

UDC 327

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/72-4-9>

Nataliia KISHCHENKO,

orcid.org/0000-0002-7685-4518

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

Associate Professor at the Department of International Relations and Humanitarian Disciplines

Ukrainian State Dragomanov University

(Kyiv, Ukraine) Natochka230@gmail.com

Illia MORHUN,

orcid.org/0000-0002-4891-7534

3rd year student of the Faculty of Political Sciences and Journalism

Adam Mickiewicz University

(Poznan, Poland) illmor@st.amu.edu.pl

EXPLORATORY POWER OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COGNITIVE PARADIGMS FOR STUDYING GLOBAL POLITICS

The article discusses the main theoretical and conceptual approaches to studying the dynamics of international order in the international system. This dynamic is manifested in the subordination of the structural elements of the international system to certain principles, norms and rules. The methodology of international order research is based on the synthesis of systemic, structural-functional, institutional-normative and synergistic approaches. Conceptually, the paradigms of neorealism and neoliberalism have the greatest influence. These paradigms place the state at the center of the discussion, but pay attention to various aspects of its role, capabilities and methods of influencing international politics. Neoliberalism supports the democratization of international relations, while neorealism advocates the idea that the international system is dominated by a hierarchical type of governance hidden behind a form of democracy that includes complex mechanisms for coordinating interests. Recent events, in particular the crisis in relations between Ukraine and Russia, which has global significance and has become the object of interstate relations not only between these two states, indicate the transformation of the foreign policy strategies of the world's most powerful states and their growing role in shaping the modern international order. At the beginning of the XXI century. there is a transition from a post-bipolar international order to a new world order. While maintaining and even strengthening its political differentiation and heterogeneity, developing along different vector trajectories, the global world is becoming more and more integrated and integrated, and states are becoming more and more interconnected and interdependent. However, this by no means means stability in international relations. Some researchers claim that the world is returning to the times of the "Cold War", others believe that the world is returning to the Westphalian period in general, and many scientists and experts agree that a period of chaos, anarchy, a kind of "game without rules" is coming in world politics. The redistribution of the balance of power in the world increases the instability of the international system. The topicality of the topic is due to the fact that during 2014–2016 geopolitical tension in the world is growing even more, threats of direct armed clashes between competing states and blocs of states are becoming real. Russia's aggression against Ukraine endangers the existence of the entire system of international law and undermines international trust, which is the basis of international law, reveals the erosion of the post-bipolar international order that was formed after the end of the Cold War.

Key words: *international order, democracy, hierarchical type of management.*

Наталія КИЩЕНКО,*orcid.org/0000-0002-7685-4518*

кандидат філологічних наук,

доцент кафедри міжнародних відносин та гуманітарних дисциплін
Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова
(Київ, Україна) *Natochka230@gmail.com***Ілля МОРГУН,***orcid.org/0000-0002-4891-7534*студент III курсу факультету політичних наук та журналістики
Університету імені Адама Міцкевича
(Познань, Польща) *illmor@st.amu.edu.pl*

ДОСЛІДНИЦЬКА СИЛА МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН ПІЗНАВАЛЬНИХ ПАРАДИГМ ДЛЯ ВИВЧЕННЯ ГЛОБАЛЬНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ

