



UDC: 327 327.8 354 93

[https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2020-4\(24\)-70-89](https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2020-4(24)-70-89)

Gurkovskiy Volodymyr Igorevich,
PHD in Public Administration, Professor, first deputy director of All-Ukrainian public organization “Center for Research on Public Administration Problems”, Professor of Public Administration in Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, 03039, Kyiv, Frometivska str., 2, tel.: +38 (067) 502 69 00, e-mail: Vladimir.gurkovskiy@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2021-5204>

Гурковський Володимир Ігорович,
доктор наук з державного управління, професор, перший заступник директора ВГО “Центр досліджень проблем публічного управління”, професор кафедри публічного адміністрування МАУП, 03039, м. Київ, вул. Фрометівська, 2, тел.: +38 (067) 502 69 00, e-mail: Vladimir.gurkovskiy@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2021-5204>



Гурковський Владимир Ігорович
доктор наук государственного управления, профессор, первый заместитель директора ВОО “Центр исследований проблем публичного управления”, профессор кафедры публичного администрирования МАУП, 03039, г. Киев, ул. Фрометовская, 2, тел.: +38 (067) 502 69 00, e-mail: Vladimir.gurkovskiy@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2021-5204>

Kolesnyk Volodymyr Timofeevich,
PhD in Public Administration, Chairman of the Board of the Association of National Security Professionals, 01030 Kyiv, Mykhailo Kotsyubynsky str., 1, tel.: +38 (050) 943 40 61, e-mail: vt.kolesnyk@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0164-9453>

Колесник Володимир Тимофійович,
кандидат наук з державного управління, голова правління ГО “Асоціація професіоналів з національної безпеки”, 01030,

м. Київ, вул. Михайла Коцюбинського, 1, тел.: +38 (050) 943 40, e-mail: vt.kolesnyk@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0164-9453>

Колесник Владимир Тимофеевич,
кандидат наук государственного управления, директор правления ООО «Ассоциация профессионалов по вопросам национальной безопасности», 01030, г. Киев, ул. Михаила Коцюбинского, 1, тел.: +38 (050) 943 40, e-mail: vt.kolesnyk@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0164-9453>

Bazhora Oleksandr Olegovich,
postgraduate, Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, 03039, Kyiv, Frometivska str., 2, tel.: +38 (063) 592 15 07, e-mail: o.bazhora@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9216-5034>

Бажора Олександр Олегович,
аспірант, Міжрегіональна Академія управління персоналом, 03039, м. Київ, вул. Фрометівська, 2, тел.: +38 (063) 592 15 07, e-mail: o.bazhora@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9216-5034>

Бажора Александр Олегович,

аспірант, Межрегиональная Академия управления персоналом, 03039, г. Киев, ул. Фрометовская, 2, тел.: +38 (063) 592 15 07, e-mail: o.bazhora@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9216-5034>



TRANSFORMATION OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: CHALLENGES AND THREATS TO WORLD SECURITY

Abstract. The article analyzes the features of the modern development of the system of international relations, concludes on strengthening the American and Chinese geopolitical positions, and assesses Ukraine's capabilities regarding participation in international relations. The geopolitical concepts of the leading states of the world, in particular, American geopolitics, Russian "neo-Eurasianism", "China-centric" expansion and European "continentalism", are studied with the aim of identifying the most effective geopolitical approaches that will determine the future format of international relations based on a polycentric concept.

Some aspects of the mentioned geopolitical concepts determine the main directions of the foreign policy of the leading states of the world today. In order to maintain a high rate of economic growth, China carries out "soft" expansion for the realization of national interests, creates contradictions in relations with

Western countries. Russia, experiencing economic decline, is taking measures to maintain a leading position in the world and pursues an aggressive anti-Western policy based on “neo-Eurasianism.” In turn, the USA and European states, which for a long time acted as “moderators” of globalization, are in a political crisis, the result of which is the strengthening of populist political forces and the policy of isolationism.

So, active geostrategic actors are stepping up activities beyond their national borders in order to change the geopolitical situation in the direction of building a multipolar world order. The efforts of such actors are focused primarily on increasing their ability to ensure economic growth.

They seek to ensure freedom of activity in the international arena, including through the rejection of “inconvenient agreements” and an increase in the number of partners or allies from among the geopolitical centers. Despite the strategic objectives, active actors are objectively forced to apply a multi-vector foreign policy.

Such an approach to the realization of national interests in a multipolar world leads to interstate competition and the search for a new format of globalization. In the above conditions, there is a complication of the political and security situation.

Keywords: geopolitics, international relations, post-bipolar system of international relations, neo-Eurasianism, Chinese centrality, continentalism.

ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН: ВИКЛИКИ ТА ЗАГРОЗИ СВІТОВІЙ БЕЗПЕЦІ

Анотація. Проаналізовано особливості сучасного розвитку системи міжнародних відносин, зроблено висновок стосовно зміцнення американської та китайської геополітичних позицій та оцінено можливості України щодо участі в міжнародних відносинах. Досліджено геополітичні концепції провідних держав світу, зокрема, американська геополітика, російське “неоєвразійство”, “китаєцентрична” експансія та європейський “континенталізм” з метою визначення найефективніших геополітичних підходів, які визначатимуть майбутній формат міжнародних відносин, побудованих на основі поліцентричної концепції.

Викладено окремі аспекти згаданих геополітичних концепцій, які визначають основні напрями зовнішньої політики провідних держав світу вже сьогодні. Щоб зберегти високий темп економічного зростання, Китай здійснює “м’яку” експансію для реалізації національних інтересів, що створює суперечності у відносинах з країнами Заходу. Росія, яка відчуває економічний занепад, вживає заходи для збереження провідної позиції у світі та проводить агресивну антизахідну політику, засновану на “неоєвразійстві”. Своєю чергою, США та європейські держави, які тривалий час виступали “модераторами” глобалізації, перебувають у політичній кризі, наслідком якої є посилення популістських політичних сил та політики ізоляціонізму.

