoral institute in 400 districts for 10 million each, regardless of national borders [12]. Sovereignty should be interpreted as a derivative structure in which the right correlates with life. The famous thesis of M. Foucault, which lives as such, becomes the main object of projection of calculations of state power. As a result, the state penetrates the private life of a person through national identity, and through citizenship, sovereignty becomes a form of existence. At the same time, the unwillingness of the national elites to abandon traditional forms of representation is fixed here.

Proponents of the deactualization of the traditional national foundations of international systemic constructions argue their own position in view of the historicity of the process of forming the system of national states. The perception of national sovereignty as inviolable and unchanged arises in certain historical conditions, which, at the present stage of world development, are absent in much of the modern world. At the same time, the humanitarian dimensions of the response of the international community require external interference and the legitimization of supranational forces, while the expansion of the boundaries of the sphere of action of international forces must be clearly defined and obtain legal regulation that reflects the gap between the practice of international interactions and the traditional perception of national sovereignty.

Conclusions. The general increased interest in democracy, which began in the late XX century and continues at the beginning of the new century, was caused, first of all, by the massive aspiration of the countries freed from authoritarianism, seeking a more perfect form of government. The political experience of developed countries shows that the most significant successes have been achieved by those political systems that were based on liberal-democratic values. This vivid example has become a decisive factor in choosing the prospects for the development of yesterday's authoritarian states. However, the future of democracy is far from unambiguous. A significant number of countries failed to deal with democratic overloads and returned to an authoritarian form of government. In addition, there is a confirmation that most of the future challenges will begin to mature in the depths of already established liberal democracies, and the cause for such fears are two reasons: the first is the lack of opportunity to explain their own shortcomings by the threat of constant rivalry with another system, given the collapse of such; the second reason is that the population of these countries is much more «infected» with regulatory expectations as to how democracy should work.

Not the exception of all these processes is the global level of social interactions. The world system as a democratic one manifests itself in two respects: as a system consisting of free societies and democratic states, and as a system in which the relations between states and peoples are determined by law and the general principles of justice. A number of researchers believe that the international architecture of collective institutions and formal agreements gradually arises and develops, oriented both on the principles of democracy and human rights, and on the legitimacy of international action aimed at their improvement and protection. The most optimistic approach is focused on finding a historical opportunity to turn into a truly democratic world. The achievement of this goal involves solving three main tasks: deepening and consolidating democracy where it has been formally realized, continuing the creation and strengthening of common structures and institutional rules of democracy at the level of regional and international organizations; the encouragement of many different streams of change and transformation that could merge into the only fourth wave of democratization.

REFERENCES

1. Moiseev, A. (2006). *Sovereignty of the State in the Modern World. International and Legal Aspects*. Moscow: Nauchnaya kniga (in Rus.).
2. Sergunin, A. (2010). Sovereignty: Contemporary Discussions in the Theory of International Relations. *Nauchnyye vedomosti Belgorodskogo gosuniversiteta (Scientific Bulletins of the Belgorod State University)*, 19(90), part 16, 231-236 (in Rus.).

3. Strange, S. (1996). *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Sergunin, A. (2010). Sovereignty: the Evolution of the Concept. *Politeks: politicheskaya ekspertiza (Politex: political expertise)*, 4, 5-22 (in Rus.).
5. Waltz, K.N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
6. Krasner, S.D. (2009). *Power, the State and Sovereignty: Essays on International Relations*. New York: Routledge.
7. Tilly, C. (2004). *Contention and Democracy in Europe, 1650-2000*. New York: Cambridge University, Press.
8. Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Reus-Smit, C. (1999). *The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity and Institutional Rationality in International Relations*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
10. Milner, H.V., Moravcsik, A. (2009). *Power, Interdependence and Nonstate Actors in World Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
11. Stein, B.N. (2007) Refugee Repatriation, Return and Refoulement During Conflict. *USAID Conference Promoting Democracy, Human Rights and Reintegration in Post-conflict Societies*, October 30–31.
12. Hardt M., Negri A. (2000). *Empire*. London: Harvard University Press.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Моисеев А.А. Суверенитет государства в современном мире. Международно-правовые аспекты / А.А. Моисеев. — М.: Научная книга, 2006. — 246 с.
2. Сергунин А.А. Суверенитет: современные дискуссии в теории международных отношений / А.А. Сергунин // Научные ведомости Белгородского госуниверситета. — 2010. — № 19(90). — Вып. 16. — Серия «История. Политология. Экономика. Информатика». — С. 231–236.
3. Strange S. The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy / S. Strange. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. — 239 p.
4. Сергунин А.А. Суверенитет: эволюция концепта / А.А. Сергунин // Политэкс: политическая экспертиза. — 2010. — № 4. — С. 5–22.
5. Waltz K.N. Theory of International Politics / K.N. Waltz. — New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979. — 250 p.
6. Krasner S.D. Power, the State and Sovereignty: Essays on International Relations / S.D. Krasner. — New York: Routledge, 2009. — 312 p.
7. Tilly C. Contention and Democracy in Europe, 1650-2000 / C. Tilly. — New York: Cambridge University, Press, 2004. — 305 p.
8. Wendt A. Social Theory of International Politics / A. Wendt. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. — 452 p.
9. Reus-Smit C. The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity and Institutional Rationality in International Relations / C. Reus-Smit. — Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999. — 199 p.
10. Milner H.V., Moravcsik A., Power, Interdependence and Nonstate Actors in World Politics / H.V. Milner, A. Moravcsik. — Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009. — 320 p.
11. Stein B.N. Refugee Repatriation, Return and Refoulement During Conflict / B.N. Stein // USAID Conference Promoting Democracy, Human Rights and Reintegration in Post-conflict Societies. — October 30-31, 1997.
12. Hardt M., Negri A. Empire / M. Hardt, A. Negri. — London: Harvard University Press, 2000. — 478 p.