У статті розглядаються основні теоретико-концептуальні підходи до вивчення динаміки міжнародного порядку в міжнародній системі. Ця динаміка проявляється в підпорядкуванні структурних елементів міжнародної системи певним принципам, нормам і правилам. Методологія дослідження міжнародного порядку базується на синтезі системного, структурно-функціонального, інституційно-нормативного та синергетичного підходів. Концептуально найбільший вплив мають парадигми неореалізму та неолібералізму. Ці парадигми ставлять державу в центр дискусії, але звертають увагу на різні аспекти її ролі, можливостей і методів впливу на міжнародну політику. Неолібералізм підтримує демократизацію міжнародних відносин, тоді як неореалізм виступає за те, що в міжнародній системі домінує ієрархічний тип управління, прихований за формою демократії, яка включає складні механізми узгодження інтересів. Останні події, зокрема криза у відносинах між Україною та Росією, яка має глобальне значення і стала об'єктом міждержавних відносин не лише між цими двома державами, свідчать про трансформацію зовнішньополітичних стратегій наймогутніших держав світу та зростання їх ролі у формуванні сучасного міжнародного порядку. На початку XXI ст. відбувається перехід від постбіполярного міжнародного порядку до нового світового порядку. Зберігаючи і навіть посилюючи свою політичну диференціацію та неоднорідність, розвиваючись за різновекторними траєкторіями, глобальний світ стає все більш інтегрованим та цілісним, а держави – все більш взаємопов'язаними та взаємозалежними. Однак це аж ніяк не означає стабільності в міжнародних відносинах. Одні дослідники стверджують, що світ повертається до часів «холодної війни», інші вважають, що світ взагалі повертається до вестфальського періоду, а багато вчених і експертів сходяться на думці, що це період хаосу, анархії, свого роду «у світовій політиці настає гра без правил». Перерозподіл балансу сил у світі посилює нестабільність міжнародної системи. Актуальність теми зумовлена тим, що протягом 2014–2016 рр. геополітична напруга у світі ще більше посилюється, стають реальними загрози прямих збройних зіткнень між конкуруючими державами та блоками держав. Агресія Росії проти України ставить під загрозу існування всієї системи міжнародного права та підриває міжнародну довіру, яка є основою міжнародного права, виявляє ерозію постбіполярного міжнародного порядку, який сформувався після закінчення холодної війни.

Ключові слова: міжнародний порядок, демократія, ієрархічний тип управління.

Formulation of the problem. The period of dominance of any paradigm, the period of “normal science”, is marked by the accumulation of scientific results found during the solving of successive tasks according to standard samples and methods, while the change of paradigms embodies the period of scientific revolution, which leads to the transformation of scientific achievements and a fundamental revision of the main strategies scientific research. At the same time, it was considered that different paradigms and corresponding theories are incompatible and cannot be subjected to any kind of comparison, since the operation of comparison is possible only within one paradigm. This interpretation of the functional attributes of the paradigm, supplemented by the methodology of the research program of the British philosopher I. Lakatos

(1922–1974), gained general recognition over time and became the foundation of modern philosophy of science.

The set of scientific paradigms, which constitutes the conceptual content and reflects the historical stages of the study of social and political life, is also used in theoretical studies of international relations and foreign policy. In turn, methodology as a special type of rational consciousness aimed at the development of methods of cognition involves the use of a paradigmatic approach to the interpretation of international processes and situations. This approach is conditioned by the attributive functions of ontology and epistemology regarding the nature of politics, particularly international politics.

The field of ontology deals with the question of the objective or, on the contrary, the subjective

essence of international political reality. Proponents of objectivism (realists) interpret politics as a sphere of social existence that exists independently of human perceptions, while “subjectivists” (idealists) believe that politics, including international politics, exists only in the form of ideas created by people and concepts.

The main provisions of the system theory were outlined in the studies of L. von Bertalanffy, T. Parsons, D. Easton, M. Kaplan, K. Waltz, F. Braillard, J. Rosenau, I. Wallerstein and others.

The **purpose** of the article is to describe the processes that occur in the research force of international relations of cognitive paradigms for the study of global politics.

According to the purpose of the article, we identified the following **tasks**:

- Rethinking the role of the international relations research force through the cognitive paradigm of studying global politics.
- Describe the phenomenon of research power in global politics.
- To analyze the cognitive paradigm of global politics by means of research power.

Presentation of the main research material. The bitter experience of conflicts and international wars of the last decade convincingly proves the absence of effective mechanisms for ensuring stability in the international system. Ukraine is a field of conflict between the geopolitical interests of the main world players – the USA, the EU, and Russia. Therefore, the search for effective international legal mechanisms, the reaction and influence of the main geopolitical players and the entire world community on the settlement of the conflict situation in the east of Ukraine, regarding the annexation of Crimea, actually determine the construction of a new international order. This once again actualizes the research topic. The purpose of the study is a historical and political analysis of the international order after the end of the “Cold War” through the prism of neorealist and neoliberal paradigms. Over the last decade, views on the issues of regulation of international relations have undergone significant changes, which is connected with the restructuring of the international system and the construction of a new international order. Large-scale and dynamic historical, cultural, political, economic, informational and technological changes have radically transformed the picture of the world and the entire system of international relations. Practice turned to theory, to the search for new criteria for interpretation and evaluation of events taking place. Thus, a conceptual discussion about the problem of regulation of international relations and the construction of a new international order took place. The