Активні геостратегічні діючі актори активізують діяльність за межами своїх національних кордонів з метою зміни геополітичної ситуації у на-

прямі побудови багатопольярного світоустрою. Зусилля таких акторів зосереджені насамперед на збільшення своїх можливостей щодо забезпечення економічного зростання. Вони прагнуть забезпечити собі свободу діяльності на міжнародній арені, в тому числі шляхом відмови від “незручних домовленостей” та збільшення кількості партнерів або союзників з числа геополітичних центрів. Незважаючи на стратегічні завдання, активні актори об’єктивно змушені застосовувати багатовекторну зовнішню політику. Такий підхід до реалізації національних інтересів у багатопольярному світі призводить до міждержавної конкуренції та пошуку нового формату глобалізації. У наведених умовах відбувається ускладнення політичної і безпекової обстановки.

Ключові слова: геополітика, міжнародні відносини, постбіполярна система міжнародних відносин, неоевразійство, китаєцентричність, континенталізм.

ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ: ВЫЗОВЫ И УГРОЗЫ МИРОВОЙ БЕЗОПАСНОСТИ

Аннотация. Проанализированы особенности современного развития системы международных отношений, констатируется укрепление американской и китайской геополитических позиций и оценены возможности Украины относительно участия в международных отношениях. Исследованы геополитические концепции ведущих государств мира, в частности, американская геополитика, российское “неоевразийство”, “китаєцентричная” экспансия и европейский “континентализм” с целью определения наиболее эффективных геополитических подходов, которые будут определять будущий формат международных отношений, построенных на основе полицентрической концепции.

Изложены отдельные аспекты упомянутых геополитических концепций, которые определяют основные направления внешней политики ведущих государств мира уже сегодня. Чтобы сохранить высокий темп экономического роста, Китай осуществляет “мягкую” экспансию для реализации национальных интересов, создает противоречия в отношениях со странами Запада. Россия испытывает экономический упадок, принимает меры для сохранения ведущей позиции в мире и проводит агрессивную антизападную политику, основанную на “неоевразийстве”. В свою очередь, США и европейские государства, которые длительное время выступали “модераторами” глобализации, находятся в политическом кризисе, следствием которой является усиление популистских политических сил и политики изоляционизма.

Активные геостратегические действующие актеры активизируют деятельность за пределами своих национальных границ с целью изменения геополитической ситуации в направлении построения многополярного мира. Усилия таких актеров сосредоточены прежде всего на увеличении своих возможностей по обеспечению экономического роста. Они стремятся обеспечить себе свободу деятельности на международной арене, в том числе

путем отказа от “неудобных договоренностей” и увеличения численности партнеров и союзников из числа геополитических центров. Несмотря на стратегические задачи, активные актеры объективно вынуждены применять многовекторную внешнюю политику. Такой подход к реализации национальных интересов в многополярном мире приводит к межгосударственной конкуренции и поиску нового формата глобализации. Следствием даного развития межгосударственных отношений является сложная политическая обстановка и обострение безопасности.

Ключевые слова: геополитика, международные отношения, постбиполярная система международных отношений, неоевразийство, китаецентричность, континентализм.

Statement of the problem. The efforts of the states of the world regarding the search for ways to continue economic growth objectively caused the development of a new format of globalization and international relations during the second decade of the XXI century. The new approaches of the countries of the world to global interaction were evidenced by the peculiarities of holding and the results of international events on economics and security that were held in 2020, in particular, the World Economic Forum in Davos and the International Conference on Security Issues in Munich. So, the theme of the annual meetings of the International Economic Forum in Davos has changed on the economic, scientific and technical cooperation of the countries of the world, which were precisely the reason for its foundation, on a joint solution to the environmental and resource problems that were discussed in 2020. Such a change in the focus of the forum in Davos indicates the deepening crisis in the global economy and the desire of most countries to solve development problems on their own, including by limiting participation in integration

processes. First of all, this concerns the states of the European Union, in which populist politicians and parties interchange at the peak of popularity. Under these conditions, the states-generators of international integration have concentrated their efforts on maintaining interstate cooperation in areas related to the foundations of human existence, in particular environmental safety and health, the use of natural resources, the restoration of regional and global stability, and the like. Moreover, these areas of cooperation should be implemented within the framework of the policy of “inclusiveness” and the participation of all states without exception, which was reflected in the slogan of the forum “Stakeholders on a united and stable world.” Forum participants attributed the rejection of multilateralism to the most serious threats to the global economy.

During a speech at the Davos forum, World Bank Director General K. Georgieva noted that moving away from the principles of multilateralism in trade and international relations could slow down economic growth [1]. German Chancellor A. Merkel calls on

the European Union not to abandon the policy of multilateralism in solving political and financial problems. According to her, the countries of the world must take into account each other's interests, and international organizations must be reformed in order to adapt them to the effective neutralization of modern challenges. [2]. The need to promote a policy of multilateralism in international relations was also supported by the President of the European Investment Bank W. Hoyer. According to him, "if we allow the biggest threat to multilateralism in the last 50 years to persist, then the whole world economy will be in danger." Compared to previous years, the holding of the International Economic Forum in 2020 was affected by the limited participation of political leaders. Against the backdrop of a deteriorating global economy, it is indicated that it can be regarded as an increase in geopolitical tensions. The complications of international relations are evident from the statements of the participants of the fifty-sixth Conference on Security in Munich (February 14-16, 2020). Speakers paid considerable attention to the problem of growing threats to world security and stability, as well as reducing the effectiveness of international organizations and collective security systems to confront new challenges and threats. The complications of international relations are evident from the statements of the participants of the fifty-sixth Conference on Security in Munich (February 14-16, 2020). Speakers paid considerable attention to the problem of growing threats to world security and stability, as well as

reducing the effectiveness of international organizations and collective security systems to confront new challenges and threats.

The use of military force to revise the established territorial division within the framework of the post-bipolar system of international relations, which is resorted to by such nuclear powers as Russia, which continues armed aggression against Ukraine and hybrid provocations in Western countries, and China, attracts national armed forces to implement its territorial claims, threatens the existence of mankind.

