

## УДК 316.74

**Современные геополитические трансформации как фактор актуализации проблемы идентичности в странах Евразийского региона****О.М. Шевченко***Южный федеральный университет, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Россия*

**Аннотация.** В статье рассматривается специфика современных геополитических трансформаций, которые оказывают серьезное влияние на место и роль национального государства в системе международных отношений. Авторы отмечают, что появление различных надгосударственных и наднациональных организаций, координирующих экономическую и политическую деятельность в современном мире, существенно снизило статус национального государства как ключевого субъекта международных отношений.

**Ключевые слова:** геополитические трансформации, национальное государство, государственный суверенитет, национальная идентичность, глобализация, регионализация.

**Для цитирования:** Шевченко О.М. Современные геополитические трансформации как фактор актуализации проблемы идентичности в странах Евразийского региона // Caucasian Science Bridge. 2019. Т. 3, №2. С. 10-15.

**Current geopolitical transformation as a factor identity in mainstreaming in Eurasia****Olga M. Shevchenko***Sothern Federal University, Rostov on Don, Russia*

**Abstract.** The article deals with the specifics of modern geopolitical transformations that have a serious impact on the place and role of the nation state in the international system. The authors note that the emergence of various supranational and supranational organizations coordinating the economic and political activities in the modern world, has reduced the status of the nation-state as the key actor in international relations.

**Key words:** geopolitical transformations, the national state sovereignty, national identity, globalization, regionalization.

**For citation:** Shevchenko O.M. Modern geopolitical transformations as a factor in the actualization of the problem of identity in the countries of the Eurasian region // Caucasian Science Bridge. 2019. Vol. 3. №2. P. 10-15.

The current global transformations are radically converting the modern world order, including having a serious impact on the place and role of the national state. Having had the status of a key subject of international relations since the peace of Westphalia, the nation-state has now so weakened its position that it is now common to speak of its crisis.

The present state of being leads to the fact that the role of the national state in the conditions of globalization becomes a relevant topic in the scientific discourse.

A number of authors (A. Melucci, G. H. von Vrigt, R. Folk, S. Strange, R. Cooper) believe that the national state is leaving the historical arena, because it has completely outlived itself. It's place should be taken the supranational power and entities. The growing

influence of supranational ("planetary") organizations " ... has the consequence of both the accelerated exclusion of weak regions, and the creation of new channels for the allocation of resources ... removed ... from the control of various national States" (Бауман, 2002).

Answering the question about the prospects of the national state in the new world order, J. Rosenau and E. Giddens take a more moderate position. They deny the hyperglobalistic rhetoric of the historical end's onset of the nation-state as an institution, believing that the state is not only able to continue to defend its interests limited by territorial barriers, but also to influence the geopolitical situation as a whole, including through military force. According to J. Rosenau and E. Giddens, state sovereignty

today is not so much a territorially designated border as the source and resource of upholding rights and privileges within the framework of a common political system connected by complex transnational networks of states" (Гуддеш, 2004).

Of course, the globalization process has a significant impact on the role of the nation state in the system of international relations. The decline in the status of a national state became possible due to the emergence of various supranational organizations coordinating economic and political activities in the modern world. The emergence of new governance mechanisms leads to the fact that states and peoples are increasingly subordinated to the new global or regional authorities.

At the end of the XX and beginning of the XXI centuries, the problem of the sovereignty of the nation state and its independence in resolving issues of domestic and foreign policy sharply intensified. The modern understanding of sovereignty includes the idea of certain obligations of the state arising from the norms of international law, which entails the accountability of this subject of international relations to the world community. On the one hand, the possibility of state intervention in the internal affairs of other countries is recognized, on the other, the right of the state to control its own territory is called into question.

In the modern world, the scale of power interference in the internal affairs of nation states is objectively increasing. As a result, the exercise of power by authorities on one continent can have significant consequences for peoples on other continents. In fact, an increase in the extent of power relations means that power centers and the very exercise of power are increasingly moving away from areas experiencing their consequences. However, access to power centers is not provided for everyone: "... the political and economic elites of the world's major metropolises are much more integrated into global structures and have more control over them than the farmers of Burundi, who

are concerned with the problem of survival" (Хелд, 2011).

