TÍTULO: El papel del enfoque pragmático en el desarrollo de sistemas de seguridad multinivel.

AUTOR:

1. Ph.D. Igor Makaruk.

RESUMEN: Las amenazas y desafíos actuales que enfrenta el sistema de relaciones internacionales en el primer cuarto del siglo XXI están impulsando a la comunidad mundial a buscar nuevos enfoques para crear un sistema seguro de coexistencia. El estudio emplea una transición de una situación problemática del mundo real (la crisis Ucraniana-Rusa, que ha pasado a la fase de guerra híbrida) al desarrollo teórico de la resolución de conflictos. Los hallazgos del documento se acercan al efecto deseado debido a un análisis en profundidad del origen de la situación de crisis, transformándolo en una confrontación directa entre los dos estados. En el estudio argumentamos que establecer un sistema de seguridad multinivel para las relaciones internacionales hará que la creación de situaciones de conflicto sea imposible en los próximos años.

PALABRAS CLAVES: Conflicto ucraniano-ruso, sistema bipolar, democratización, relaciones internacionales, enfoque pragmático.

TITLE: The role of pragmatic approach in the multi-level security system development.

AUTHOR:

1. Ph.D. Igor Makaruk.

ABSTRACT: The current threats and challenges facing the system of international relations in the first quarter of the 21st century are prompting the world community to seek new approaches to create a secure system of coexistence. The study employs a transition from a problematic real-world situation (Ukrainian-Russian crisis, which has moved into the phase of hybrid warfare) to the theoretical development of conflict resolution. The paper findings have come close to the intended effect due to an in-depth analysis of the crisis situation origin, transforming it into a direct confrontation between the two states. In the study we argue that establishing a multi-level security system for international relations will render the creation of the conflict situations impossible in years to come.

KEY WORDS: Ukrainian-Russian conflict, bipolar system, democratization, international relations, pragmatic approach.

INTRODUCTION.

> Ukraine, however, is a cleft country with two distinct cultures.
> The civilizational fault line between the West and Orthodoxy runs
> through its heart and has done so for centuries.
> Samuel P. Huntington.

The phenomenon of democracy has undergone a complex and long evolutionary process, finally facing the unexpected challenges of globalization in the twenty-first century, which have been increasingly articulated in the context of the systemic crisis of capitalism and liberalism during the period of 2000–2019[1].

---

[1] **For more detailed treatments, the reader may consult Volodymyr Zinchenko, "Modern Global World System and Liberal Model Crisis" ["Sučasna hlobalʹna svitova sytema i kryza liberalʹnoji modeli"] Gumanitarniy visnik Zaporizhkoi derzhavnoi inzhenernoi akademii 41 (2010): 161–168. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/znpgvzdia_2010_41_15**

The dynamic process of civilizational transformation and the emergence of a number of authoritarian states as economic leaders have necessitated the search for a new paradigm that could be consistent with the imperatives of development.

The cardinal changes that have been underway to a different extent concern all major spheres of life, and in particular, the modern system of international relations, the development trend of which is increasingly determined by the inversion of their pragmatization, i.e. the search for effective mechanisms for the establishment of the leading-edge principles of international cooperation founded on democratic values[2]. Its traditional role of laying foundation for social relations in nation-states increasingly requires extrapolation to the international system of both bilateral and multilateral relations.

The impulsive cause of civilizational development; therefore, it is, first of all, the improvement of the international relations system targeted at the maximum use of the fundamental democratic principles. In other words, it is possible to talk about the appropriate modernization of the democracy phenomenon, which, in turn, can become the ground for qualitatively new principles of democracy[3]. The obvious process of the international relations system pragmatization, capable of resolving a number of traditional differences and contradictions between the main political actors, cannot find stability and takes place in a minimum conflict environment without democratization of the international system. And that is impossible when maintaining inequality between states of different regions and statuses in the development, adoption and implementation of solutions relating to common interests.

---

[2] **Humanitarno-naukove znannja: komunikatyvni zasady. Materialy Mižnarodnoji naukovoji konferenciji 6-7 žovtnja 2017 r. – Chernivtsi: Chernivetskyi nats. u-tet, 2017: 463.**
[3] **Oleksandr Pukhkal. "Modernization of Political System of Ukraine: State-Administrative Measuring". ["Modernizacija polityčnoji systemy Ukrajiny: deržavno-upravlins′kyj vymir"] Public Administration and Local Government (2010), accessed April 20, 2019 http://www.dridu.dp.ua/vidavnictvo/2010/2010_03(6)/10pogduv.pdf.**

Setting of the international relations system pragmatization problem in the context of democratization development is kept current by the realities of the globalization dynamic process followed by numerous unpredictable conflicts and crisis phenomena, which gives grounds to speak about the end of history and even the world itself to some scholars. According to the theory of synergetics, we are talking, to all intents and purposes, about the newest, and therefore unknown, phase of social development[4]. It should be recognized that traditional conceptual approaches to gauge this phenomenon are ineffective. Thus, our study is also being updated with the necessity to rethink existing approaches to explaining the topic under consideration, and then to lay out an approach that would allow for a more detailed and objective explanation of the problem. After all, at this level in the context of the study, we cannot overlook the war that has broken up in Central and Eastern Europe, which is by all accounts a civilizational war within the framework of the Orthodox civilization[5].

DEVELOPMENT.

Research methodology.