Therefore, during a speech at the fifty-sixth Munich conference, German Minister of Defense A. Kramp-Karrenbauer presented the official position of the state and called Russia the source of the main threat to Western states. According to her, Russia with hybrid attacks and neglect of territorial sovereignty puts pressure on Ukraine and the Baltic countries, attacks in the Ukraine and Germany, and the annexation of Crimea is a challenge to the ideals and values of the West [3]. At the same time, the conference in Munich demonstrated the absence in the leading states of the world of a coordinated approach to ending the aggressive actions of Russia and solving other security problems. The special vision of French President E. Macron on a new strategy for relations with Russia [4] and the critical speech of J. Borrell regarding the EU's slow reaction to international conflicts and threats noted the West's unwillingness to defend the post-bipolar territorial structure.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The theoretical basis for

the study of the features of geopolitical concepts of the leading countries of the world and their influence on the development of international relations was the development of domestic and foreign experts on these issues. Features of international relations in a multipolar world are studied in the works of G. Kissinger, Z. Brzezinski, A. I. Shapovalova, S. Cohen, S. Andrushchenko. Given the use of research by Russian scientists in substantiating Russian aggressive foreign policy, special attention is paid to the theoretical calculations of A. Dugin, S. Kapkov, L. Ivashov.

The aim of the article is to study the main geopolitical concepts of the leading countries of the world and determine from them those that in the future will determine the quantity and quality of world decision-making centers. In addition, the article is aimed at identifying possible approaches to countering Russian aggression. Statement of the main material. The current complication of international relations is caused by the desire of individual countries to single-handedly view post-bipolar international relations to ensure their own economic development. Such an individual position ultimately leads to the deepening of interstate contradictions and armed conflicts against the backdrop of the failure of the leading states to effectively counter security threats, in the Post-Soviet space.

The revisionist actions of Russia in relation to the period of the establishment of a multipolar world order aimed at providing the Russian Federation with the status of a world geopolitical center that belonged to the former USSR led to an increase in conflict in

Europe. However, these Russian actions do not have an appropriate ideological (value), economic, scientific and technological basis.

In turn, China, relying on the large-scale results of economic and technological development, continues to use the socialist ideology and experience of the former USSR and is considering the possibility of installing a bipolar world order in which China will assume the role of a world decision-making center. A number of scientists who have studied the formation of post-bipolar international relations have come to the conclusion that social, economic, ideological, regulatory, and other processes are incomplete. The transformation from the Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations to a multipolar world order took place peacefully, however, individual factors of the Cold War survived in modern life.

Analyzing the transition of the world from the Yalta-Potsdam to the post-bipolar system of international relations, A. Shapovalova notes its multi levelness. The interconnection of structural levels, each of which is to some extent autonomous, does not provide for a permanent hierarchy. According to a study by a Ukrainian scientist, the Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations was determined by such levels as: ideological, which had a manifestation in the antagonism between liberal and socialist ideologies; regulatory and institutional, in which primacy had second-hand sovereignty; relational-distributive, namely, bipolar world order; and functional, in the framework of which stable relations were formed between states in the middle of the blocs and interblock

relations. The essential of the incompleteness of the transformation of international relations and the establishment of a multipolar world order is that simultaneously with the synchronization of ideological and functional levels there was no design of the normative-institutional level and the development of a stable configuration at the distributive-relational level [5].

The uncertainty of such features of the existence of a multi-polar world order as the status characteristics of actors, the direction of their interaction and relational relations led to the absence of a mutually acceptable system of political, economic and social relations between states.

The collapse of the Soviet camp and the cessation of the existence of one of the geopolitical poles, as a key component of the Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations, opened up opportunities for the continuation of the systemic development of only the transatlantic and European community. Other states, in the conditions of the uncertain polarity of the new system, were forced to independently search for ways of political, economic and social development. The powerful economic, scientific, technological and financial resources of the collective West have led for a long time the orientation of the developing countries to intensified cooperation with Western states. In fact, it was this orientation that became the basis for globalization in the late XX–early XXI centuries. Western states set trends and standards for the global development of mankind.

At the same time, for Russia, the orientation toward Western values was perceived as a loss of a leading posi-

tion in international relations. Other states abandoned the development of relations with the West for religious or philosophical reasons. Indicative evidence of the choice of one's own way of building a new configuration of international relations was the speech of the President of the Russian Federation V. Putin at the security policy of the conference in Munich in 2007, during which he announced his intentions to review the results of the development of international relations after the collapse of the Soviet camp and, if necessary, provide force Russia's status as a global decision center.

The need to choose the direction and methods of ensuring the development of states in the post-bipolar world actualized their application of approaches to the development of their own foreign policy, taking into account the geographical location, resource potential, ideological and religious features, and the like. At the same time, the number of actors has recently increased due to developing countries in which there is an increase in the level of economic and technological development, as well as the strengthening of military power. Thus, today it can be argued about the rivalry of geopolitical concepts that are used by states claiming the status of world decision centers.

The USA military-political leadership in the formation of national foreign policy continues to rely on geopolitical approaches, the basis of which is the work of A. Mahan, F. J. Turner, H. Mackinder, N. Spykman and the like. At the same time, dualism, relevant for the Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations, is absent in modern American geopolitics. But USA foreign

policy has several regional directions for the realization of national interests. A significant role in the formation of this approach belongs to the scientific works of S. Cohen, G. Kissinger and Z. Brzezinski.

In his work, S. Cohen proceeded from the realities of the Cold War and the rivalry between the capitalist and socialist systems, which were equidistant from non-aligned countries. At the same time, S. Cohen's views on the world order, expressed by him in various works, the book "Geography and Politics in a Divided World", contributed to the development of the concept of regional geopolitics. He used the hierarchical principle of the distribution of the world's regions into geostrategic and geopolitical states. The first type included trade-oriented maritime states, and the second type consisted of states of the same region, which should have relative similarity [6].