methodology of international order research is based on the synthesis of such basic approaches. According to the systemic approach, the international order is considered in close connection with the system of international relations, based on certain regularities of its functioning and development, interconnectedness and interdependence of its structural elements. The integrity of the world assumes that the political, economic, informational, humanitarian and legal order are interconnected elements of the international system. The basis of the structural-functional approach is the study of the international order through the prism of the performance of functions, and possibly dysfunctions, by the structural elements of the international system (actors of international relations), depending on their role and place in the international stratification system. In real politics, the states of the world follow the so-called unwritten rules of conduct, which are not codified, but their effectiveness stems from the structural and functional relations between the states. Supporters of this approach are representatives of both the realist / neorealist and liberal / neoliberal paradigms: R. Gilpin, R. Jervis, R. Cohen, G. Morgenthau, J. Nye, K. Waltz and others.

The institutional-normative approach expands the structural-functional approach and is based on the fact that the international order is a codified system of rules of conduct that all participants in international relations must follow and fulfill the obligations imposed on them by international institutions (Doroshko). Ukrainian scientist O.A. Koppel identifies three types of international order within this approach. The legal international order is based on the recognition that international relations are regulated by norms, procedures, institutions and structures of a supranational nature. Institutional international order is defined as such a system of international, interstate relations, which aims to ensure the basic needs of the country and other institutions, to create and maintain conditions for their existence, security and development. The transnational international order is characterized by the displacement of states from the arena of international relations by other actors. Well-known international scientists R. Cohen, J. Nye also emphasize international institutions as instruments of regulation, especially those that are institutions of interstate cooperation. Representatives of this approach are also J. Eikenberry, G. Clark, S. Krasner, T. Frank, P.A. Tsygankov and other scientists. In the author’s opinion, a synergistic approach that deepens the study of the processes of self-organization of the international system, reveals a deep connection between order and chaos, reversible and irreversible processes, randomness and necessity, linearity and nonlinearity, micro- and macro-levels is an addition to the above-mentioned approaches and is absolutely

necessary environment, makes significant additions and changes to the modern scientific picture of the world, to the reconstruction of the worldview and methodological foundations of the study of the international order. Non-linear effects of the evolution of systems of any type, crisis and bifurcation fall into the scope of the study, which becomes especially relevant in the study of the modern international order (Huntington, 1996).

From the point of view of synergy, it is impossible to impose development paths on complex, open, non-linear systems, which is the international system – only their self-organization is possible. It is quite common to think that order and chaos are not diametrically opposed, and there is no clear boundary between them. In any non-linear system, including an international one, chaos and order replace each other. The combination of order and chaos is not a unique feature of the current state of international relations, but is essentially their attribute throughout the history of development. According to some scientists, in the international system “the principles of self-organization prevail over the principles of organization, which is interpreted as the activity of organizing, structuring and managing systems”. At the same time, order and chaos exist in parallel. Order may prevail at the macro level, and chaos at the micro levels of the international system. It can be the other way around. Therefore, according to the researchers, “there is a synchronization of spatially separated processes”. The synergistic approach includes the use by researchers of specialized databases, methods of mathematical statistics, game theory and complex computer simulation models, which makes it possible to forecast the balance of forces in the international arena and the balance of interests of the main international actors and to determine the main trends of the modern international order. The study of international order is the subject of theoretical and conceptual debate between historians, political scientists, sociologists and internationalists (Kishchenko, 2016).