Restriction of sovereignty does not really apply to all states. States with sufficient economic, military, and technological potential — primarily the United States, as well as a number of states in Western Europe and Southeast Asia — do not allow their sovereignty to be eroded. Those who do not have such potential, while remaining formally sovereign, actually lose some of their real sovereignty.

Thus, globalization becomes a "tool for establishing a "new world order" by members of the "global club"" (Костина, 2009). It is based on the forced distribution by Western countries, led by the United States, of the neoliberal socio-economic model. The decrease in the role of the nation-state in world processes is due to the inability of a number of national political institutions to resist the spread of this model. The formation of new economic and political-economic unions, regional and international organizations, such as the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the European Union, the World Trade Organization (WTO), etc., is a reflection of the global globalization trend. Being the structural elements of the global system, they are aimed at improving the management efficiency of both the world community as a whole and its individual parts, but at the same time they are not without certain contradictions. Their source: the presence of national, corporate, and clan interests that cannot be overcome in the modern system of relations.

In the context of global transformations taking place in the world, the economic sphere is becoming more and more politicized, since in achieving political goals, more and more often, not military, but, at first glance, peaceful, economic levers are used. According to Schmitt, the political sphere as a mechanism for dividing into "groups of friends and enemies" permeates the economic sphere of social life. Since economic differences acquire a political status,

the concept of "economic power position" arises. Its essence is that "... economically funded imperialism .... will try to introduce a condition on Earth in which he will be able to freely apply his economic means of power: an embargo on loans, an embargo on raw materials, the destruction of foreign currency, etc." (*Шмумм*, 1992).

Modern geopolitical transformations are fundamentally changing the alignment of political forces on the world stage. States can no longer be considered as purely "discrete worlds," because they are somehow integrated into complex global and regional structures. Despite the objectively existing inequality and hierarchy, even the most powerful states are affected by both globalization and regionalization.

The regionalization process deserves special attention, which intensified in connection with the emergence of regional centers of influence. According to A. Karimova, "... the semantic conjugation of the region with the distribution of power puts it at the center of political transformations" (*Каримова*, 2006).

The processes of regionalization are predominantly the counter-tendency of globalization, but they can also strengthen the latter. Regionalization contributes to the emergence of dividing lines between regional groupings of states; the separation of profitable and non-profitable zones that do not coincide with the geographical borders of nation-states; autonomy; the revival of traditionalism; localization fragmentation and fragnegration.

Each of the above factors leads to certain consequences. Thus, the emergence of dividing lines between regional groupings of states allows them to strengthen their positions in a globalizing world. As a result of the separation of profitable and nonprofit zones that do not coincide with the geographical borders of national states, more and more power is transferred to the authorities of trans- and subnational regions, which become the "building material" of a new political map of the world in the interests of global corporations. Autonomization involves the

revival of religious, ethnic, national centers for the consolidation of communities within countries, regions, civilizations. Traditionalism contributes to the revival of archaic and nationalism. Through localization, ethnic and civilizational entities that pursue a policy of cultural autonomy are consolidated. The latter contributes to the preservation of various cultural areas with their particularistic value systems (tribalism, fundamentalism, nationalism, socialism, communism, etc.). Fragmentation of the world demonstrates the split and clash of interests of various international communities due to their national and cultural differentiation. Finally, fragmentation (a combination of integration and fragmentation processes) contributes to the formation of blocs and unions of nation-states in the form of complex hierarchical systems that will lead the struggle for decreasing world resources. In this context, the combination of the processes of globalization and European integration – regionalization – is a very interesting and ambiguous construction. If, in economic terms, European integration is a natural phenomenon of globalization, then politically, European integration is, in a certain sense, a response to the challenges of globalization, an attempt to integrate the economic potential of European countries and contrast European political unity with the growing power of American pressure. This is noted by many analysts. In particular, J. Chiesa writes: "American interests are strongly opposed to European ones ... in addition, the United States, which has been placed by history at the head of the entire world, instead of ruling the planet, is all more openly concerned with its own interests" (*Кьеза*, 2010).