The main features of the geopolitical model of S. Cohen, which is reflected in American foreign policy in the post-bipolar world, is the polycentricity of international relations. The world is divided between geopolitical centers, which he considered first-order states - the USA, Europe, the former USSR, Japan and China. States that have recently received economic development, but did not have a significant impact on the global world order, S. Cohen was classified as geopolitically independent [7]. The need to implement national interests objectively pushed official Washington to pursue a multi-vector foreign policy already during the existence of a bipolar world. G. Kissinger, as an adviser to the President of the USA on national

security issues in the administration of R. Nixon, was the organizer and made efforts to improve USA-Chinese relations. The use of the Chinese factor in relations with Moscow and the building of US-USSR-PRC relations was called the "Nixon Triangle." Thus, the USA got a supporter in the confrontation with the former USSR.

Over time, in his book "Diplomacy," G. Kissinger made an attempt to determine the principles of USA foreign policy in the XXI century. According to him, in an international system that will have five or six large and many small states, the order should be based on reconciliation and balancing of competing national interests. America, like other states, must learn to maneuver between the rigid necessity and flexibility of choice, the invariable principles of international relations and the elements that are kept secret by statesmen [8].

Using geopolitical concepts, G. Kissinger described America as an island between the shores of giant Eurasia with resources and a population much larger than that of the United States. The USA geopolitical goal should be to prevent the centers of Europe and Asia from falling under the control of an enemy state. Realization of the task is possible provided that a multi-vector foreign policy is implemented using the geopolitical features of the regions of the world.

The geopolitical ideas of another American influential politician S. Brzezinski on strengthening USA leadership in the world are based on the large-scale achievements of the state in various fields, including military, economic, technological and cultural. "It is the combination of all these factors

that makes America the only world superpower with wide capabilities” [9].

During the first decade of the existence of the post-bipolar world order, S. Brzezinski relied on the ideas of classical geopolitics to develop approaches to the content of world leadership by the United States. The need to use geopolitics to process a multi-vector foreign policy is justified by him on the assumption that “nation-states remain the main links in the global system ... and competition based on territorial ownership still dominates international relations. In this competition, the geographical position remains the starting point to determine the foreign policy priorities of the nation-state and the size of the national territory retain the importance of an important criterion of status and strength” [10].

In a multipolar system of international relations, the development of a state’s foreign policy requires a clear understanding of which state nations will objectively have to build relations with and in what ways this should be done. Foreign policy priorities should be determined among states that have the most active position and are capable of determining the development of international relations in a strategic perspective.

S. Brzezinski determined the existence of active geostrategic actors, which are “states with the ability and national freedom to exercise power or influence outside their own borders in order to change the existing geopolitical situation” [11]. At the same time, he assigns a special place to “geopolitical centers - states that matter not through force and motivation, but through their location and the consequences of their

potential vulnerability to the actions of geostrategic actors.” The identification of key Eurasian geopolitical centers of the post-Cold War period, as well as their protection, are thus a fundamental aspect of America geostrategy.

On the Eurasian continent, S. Brzezinski noted five key geostrategic actors – France, Germany, Russia, China and India. Ukraine, Azerbaijan, South Korea, Turkey and Iran the role of fundamentally important geopolitical centers. Based on this classification, key actors should be identified and a correct assessment of the theater of action should be carried out to form the USA geostrategy in terms of strategic management of USA geopolitical interests in Eurasia [12].

In an applied sense, S. Brzezinski proposed to implement theoretical calculations in the format of a multi-vector policy on the Eurasian continent. In his views, the USA should have had its own approach to the countries of Southeast Europe, Central Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and the Persian Gulf. Over time, given the increasing aggression in Russia’s foreign policy, S. Brzezinski in his work “Second Chance: Three Presidents and the Crisis of the American Superpower” emphasized the importance of abandoning a unipolar policy and increasing attention to developing relations with Europe and China while pursuing a policy of containment with respect to Russia [13].

Geopolitical approaches to the implementation of the multi-vector US policy in post-bipolar international relations have been used for a long time to develop a series of periodic conceptual documents on security issues.

These include, but are not limited to, the USA National Security Strategy, the US National Defense Strategy, the US Nuclear Policy Review and the National Biological Defense Strategy, and the US Missile Defense Review. An analysis of the strategic environment (political and security of the situation), as part of these documents, defines the main geostrategic actors and geopolitical centers that should be taken into account when solving foreign policy tasks to strengthen the USA leadership police in the world [14].

The modern geopolitics of Russia is determined by the desire of the Russian elite to review the results of the period of formation of the post-bipolar system of international relations. The incentive to take such a position was the lack of formally fixed agreements between the USA and the former USSR, and eventually Russia, related to the cessation of the existence of the socialist camp. The unacceptability for Russia of the role of a regional power, which continues to hold a significant arsenal of nuclear weapons, has caused the choice by the Russian military-political elite of the course to use force to solve foreign policy tasks.

Having the will and at the same time limited resource potential for influencing the geopolitical situation in the world, Russia resorted to the search for a geopolitical concept to justify an aggressive foreign policy. In addition, multinational and multi-religious Russia needed a structured theory to realize national interests in the context of ideological and value disorientation.

Under the circumstances, a number of geopolitical concepts arose, among which neo-Eurasianism was most

widespread. During its formulation, the authors and followers turned to a free interpretation of the principles of classical Eurasianism, the founders of which were N. Trubetskoy, P. Savitsky, L. Krasavin, R. Jacobson, G. Vernadsky, G. Frolovsky, P. Suvchinsky.

The Russian political scientist A. Berdin identified the following neo-Eurasian trends: neo-Eurasianism by A. Dugin, followers of L. Gumilyov, the “academic” school of Eurasianism, the right-conservative and left-wing movements, the Eurasian paradigms of regional ideologies of some republics of the Russian Federation and the CIS, Russian nationalism (E. Kholmogorova, E. Prosvirin, V. Milov, N. Narochnitsky).

The indicated directions of modern neo-Eurasianism have a number of common conceptual features, which makes it possible to consider it as a worldview system. The factors that, according to A. Berdin, unite modern neo-Eurasian trends, include recognition of the cultural and civilizational continuity and geopolitical self-sufficiency of Russia and Eurasia as a whole, an organic type of philosophy of history, polycentrism (the methodology of “local civilizations”), etc. [15].