Despite the appearance in recent decades of scientific works by both Western and Ukrainian scientists devoted to the study of the international and world order, the problem requires further analysis. Ukrainian scientists study the international order through the prism of the structure of the international system, analyzing integration and globalization processes, foreign policy of states, etc. The problem of international order is relevant both in theoretical discourse and in practical terms. The analysis of theoretical works on this issue shows that international order has traditionally been interpreted in two main meanings: first, as an analogue of social order transferred to international relations, that is, the complete opposite of chaos and anarchy in them; secondly, as a set of

rules of behavior of the subjects of international relations, which they are forced to follow in view of the specifics of the existing international system⁶. The majority of authors are inclined to see the order as “the embodiment of a reasonable and restrictive beginning in the foreign policy of states and their mutual relations, associating with the function of such limitation strengthening the stability of the world system”. Scientists understand the international order as “the organization of interstate relations aimed at ensuring the needs of the main international actors, and the world order as the organization of international relations aimed at ensuring the hegemony of one of the actors”. The British researcher R. Cooper proposed several interpretations of the international order: first, this can be considered the prevailing type of foreign policy behavior of states, regardless of whether it serves to organize or disorganize the system; secondly, order can mean a certain form of system stability and integrity; thirdly, order can be understood as the rules that govern the system and maintain it in a state of stability, their moral content (Malskyi, 2011).

Regarding the theories of political neorealism (structural realism) and political neoliberalism (neoliberal institutionalism), they not only compete with each other, but also often borrow individual arguments from each other, there are more similarities than differences between them. Such a large number of trends that crystallized from the main paradigms is a confirmation of this and a continuation of the interparadigm debates that have been taking place in the theory of international relations since its inception. The Ukrainian scientist S.O. rightly notes. Shergin, that the paradigmatic orientation of the majority of American political scientists is being transformed in the direction of the post-classical version of realism and liberalism. They are motivated by numerous factors, first of all, the desire to be useful in terms of participation in the development and modification of the US “grand strategy” in the context of global transformations. How the international order and the transformation of the international system being interpreted by the representatives of these paradigms? Neorealism interprets the international order as the result of relations between large states, and the structural features of the international system do not depend on any efforts of small and medium-sized states. Therefore, the relations between large states and other (medium and small) states are not defined “as anarchic, but take on new forms that depend mainly on the will of the large states”. The rules of the game are determined by powerful actors, which is the vertical dimension of the international order according to S. Hoffmann (Maiboroda, 2015). At the same time, relations between equal actors are a horizontal dimension of the international order. We would like to add that

in the multipolar international system the maintenance of order is ensured through the mechanism of political balance; in bipolar, the main mechanism is the “balance of forces”. The author agrees with the opinion of scientist O.A. Koppel that “a realistic international order is based on the understanding that the basis of international relations is the protection of each state’s national interests. The anarchic nature of the international order is explained by the fact that each of the subjects forming this order pursues individual goals and interests”. The changes defining the main contours of the modern international order are connected both with historical events dating back to the second half of the 20th century, when the “balance of power” was the main principle of maintaining the stability of the international order, and the first decade of the 21st century, when the certain rules of the game in the relations between international actors in the post-bipolar period, when the “balance of forces” is replaced by the “balance of interests”. It is clear that the “balance of power” was effective in the international system, which had a clear hierarchical structure, which was based on the power potential of the most powerful states. However, with the emergence of a large number of non-state actors in world politics, the international system is becoming more and more complex and structured (Wallerstein).

J. Rosenau notes that two worlds coexist in the international system, one of them is dominated by states (the state-centric world), and in the other there are various, relatively equal actors (the polycentric world). Therefore, the international order depends not only on the state, but also on transnational and supranational actors, which correlates with neoliberalism. Scientists rightly note that as a result of the increase in the number of international actors and their interconnectedness, the very structure of the system of international relations is transformed, and the main principle becomes the “balance of interests”. According to the scientist, the Yalta-Potsdam order collapsed, and “the international system began to slide towards deregulation”. Practically all the countries that became independent after the destruction of the “Iron Curtain” made a choice in favor of changing the foreign policy course. Strategically, this had a stabilizing effect, but it gave an impetus to debalancing the international system, at least in the context of relations between the newly independent states. According to J. Rosenau, this is turbulence in world politics, but international processes are somehow determined by a certain order. Threats and challenges of a non-military nature are increasing, significant changes are taking place in the world economy, where interdependence has an increasing influence on politics. Integration processes, the globalization of the world,