Global transformations have a mixed effect on national identity. On the one hand, the process of erosion of national identity is obvious, which is manifested in the weakening of the role of nation states in world politics as a result of increased influence of supranational political and transnational economic institutions. Supranational and transnational institutions in one way or another undermine the national and cultural con-

texts of states that are irreplaceable for the majority by global self-determination. On the other hand, vigorous steps are being taken to develop and strengthen national identity, which, depending on the context, can be filled with both ethnic and even tribalist characteristics, and express citizenship (state) affiliation. Scientists who have gained special fame for their works on Nations and nationalism (B. Anderson, E. Gellner, E. Smith, etc.) believe that the national state in the modern world system will retain its significance. While acknowledging the convergence of Nations in the course of globalization, they deny that this trend contributes to the formation of people's indifference to the problems of their national life. This is confirmed by the growing importance of national identity. In the context of global unification, it performs a number of extremely important functions for the nation: integrative, normative, cognitive, adaptive, ideological, and spiritual-psychological.

Actualization of the problem of identity in such a situation is quite natural, since identity, first of all national, is one of the ways of self-determination in this world, finding meaning for the present and future of one's country. So S. Huntington believes that Iran, South Africa and Taiwan are characterized by a search, and in some cases, a revision of national identity. Modern China faces the challenge of turning a civilizational identity into a national identity. If an identity crisis occurs in some countries, discussions are sparked on this issue. Turkey and Russia are facing a similar dilemma today. So, according to N. Fedotova, our country continues to search for an answer to the question of its origins, and, as a result, identification with the Western or Eurasian world (Fedotova, 2006). The question of national identity is potentially facing European countries that have faced mass migration from Africa and the Middle East. Finally, countries whose sociocultural code is far from Western liberalism and individualism are beginning to worry about their own identity. "The crisis of national identity, summarizes the problem S. Huntington, has become a global phenome-

non" (Хантингтон, 2008). With regard to the actualization of the "national issue", in our opinion, it is closely related to the processes of adaptation of society to new social challenges. Since global transformations, as noted earlier, lead to a crisis of the nation state, such a form of self-identification as national identity is objectively subjected to a serious test. The formation of national identity is associated with the New Age. This form of identity has replaced the more archaic ethnic and ethno-religious forms. The key factor underlying the formation of the new identity was the economic interests of the European bourgeoisie. According to L. Greenfeld, nationalism as an ideology was originally associated with the protectionism of its economy (Greenfeld, 1992).

The European modernization of the New Age, which was based on the needs of rapidly developing capitalism, was a complex of interrelated socio-economic and political changes. This inevitably entailed the formation of the idea of national identity, in which the cultural and political identities merged (Fedotova, 2006).

Despite the objectively existing economic prerequisites for the formation of a nation, its final formation as a cultural and political community was preceded by the emergence of a nation state. The reason was that only the state was able to formalize and successfully impose on the folk, originally consisting of various ethnic groups, the whole range of national standards: cultural, linguistic, ethical, economic, economic, civil. Ideally, a nation is a folk whose territory and culture are a differentiating marker of identity, since the external borders of the state are made internal borders in the minds of citizens граждан (Балибар, 2003).

In connection with the foregoing, it is difficult to disagree with those who claim that nations are not formed or self-organized, but are built by the state with the help of a national idea (Геллнер, 2002).

Since in the modern world the national state is in a crisis situation, counter-tendencies arise, associated with a return to

more archaic than national forms of identity - ethnic and religious.

The most striking and at the same time tragic example of the actualization of ethnic identity was the events in Yugoslavia, which entailed not only internecine wars and bloody ethnic cleansing undertaken by Serbs, Croats and Kosovo Albanians, but also the collapse of the state, which caused global destabilization. For many decades, Kurdish ethnic self-identification has threatened the integrity of Turkey, accompanied by permanent hostilities. Ethnic self-identification has given particular urgency to the Georgian conflict, which entailed the actual separation of Abkhazia and South Ossetia from Georgia.