At the same time, according to unclear formulations of the Eurasian principles, it is possible to consider quite pragmatic approaches to justifying an aggressive foreign policy and consolidating the Russian population around the Kremlin in the face of miscalculations in domestic policy. So, for most of the authors of the neo-Eurasian trends, the anti-Western orientation of ideas is characteristic; it was most likely a reaction to an increase in the intensity of

contacts with the West, which is developing more intensively and efficiently. Negatively characteristic conflict laws, messages and countries should be directed towards the struggle against Russia and the consolidation of Russia, in which cultural, social, social and economic regions live. Everything related to the USA and the USA is directly related to the strategic directions of Heartland (Russia) and the incentive bag polar retinue.

Assessing the role and place of Russia in a multipolar world, A. Dugin introduces the idea of the verticality of her efforts in the new world order. The fate of the world order is currently being decided in Russia, Russia and through Russia.

Based on the leading role of Russia in building a multipolar world, emphasis is placed on the importance of gaining allies in different parts of the world. The strategic task of upholding its own independence forces Russia to cooperate with all potential partners in multipolarity.

The efforts of Russian politics should be focused on the strategic reorganization of the space around Russia: Russia's access to vital geographical objects; prevention of integration of neighboring states into NATO, continuation of Eurasian integration; countering globalization and the like. In the context of the strategic reorganization of the surrounding area, special attention is paid to the project "Greater Eastern Europe" and the integration of Ukraine, Belarus and Russia into a single strategic structure. Without Ukraine, Russia is not self-sufficient either in the spatially strategic, demographic, or political sense.

At the same time, to build a multipolar world, the Russian geopolitics of neo-Eurasism provides for the development of relations with distant foreign states. In relations with European states, Russia must outperform the USA in the European space in order to fulfill its foreign policy objectives and contribute to the crystallization of the continental identity of the European Union. Guidelines in the Middle East region should be to promote the preservation of traditional society, support for Arab countries, the promotion of independent geopolitical behavior in Turkey and the like. Here, "Moscow - Tehran" should be the main direction of the formation of the strategic space and the transformation of the "Heartland", formulated by K. Haushofer, into global power.

Also, to build the Eurasian space, Russian geopolitics consider it necessary for Russia to develop relations with the countries of Central, South and Southeast Asia. At the same time, given the desire of China to develop Russian Siberia and penetrate the Central Asian countries, neo-Eurasian geopolitics provides for a redirect of Chinese efforts to regions south of China [16]. The disappearance of the socialist camp and the relevance of the application of communist ideology in public administration, as well as the rejection of Soviet-era values, objectively forced the Russian leadership to choose geopolitical concepts for the development of the state. In this context, neo-Eurasianism better replaces the lost ideological background and the failure of modern Russia to realize its ambitions. The geopolitical concept of a multipolar world order, developed by neo-

Eurasian theorists, is partially mentioned already in the National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation until 2020. In particular, a document approved in 2009 stated that Russia had renewed its ability to uphold national interests as a key subject of multipolar international relations. The implementation of the aforementioned task involves the active participation of Russia in the development of a multipolar world order [17]. Intensive economic development and the strengthening of military power during the reforms initiated by Deng Xiaoping created the basis for China to implement its own approach to protecting national interests.

The geopolitical principles of China's foreign policy were formed during the historical development of the Chinese state and included traditional Chinese centrism, which determines the attitude of the Chinese towards foreign countries. The Chinese elite considers "neighboring countries and foreigners to be barbarians, to whom the empire carries the world of culture, and the emperor's heavenly mandate is intended to enlighten humanity" [18].

The mentioned principle of interaction with the outside world involves the expansion of the Chinese worldview, gaining foreign experience and at the same time preventing the erosion of Chinese values. Russian political scientists note that China's geopolitical strategy is based on the philosophy of the Great Chinese Order, which combines openness to the outside world with the protection of Chinese culture and identity from external influences. This is the double vector of China's geopolitics [19].

This approach determines the main feature of Chinese geopolitics, namely, the non-use of dichotomy in the civilizational structure of the world. In geopolitics, the Chinese profess the three-fold system of the game: my self, allies (partners), rival. The Chinese do not play according to the scheme: against each other [20].

Taking second place after the USA in economic development, official Beijing is making significant efforts to build pragmatic relations with Washington, which is both a competitor and a partner. Regarding the United States, China uses the strategy of "absorbing someone else's activity" to gain primacy due to the spread of the Chinese presence from different angles, including from the middle [21].

The application of this approach during the reform period led to significant economic success and stimulated the Chinese side's confidence in the loyalty of the chosen approach to the development of international relations. Despite this, during the Nineteenth Congress of the CCP (in 2017), the completion of the Deng Xiaoping era "hiding its capabilities and content aside" was announced and the Chinese Dream state development strategy was adopted.

The strategy defines China's new approaches in realizing the national interests of the state. The foreign policy of modern China is characterized as "strong, but not tough." In the next decade, China will not be shy about offering "Chinese wisdom and a Chinese approach to solving the problems facing humanity." It is from this point that one should evaluate the Chinese transnational initiative "One Belt – One

Way”, which should unite states with a “common destiny.” The implementation of this initiative will contribute to the transformation of Eurasia into an economic and strategic region that can compete with the Euro-Atlantic region [22]. Assessing the strategic intentions of China, Russian political scientists note that unlike Washington, which would like to see the world of the XXI century unipolar (led by the United States), but multipolar - Asia, Beijing sees a multipolar world with unipolar China-centered Asia [23].

European countries, having a high level of interaction among themselves, create one of the most important global driving forces for economic development and the formation of a modern system of international relations. However, despite the close relationship between states, European geopolitics remains fragmented.

The main reason for the lack of a common geopolitical concept for Europe should be considered the presence of significant differences between European countries in matters of national interests and how to implement them. In addition, the development of a common geopolitical approach is hindered by the long and conflict-ridden history of the state and the preservation of ethnic contradictions, which contribute to the strengthening of nationalism and populism in the European space. These features of modern Europe today, as never before, determine the emergence in various European countries of different approaches to building relations with representatives of other geopolitical regions.