the strengthening of the role of transnational actors, accompanied by the erosion of state sovereignty, the transparency of state borders, the blurring of borders between the internal and external policies of states, bring security issues, economic issues, the observance of human rights, the legitimacy / illegitimacy of authoritarian regimes to the fore. Such changes do not fit into the neorealist paradigm, so neoliberalism is gaining relevance, whose representatives agree that the state is not the only, and sometimes not the main, actor. It is increasingly available to transnational and industrial groups, non-governmental organizations, terrorist and criminal groups, professional associations and even individuals. Under such conditions, neoliberals increasingly emphasize the role of the state, but due to the development of cooperation, which increasingly distances their views from neorealism (Guberskyi, 2004).

Conclusions. Summarizing the achievements of the Political Science of International Relations in the context of the above paradigms, we note that the 1970s and 1980s were the period of its theoretical and conceptual maturity. At this time, it was formed as a set of specialized directions and schools, united in the object and cognitive goals of research. Epistemologically and ontologically, they are based on general philosophical and theoretical-methodological principles, but differ in a certain way in the matter of specific subjects and methods of research. Taking into account the epistemological complexity of the subject, the reasons for the significant differences in the views and researches of many political scientists on the nature and regularities of the development of modern international relations become clear.

The next period in the development of this discipline, which began with the establishment of the globalist paradigm in it, in particular in the American science of international relations, is characterized by a much greater praxeological focus. This does not at all mean the end of paradigmatic discussions and the cessation of scientific research within the framework of the theory and political science of international relations in the United States or other countries of the world. The degree of risk of scientific theorizing in the field of international relations is always high, but absolutely justified, taking into account the practical importance of the systematic analysis of modern global processes and transformations.

It is likely that metatheoretical paradigms will be decisive for the next stage of the development of these related but autonomous scientific disciplines – those that go beyond the generally recognized boundaries and are formed on fundamentally different bases in the conditions of scientific revolutions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бжезінський, З. Україна у геостратегічному контексті. Київ: Києво-Могилянська Академія, 2006. 96 с.
2. Дорощко М. С. Вплив політики «перезавантаження» відносин США з Російською Федерацією на переструктурування пострадянського геополітичного простору. *Проблеми міжнародних відносин: Зб. наук. пр.* Київ: КиМУ, 2010. 108–119 с.
3. Герасимчук, Т.Ф. Концепція міжнародних режимів у теорії міжнародних відносин. Міжнародні зв'язки України: наукові пошуки і знахідки – Міжнародні відносини України: наукові пошуки та знахідки. За ред. С.В. Віднянського. Київ: 2010. 319–323 с.
4. Герасимчук, Т.Ф. Проблеми війни та миру в теорії демократичного миру. Київ: Вісник дипломатичної академії. Збірник наукових праць, 2010. вип. 16, 177–186 с.
5. Губерський, Л.В. Українська дипломатична енциклопедія. Київ: Знання України, 2004. 69–73 с.
6. Huntington, S. P. The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*. May–June 1993.
7. Huntington, S. P. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order. New York: 1996.
8. Wallerstein I. The Geopolitics of Ukraine's Schism, Common Dreams, 2014. URL <http://www.commondreams.org/views/2014/02/15/geopolitics-ukraines-schism>.
9. Кіщенко Н., Бабій С. Лінгвокогнітивний та лінгвокультурологічний підходи до метафоричного розуміння культурного концепту «Мудрість». *Інтелектуальний архів*. Конкорд, Онтаріо, Канада: Shiny World Corp. 2016. 38–47 с.
10. Кіщенко Н. Вербалізація концепту WISDOM/МУДРІСТЬ у дискурсі англomовної авторської казки. Київ: КНЛУ. 2017. 189 с.
11. Кіщенко Н. Моделі художньо-образних метафор мудрості в англійських казках. Київ: Науковий часопис НПУ ім. М.П. Драгоманова. 2019. 87–94 с.
12. Киридон А.М., Троян С.С. Російсько-грузинський конфлікт 2008 року: історико-політологічний аналіз. Київ-Рівне: РІС КСУ. 2009.
13. Майборода О.М. Етнічність у міжнародній системі. Київ: ІПіЕД ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України. 2015. 15 с.
14. Мальский, М.З. Теорія міжнародних відносин: підручник. Київ: Знання. 2011. 104 с.