Appealing to ethnic identity in modern Europe is becoming the ideological foundation of movements for the sovereignty of the Catalans and Basques in Spain, the Scots in the UK, etc.

The revival of religious identity in a globalizing world is primarily associated with Islamic fundamentalism. If the terrorist attacks of al-Qaeda were aimed at sowing panic among the population and showing the vulnerability of even such a powerful state as the United States, the actions of the Taliban and ISIL movements to create an Islamic Caliphate on the territory of sovereign Afghanistan, Iran and Syria undermine the very idea of a secular national state and national identity.

As for the actualization of the national form of identity, in our opinion, it is most pronounced among the Eurasian countries in modern Russia. First, the ideological form of identity (the Soviet people) that personifies the idea of building communism has sunk into Oblivion along with the Soviet Union. Secondly, the collapse of the USSR as a great power was a blow to the sense of national pride of the country's population. Thirdly, the separatist movements that intensified after the collapse of the USSR, under the conditions of the objectively existing multi-confessionality and multi-ethnicity, threatened to lead to disintegration within Russia itself. The reason was that the principle of administrative-territorial division both

in the USSR and in Russia de jure was based on the principle of national autonomy. In addition, the experience of Yugoslavia testified to the possibility of the collapse of Russia under the influence of centrifugal trends associated with the ethnic factor. Events such as the Chechen war, the intensification of Islamic fundamentalism in Dagestan, as well as Tatarstan's earlier attempts to secede from the Russian Federation, contributed to a number of state initiatives to form a national Russian identity at a new stage in the country's historical development.

The political leadership of the Russian Federation attempts, firstly, to revive the sense of national pride, appealing to the country's historical past, the large-scale achievements and victories of the Russian Empire and the USSR. Secondly, to actualize the feeling of national exceptionalism, cultivating in the minds of Russians the idea of a fundamentally different and autonomous value-worldview attitude towards the West. Thirdly, to reanimate the messianic ideas characteristic of the Russian mentality, which is reflected in military and economic assistance to those peoples and states in respect of which the principle of justice is violated. The most controversial are the attempts of the Russian state to unite the nation on a confessional (Orthodox) basis, since Christianity is a traditional religion only for a part of the country's population. In the context of the foregoing, the author notes: in a globalizing world, both cosmopolitan, essentially entropic, and local, and even tribalistic, value-world outlooks and, as a result, methods of self-identification prevail. The revival of national identity as a symbiosis of civil, cultural and territorial unity is constructive in modern conditions. The national form of identity indirectly contributes to the preservation of the main legitimate unit of international relations - the national state, and ultimately acts as a guarantor of stability on a global scale.

#### **Литература**

1. Балибар Э. Нация как форма: история и идеология // Балибар Э., Валлерстайн И. Раса, нация, класс. Двусмысленные идентичности. – М.: Логос – Альтера, Ессе Номо, 2003. – С. 103-122.

2. Бауман З. Национальное государство – что дальше? // –Отечественные записки. – 2002. – № 6. – С. 31-57

3. Геллнер Э. Пришествие национализма. Мифы нации и класса // Нации и национализм / Б. Андерсон, О. Бауэр, М. Хрох и др. – М.: Практикс, 2002. – 416 с.

4. Гидденс Э. Постмодерн // Философия истории: Антология. – М.: Аспект Пресс, 1995. – С. 340-348.

5. Каримова А.Б. Регионы в современном мире // Социологические исследования. – 2006. – № 5. – С.32-41.

6. Костина А.В. Кризис современной идентичности и доминирующие стратегии идентификации в границах этноса, нации, массы // Знание. Понимание. Умение. – 2009. – №4. – С. 167-175.

7. Кьеца Дж. Война империй: Восток-Запад. Раздел сфер влияния. – М.: Эксмо. 2006. – 320 с.

8. Малахов В.С. Национализм как политическая идеология. – М.: КДУ, 2010. – 318 с.