Britain’s secession from the EU demonstrated two different geopolitical

theories in Europe. So, the UK remains committed to the Anglo-Saxon geopolitical school. The European Union, on the other hand, acts as one of the most influential world geopolitical centers, and the processes within the EU and its adjacent spaces determine the foreign policy strategies of both the Union states and neighboring states, Ukraine in particular [24].

The Germany-France tandem, which after Brexit remained the core of integration processes and foreign policy initiatives, considers the European geopolitical space as a united Europe, which supports interaction with all countries of the Eurasian continent. This approach is largely based on the views of Conrad Adenauer, a supporter of a united Europe, and the “continentalist” Charles de Gaulle.

Germany and France are the main moderators of geopolitical initiatives to formulate EU foreign policy. The concept of “European continentalism”, which was formulated in the 1960s of the last century and largely reflected the ideas of K. Haushofer, K. Schmitt, remains an important guideline for geopolitical decisions.

Germany and France are the main moderators of geopolitical initiatives to formulate EU foreign policy. The concept of “European continentalism”, which was formulated in the 1960s of the last century and largely reflected the ideas of K. Haushofer, K. Schmitt, remains an important guideline for geopolitical decisions. First of all, the situation will become more complicated due to the geopolitical ambitions of the Central states, in particular Poland (the concept of returning to borders before 1772), Hungary (the concept of

Greater Hungary) and Romania (the concept of Greater Romania). All of them consider the EU as a mechanism for the formation of their own spheres of influence, and Ukraine, to one degree or another, is the object of these geopolitical concepts [24].

In this regard, Russian aggression against Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea led to a decrease in the relevance of the concept of “European continentalism.” In fact, today we should talk about the actualization of “Atlantism” as the basis for cooperation between Europe and the United States.

At the same time, the countries of the European Union do not intend to refuse to build a full-fledged European geopolitical space. Germany’s political leaders recognize its importance in strengthening Germany’s position on the world stage as opposed to the USA and China. At the same time, Germany relies more on bilateral diplomacy than on general mechanisms for solving economic and political problems [24].

Findings. Today, the states of the world are searching for new approaches to building interstate relations to replace the globalization format that was effective at the end of the twentieth century. In particular, active geostrategic actors are stepping up activities beyond their national borders in order to change the geopolitical situation in the direction of building a multipolar world order.

The efforts of such actors are focused primarily on increasing their ability to ensure economic growth. In particular, they seek to secure freedom of activity in the international arena by abandoning “inconvenient agreements” and increasing the number of

partners or allies from among the geopolitical centers.

The strategic tasks of active geostrategic actors today are different from each other, which accordingly requires different ways to solve them. So, for the United States, the strategic task remains the preservation of world leadership, is reflected in the conceptual documents of state development. Other active actors are trying to secure their freedom of action by increasing their influence on the geopolitical situation in order to obtain the status of a world decision-making center. In this way, they can strengthen their geopolitical position for conducting a strategic dialogue with the USA and gaining an advantage in relations between themselves.

At the same time, it must be recognized that, despite the strategic objectives, active actors are objectively forced to apply a multi-vector foreign policy and use approaches that are developed taking into account the achievements of the founders of geopolitics.

At the same time, it must be recognized that, despite the strategic objectives, active actors are objectively forced to apply a multi-vector foreign policy and use approaches that are developed taking into account the achievements of the founders of geopolitics. Thus, the system of state borders in Europe was violated, which made it impossible to fully implement such geopolitical concepts as Russian “neo-Eurasianism” and European “continentalism.” The main reason for this should be considered the threat of the destruction of the system of international law and the growth of conflict

in the Eurasian continent, a significant number of disputed territories within the European states and Asian countries.

REFERENCES

1. *Georgieva, K., Gopinath, G.* (2020, January 20). Press Conference: IMF World Economic Outlook Update. www.weforum.org. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/events/world-economic-forum-annual-meeting-2020/sessions/imf-world-economic-outlook-update> [in English].
2. *Merkel, A., Schwab, K.* (2020, January 23). Special Address by Angela Merkel, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany. Speakers. www.weforum.org. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/events/world-economic-forum-annual-meeting-2020/sessions/special-address-by-angela-merkel-chancellor-of-the-federal-republic-of-germany> [in English].
3. *Kramp-Karrenbauer, A.* (2020, February 15). "Defending the West". Speech by Federal Minister of Defence Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer at the Munich Security Conference. www.bmvg.de. Retrieved from <https://www.bmvg.de/resource/blob/183082/0dd7817ea0c5dd8a0fd261ba4f302da5/20200217-download-englische-rede-akk-data.pdf> [in English].
4. *Macron, E., Ischinger, W.* (2020, February 15). Chairman's Interview with Emmanuel Macron. Munich Security Conference, 2020. securityconference.org. Retrieved from <https://securityconference.org/en/medialibrary/asset/chairmans-interview-20200215-1115/> [in English].
5. *Shapovalova, O. I.* (2013). Systemnyi perekhid vid yaltynsko-potsdamskoi do postbipoliarnoi systemy miznarodnykh vidnosyn: nezavershena dekonstruktsiia [Systemic transition from the Yalta-Potsdam to the post-bipolar system of international relations: incomplete deconstruction]. *Naukovyi visnyk Dyplomatychnoi akademii Ukrainy – Annual Journal of the Diplomatic Academy of Ukraine*, 20(2), 95-103. Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvdau_2013_20%282%29__14 [in Ukrainian].
6. *Cohen, S. B.* (1971). *Geography and Politics in a Divided World*. Oxford [in English].
7. *Kapkov, S.* (2009). Politsentrizm kak osnovnoe napravlenie sovremennoy amerikanskoj geopoliticheskoy mysli [Polycentrism as the mainstream of modern American geopolitical thought]. *Politicheskaya Ekspertiza: POLITEX*, 5(2), 254-268. Retrieved from <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=12798925> [in Russian].
8. *Kissinger, H.* (1994). *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon & Schuster [in English].
9. *Brzezinski, Z.* (2016). *The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. New York: Basic Books [in English].
10. *Brzezinski, Z.* (2001). *The Geostrategic Triad: Living with China, Europe, and Russia*. Washington: CSIS [in English].
11. *Brzezinski, Z.* (2016). *The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. New York: Basic Books [in English].
12. *Brzezinski, Z.* (2001). *The Geostrategic Triad: Living with China, Europe, and Russia*. Washington: CSIS [in English].
13. *Brzezinski, Z.* (n.d.). Eshche odin shans. Tri prezidenta i krizis amerikanskoj sverkhderzhavy [One more chance. Three presidents and the crisis of the American superpower]. Retrieved from <https://royallib.com/>