REFERENCES

1. Brzezinski, Zb. (2006). *Ukraine in geostrategic context*. [Ukraine in geostrategic context]. Kyiv: Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia [in Ukrainian].
2. Doroshko, M.S. (2010). Vplyv polityky Perezavantazhennia vidnosyn USA z Rosiiskoiu Federatsiieiu na perestrukturuвання postradianskogo heopolitychnogo prostoru [The impact of the policy of resetting US relations with the Russian Federation on the restructuring of the post-Soviet geopolitical space] *Problemy mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn: Zb. nauk. pr.* Kyiv: KyMU. Vyp. 1. S. 108–119. [in Ukrainian].
3. Gerasymchuk, T.F. (2010). Kontseptsiiia mizhnarodnykh rezhymiv u teorii mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn. Mizhnarodni zviazky Ukrainy: naukovy poshuky i znakhidky – International Relations of Ukraine: scientific searches and findings. [The concept of international regimes in the theory of international relations. International relations of Ukraine: scientific research and findings]. S.V. Vidnyanskyj (Ed.), 19, 319–323 [in Ukrainian].
4. Gerasymchuk, T.F. (2010). Problemy vijny ta myru v teorii demokratychnogo myru. [Problems of war and peace in the theory of democratic peace.]. *Visnyk dyplomatychnoi akademii. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, 16, 177–186 [in Ukrainian].
5. Guberskyi, L.V. (Ed.). (2004). *Ukrainska dyplomatychna entsyklopediia*. [Ukrainian diplomatic encyclopedia]. (Vols. 1–2). Kyiv: Znannia Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].
6. Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*. May–June
7. Huntington, S. P. (1996). The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order. New York
8. Wallerstein I. The Geopolitics of Ukraine's Schism Published on Saturday, February 15, 2014 by Common Dreams. URL <http://www.commondreams.org/views/2014/02/15/geopolitics-ukraines-schism> (Last accessed: 03.02.24)
9. Kishchenko N. & S. Babii (2016) Lihvokohnyvnyi ta lihvokulturolohichnyi pidkhody do metaforychnoho rozuminnia kulturnoho kontseptu «Mudrist» [Linguo-Cognitive and Linguo-Cultural Approaches to Metaphorical Understanding of Cultural Concept “Wisdom”]. *Intellectual Archive*. Concord, Ontario, Canada : Shiny World Corp., September/October. Vol. 5, No. 5. P. 38–47. [in Ukrainian]
10. Kishchenko, N.D. (2017) Verbalizatsiya kontseptu WISDOM/MUDRIST' u diskursi anglomovnoyi avtorskoyi kazky [Verbalization of the WISDOM/WISDOM concept in the discourse of an English-language author's fairy tale]: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.04 / KNLU. Kyiv, 2017. 189 s. [in Ukrainian]
11. Kishchenko, N. (2019). Modeli khudozhno-obraznykh metafor mudrosti v anhliiskykh kazkakh [Models of Artistic-Figurative Metaphors of Wisdom in English Fairy Tales]. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University*. 2019, № 9. P. 87–94. [in Ukrainian]
12. Kyrydon, A.M., & Troian, S.S. (2009). Rosiisko-gruzynskiy konflikt serpnia 2008 roku: istoryko-politolohichnyi analiz. [Russian-Georgian conflict of August 2008: historical and political analysis.] Kyiv–Rivne: RIS KСУ [in Ukrainian].
13. Maiboroda, O.M. (2015). Etnichnist u mizhnarodnii systemi. [Ethnicity in the international system] Kyiv: ІПіЕД ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України [in Ukrainian].
14. Malskyi, M.Z. (2011). *Teoriia mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn: pidruchnyk*. [Theory of international relations: textbook] Kyiv: Znannia [in Ukrainian].