9. Федотова Н.Н. Мультикультурализм и политика развития // Журнал социологии и социальной антропологии. – 2006. – Т. 9. – № 3. – С.75- 92.

10.Хантингтон С. Кто мы?: Вызовы американской национальной идентичности. – М.: Издательская группа АСТ, 2008. – 640 с.

11.Хелд Д. Глобальные трансформации: Политика, экономика, культура. – М.: Практикс, 2004. – 576 с.

12. Шмитт К. Понятие политического // Вопросы социологии. – 1992. – № 1. – С. 37-67.

13. Greenfeld Liah. Nationalism: Five Roads to modernity / L. Greenfeld. – Cambridge, 1992. – 581p.

#### References

1. Balibar E. (2003). Natsiya kak forma: istoriya i ideologiya [Nation as a form: history and ideology]. In Balibar E., Wallerstein I. Rasa, natsiya, klass. Dvumyslennyye identichnosti [Race, nation, class. Ambiguous identities]. – М.: Logos - Altera, Ecce Homo.

2. Bauman Z. (2002). Natsional'noye gosudarstvo – chto dal'she? [The national state - what

next?]. Otechestvennyye zapiski [Domestic notes], 6, 31-57. (in Russian).

3. Chiesa J. (2006). Voyna imperiy: Vostok-Zapad. Razdel sfer vliyaniya [War of Empires: East-West. Section of spheres of influence]. М.: Eksmo. 320 p.

4. Fedotova N.N. (2006). Mul'tikul'turalizm i politika razvitiya [Multiculturalism and development policy]. Zhurnal sotsiologii i sotsial'noy antropologii Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology, 3, 75-92.

5. Gellner E. (2002). Prishestviye natsionalizma. Mify natsii i klassa [The coming of nationalism. Myths of the nation and class]. In B. Anderson, O. Bauer, M. Hroh and others. Natsii i natsionalizm [Nation and nationalism]. М.: Praxis. 416 p.

6. Giddens E. (1995). Postmodern [Postmodern]. In Filosofiya istorii: Antologiya [Philosophy of History: Anthology]. М.: Aspect Press, 340-348.

7. Greenfeld Liah (1992). Prishestviye natsionalizma. Mify natsii i klassa [Nationalism: Five Roads to modernity]. L.: Cambridge, 1992. 581p.

8. Held D. (2004). Global'nyye transformatsii: Politika, ekonomika, kul'tura [Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, Culture]. М.: Praxis. 576 p.

9. Huntington S. (2008). Kto my?: Vyzovy amerikanskoy natsional'noy identichnosti [Who are we? Challenges of American National Identity]. М.: AST Publishing Group. 640 p.

10. Karimova A.B. (2006). Regiony v sovremennom mire [Regions in the modern world]. Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya [Sociological studies], 5, 32-41.

11. Kostina A.V. (2009). Krizis sovremennoy identichnosti i dominiruyushchiye strategii identifikatsii v granitsakh etnosa, natsii, massy [The crisis of modern identity and the dominant identification strategies within the boundaries of an ethnic group, nation, mass]. Znaniye. Ponimaniye. Umeniye [Knowledge. Understanding. Skill], 4, 167-175.

12. Malakhov V.S. (2010). Natsionalizm kak politicheskaya ideologiya [Nationalism as a political ideology]. М.: КДУ. 318 p.

13. Schmitt K. (1992). Ponyatiye politicheskogo [The concept of political]. Voprosy sotsiologii [Questions of sociology], 1, 37-67.

#### ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ / INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

**Шевченко Ольга Михайловна**

Профессор, доктор философских наук, доцент кафедры конфликтологии и национальной безопасности, Институт социологии и регионоведения Южный федеральный университет  
E-mail: olgashv2007@yandex.ru

**Поступила в редакцию 7 апреля 2019 г.**

**УДК 316.74**

**Shevchenko Olga Mikhaylovna**

Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Conflictology and National security, Institute of Sociology and Regional Studies  
Southern Federal University  
E-mail: olgashv2007@yandex.ru