- read/bgezinskiy_zbignev/eshche_odin_shans_tri_prezidenta_i_krizis_amerikanskoj_sverhdergavi.html#0 [in Russian].
14. National Security Strategy of the United States of America. (2017). The White House. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> [in English].
 15. *Berdin, A. T.* (2015). Osnovnye napravleniya evraziystva v postsovetsoj Rossii [The main directions of Eurasianism in post-Soviet Russia]. *Vestnik Akademii Nauk RB – The Herald of the ASRB*, 20(4), 50-51. Retrieved from <http://www.vestnikanrb.ru/files/vestnik2015-4.pdf> [in Russian].
 16. *Dugin, A. G.* (2011). Geopolitika [Geopolitics]. *Gaudeamus – Gaudeamus*. (pp. 471-493). Moscow [in Russian].
 17. Strategiya natsionalnoj bezopasnosti Rossijskoj Federatsii do 2020 goda [National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation until 2020]. (2009). Moscow. Retrieved from <http://www.scrf.gov.ru/documents/99.html> [in Russian].
 18. *Harari, Y. N.* (n.d.). Sapiens. Kratkaya istoriya chelovechestva [Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind]. Retrieved from <https://citaty.info/book/yuval-noi-harari-sapiens-kratkaya-istoriya-chelovechestva> [in Russian].
 19. *Kugay, A. I.* (2019). Muskuly Drona: sovremennaya geopoliticheskaya doktrina Kitaya [Muscles of the Dragon: China's modern geopolitical doctrine]. *Upravlencheskoe konsultirovanie – Management Consulting*, 6, 36-37. Retrieved from https://sziu.ranepa.ru/images/nauka/UK_DOI/6_19/Kugay_06_19.pdf [in Russian].
 20. *Ivashov, L. G.* (2015). Geopolitika Russkoj tsivilizatsii [Geopolitics of Russian civilization]. Moscow: Institut russkoj tsivilizatsii. Retrieved from http://rusinst.ru/docs/books/L.G.Ivashov-Geopolitika_Russkoj_civilizatsii.pdf [in Russian].
 21. *Yeo, S.J.* (2016). Geopolitics of search: Google versus China? *Media, Culture & Society*, 38(4). Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0163443716643014> [in English].
 22. Polnyj tekst doklada, s kotorym vystupil Xi Tsin'pin na 19-m sezde KPK [The full text of the report made by Xi Jinping at the 19th CCP Congress]. (2017). *russian.news.cn*. Retrieved from http://russian.news.cn/2017-11/03/c_136726299.htm [in Russian].
 23. *Ivashov, L. G.* (2015). Geopolitika Russkoj tsivilizatsii [Geopolitics of Russian civilization]. Moscow: Institut russkoj tsivilizatsii. rusinst.ru. Retrieved from http://rusinst.ru/docs/books/L.G.Ivashov-Geopolitika_Russkoj_civilizatsii.pdf [in Russian].
 24. *Andrushchenko, C. V.* (2014). Osoblyvosti suchasnoho yevropejskoho heopolitychnoho prostoru [Features of modern European geopolitical space]. *Mizhnarodni vidnosyny. Seriya "Politychni nauky" – International Relations. Series "Political Science"*, 3. Retrieved from http://journals.iir.kiev.ua/index.php/pol_n/article/view/2230 [in Ukrainian].
 25. *Hurkovskij, V., Bazhora, O.* (2020). Stratehichni komunikatsii yak instrument pobudovy suchasnoj arkhitektury mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn [Strategic communications as a tool for building a modern architecture of international relations]. *STRATCOM*, 1, 15-27 [in Ukrainian].
 26. *Gurkovskij, V., Dmitruk, S.* (2019). Analiz mozhyvostei sektoru bezpeky i oborony shchodo zabezpechennia natsionalnoj bezpeky Ukrainy [Social and

- Human Sciences [Analysis of Possibilities of the Security and Defense Sector for the Provision of the National Security of Ukraine]. Polish-Ukrainian scientific journal, 04(24). Retrieved from https://sp-sciences.io.ua/s2664201/gurkovskiy_volodymyr_dmitruk_sergiy_2019._analysis_of_possibilities_of_the_security_and_defense_sector_for_the_provision_of_the_national_security_of_ukraine_social_and_human_sciences_polish-ukrainian_scientific_journal_04_24 [in Ukrainian].
27. *Gurkovskiy, V., Dmitruk, S.* (2019). Analiz stratehuvannya bezpekovoho seredovyscha yak priorityetne zavdannia derzhavnogo upravlinnia u sferi voiennoi bezpeky [Analysis of the strategy of the security environment as a priority task of public administration in the field of military security]. O. I. Parkhomenko-Kutsevil (Eds.). *Yevropeiskiy vymir reformuvannya publicnogo v Ukraini – European dimension of public reform in Ukraine: Proceedings of the International scientific-practical conference.* (p. 97). Kyiv: MAUP [in Ukrainian].
- [Digital source]. – Access mode : <https://www.weforum.org/events/world-economic-forum-annual-meeting-2020/sessions/special-address-by-angela-merkel-chancellor-of-the-federal-republic-of-germany> – A title is from a screen.
3. “Defending the West”. Speech by Federal Minister of Defence Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer at the Munich Security Conference 15 February 2020. // Munich Security Conference 2020, February 15, 2020. [Digital source]. Access mode : <https://www.bmvg.de/resource/blob/183082/0dd7817ea0c5dd8a0fd261ba4f302da5/20200217-download-englische-rede-akk-data.pdf> – A title is from a screen.
4. Chairman's Interview with Emmanuel Macron. Emmanuel Macron (President, French Republic), Moderator: Wolfgang Ischinger (Chairman of the Munich Security Conference) // Munich Security Conference 2020, February 15, 2020. [Digital source]. Access mode: <https://securityconference.org/en/medialibrary/asset/chairmans-interview-20200215-1115/> – A title is from a screen.
5. Шаповалова О. І. Системний перехід від ялтинсько-потсдамської до постбіполярної системи міжнародних відносин: незавершена деконструкція // *Наук. вісн. Дипломатичної академії України.* 2013. Вип. 20(2). С. 95–103. Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvdau_2013_20%282%29_14
6. *Cohen S. B.* Geography and Politics in a Divided World. // Oxford. 1971. – P. 18.
7. *Канков С.* Полицентризм как основное направление современной американской геополитической мысли. Политическая экспертиза: Политэкс. Санкт-Петербург. гос. ун-т. Санкт-Петербург. 2009.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Press Conference: IMF World Economic Outlook Update. Speakers: Kristalina Georgieva, Gita Gopinath. // World Economic Forum, January 20, 2020. [Digital source]. Access mode: <https://www.weforum.org/events/world-economic-forum-annual-meeting-2020/sessions/imf-world-economic-outlook-update> – A title is from a screen.
2. Special Address by Angela Merkel, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany. Speakers: Angela Merkel, Klaus Schwab. // World Economic Forum, January 23, 2020.

- Т. 5, № 2. С. 254–268. Режим доступа: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=12798925>
8. Henry Kissinger. *Diplomacy* // Simon & Schuster. 1994. P. 740–741.
 9. Zbigniew Brzezinski. *The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* // Basic Books. 2016. P. 24.
 10. Zbigniew Brzezinski. *The Geostrategic Triad: Living with China, Europe, and Russia*. // CSIS. 2001. P. 31.
 11. Zbigniew Brzezinski. *The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* // Basic Books. 2016. P. 39–41.
 12. Zbigniew Brzezinski. *The Geostrategic Triad: Living with China, Europe, and Russia* // CSIS. 2001. P. 42.
 13. *Збигнев Бжезинский*. Еще один шанс. Три президента и кризис американской сверхдержавы [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа : https://royallib.com/read/bgezinskiy_zbignev/eshche_odin_shans_tri_prezidenta_i_krizis_amerikanskoj_sverhdergavi.html#0
 14. National Security Strategy of the United States of America // The White House. 2017. [Digital source]. Access mode : <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf> – A title is from a screen.
 15. *Бердин А. Т.* Основные направления евразийства в постсоветской России // Вест. Акад. наук РБ. 2015. Т. 20, № 4. С. 50–51. Режим доступа: <http://www.vestnikanrb.ru/files/vestnik2015-4.pdf>
 16. *Дугин А. Г.* Геополитика. // Гаудеамус. Москва, 2011. С. 471–493.
 17. Стратегия национальной безопасности Российской Федерации до 2020 года [Электронный ресурс] // Москва. 2009. Режим доступа : <http://www.scrf.gov.ru/documents/99.html>
 18. *Юваль Ной Харари*. *Sapiens*. Краткая история человечества. [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа: <https://citaty.info/book/yuval-noi-harari-sapiens-kratkaya-istoriya-chelovechestva>
 19. *Кугай А. И.* Мускулы Дракона: современная геополитическая доктрина Китая [Электронный ресурс] // Управленческое консультирование. 2019. № 6. 36–37. Режим доступа: https://szii.ranepa.ru/images/nauka/UK_DOI/6_19/Kugay_06_19.pdf
 20. *Ивашов Л. Г.* Геополитика Русской цивилизации [Электронный ресурс]. Москва: Ин-т рус. цивилизации, 2015. С. 211. Режим доступа : http://rusinst.ru/docs/books/L.G.Ivashov-Geopolitika_Russkoy_civilizacii.pdf
 21. Shin Joung Yeo. *Geopolitics of search: Google versus China?* // Media, Culture & Society. 2016. Vol. 38 (4) 2016. [Digital source]. Access mode: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0163443716643014>
 22. Полный текст доклада, с которым выступил Си Цзиньпин на 19-м съезде КПК [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа : http://russian.news.sp/2017-11/03/c_136726299.htm.
 23. *Ивашов Л. Г.* Геополитика Русской цивилизации [Электронный ресурс] // Ин-т рус. цивилизации. 2015. С. 209. Режим доступа : http://rusinst.ru/docs/books/L.G.Ivashov-Geopolitika_Russkoy_civilizacii.pdf
 24. *Андрущенко С. В.* Особливості сучасного європейського геополітичного простору [Електронний ресурс] // Міжнар. відносини. Серія: Політичні науки. 2014, № 3. Режим доступу : http://journals.iir.kiev.ua/index.php/pol_n/article/view/2230
 25. *Гурковський В., Бажора О.* Стратегічні комунікації як інструмент по-

- будови сучасної архітектури міжнародних відносин // Наук.-публ. вид. "STRATCOM" Навч.-наук. центру стратег. комунікацій у сфері нац. безпеки та оборони. 2020. № 1. С. 15–27.
26. *Гурковський В., Дмитрук С.* Аналіз можливостей сектору безпеки і оборони щодо забезпечення національної безпеки України Social and Human Sciences. Polish-Ukrainian scientific journal 04 (24). Режим доступу: <https://sp-sciences.io.ua>
27. *Гурковський В., Дмитрук С.* Аналіз стратегування безпекового середовища як пріоритетне завдання державного управління у сфері воєнної безпеки / Європейський вимір реформування публічного в Україні: матеріали Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф., (22 листоп. 2019 р.) / за заг. ред. О. І. Пархоменко-Куцевіл. Київ: МАУП, 2019. 97 с.