On the one hand, the phenomenon of democracy as a whole is the subject of a great deal of studies both by domestic and foreign authors, who are currently premised on different conceptual approaches to this phenomenon estimate. On the other hand, there is a lack of scientific research results on the topic of democratization development against the backdrop of the international relations system pragmatization which has complicated the author's conceptual positioning.

The subject matter under study is raised to a greater or lesser extent in the works of the leading Ukrainian scholars, namely Igor Tsependa, Igor Todorov, Sergiy Fedunyak, Viktor Hura, Yevhen

---

[4] **Synergetics is an interdisciplinary science dealing with the study of the processes of self-organization and origin, stabilization and disruption of different nature structures (systems) on the basis of mathematical physics methods ("formal technologies"). The synergetic approach is also applied in the study of such a complex and unstructured system as the network information space.**

[5] **Ivan Hvat. "East Slavic Orthodox civilization. What Benefits Await Ukraine?" ["Sxidnoslovjansʹka pravoslavna cyvilizacija. Jaki ž blaha čekajutʹ na Ukrajinu?"] https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/25110478.html**

Kaminskyi, Borys Kantseliaruk, Andriy Kudriachenko, Serhiy Sherhin, Ihor Khyzhniak, Yuriy Skorokhod, Iryna Onyshchenko, Oleksandr Potiekhin, Yuriy Pavlenko, Leonid Leshchenko, and Olga Zernetska. Among the foreign experts, who have studied this topic, the lead is taken by such scholars as Marek Petras, Anthony Giddens, Roland Robertson, Jean Baechler, Robert Alan Dahl, Karl Popper, John Keen, Arend d'Angremond Lijphart, Juan José Linz, Seymour Martin Lipset, Guillermo O'Donnell, Klaus Offe, Adam Przeworski, Walt Whitman Rostow, Giovanni Sartori, Samuel Phillips Huntington.

In modern literature there are many academic works on the study of the problem of crisis democracy, the transformation of its processes in the globalized age and blurring of the international relations system early in the 21st century, its function in the provision of socio-economic and political transformations, the features of societies political civility, but the scholars of the current international realm do not always use the concepts that allow applying the advances of modern socio-political thought at a sufficient level of consistency in the context of the transformation of democratization processes, which take a quantum leap in their formation; therefore, there is a demand for special scholarly inquiry into this topical issue.

The study presents the author's research hypothesis and attempts to justify the constructivism of the democratization role function in the climate of pragmatization of the modern international relations system.

The author's systematic approach to the coverage of the topic implies its holistic perception: the basis is the democratization development in general, and the components are international intercourse, pragmatization of international relations, democratic world as a factor of development, democratic determinants within the context of modern globalization transformations. This made it possible to study the problem against the backdrop of close interaction of its determining factors; therefore, to significantly expand the intelligible field of the author, which, in turn, had a positive impact on the

degree of cognitiveness, and finally, on the conditions of scientific certainty. In a loose sense, this has also led to the necessity to trace the correlation between the evolution of the democratic paradigm and the new paradigm of the international relations system pragmatization.

The conceptual dimension of the problem of the international relations pragmatization suggests that it is possible to talk mainly about the study of its individual (autonomous) aspects, and this indicates a simplistic approach[6]. The phenomenon of pragmatization, for one part, is understood as such which is conditioned by the processes of globalization solely, and for the other part – as a sign of a radical transformation of the system of international relations[7]. Proponents of these approaches surely have certain soundness, but we believe, this socio-political phenomenon estimate should be grounded primarily on its regularity, synergism and close interdependence with civilizational processes. Legitimate cognition of this phenomenon, among other things (as already mentioned), will provide an opportunity to objectively accept the numerous challenges of our time (various conflicts, extreme opposition to democracy and responses, crises, international terrorism, etc.), and then to search for effective mechanisms of both prevention and confrontation with them. It is the state of foreign affairs which is marked by the level of their pragmatization that is the key to successful resolution of these problems, since they have got an international dimension.

The multidimensional approach to the study of such an essential factor of the development process as pragmatization of the external relations system implies that now it is necessary to proceed from the fundamental concept of nonlinear theory – fluctuations[8].

---

[6] **Katarzyna Kącka, ed., Stosunki międzynarodowe. Wokół zagadnień teoretycznych [International relations. On theoretical issues] (Toruń: Drukarnia Wydawnictwa Naukowego UMK, 2014).**
https://repozytorium.umk.pl/bitstream/handle/item/2871/stosunki-m-2014m.pdf?sequence=1
[7] **Constant changes, oscillations in complex systems, i.e. transition from one state to another.**
[8] **Igor Makaruk. "Democratic Developments in the Context of Crowing Pragmatism in International Relations (conceptual dimension)" ["Demokratyzacijnyj rozvytok v umovax pragmatyzacii systemy mižnarodnyx vidnosyn (konceptualnyj vymir)"] (PhD diss. abstract, Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Kyiv, 2010), 21.**

It is thus referred to a complex form of social progress – the evolutionary-undulating one[9]. It is worth noting that, given the concept of fluctuations, the pragmatization of the existing system of international intercourse serves as one of its factors, which can be considered in the spatial and temporal dimension with specific forms of manifestation, interdependence and impact on the environment.

Results of the study.

The global society has entered a fresh period of development, i.e. the phase of a new system of foreign relations development, which could respond to the latest challenges of our time. Scholars and analysts agree that "the process of formation and the new system of international relations build-up is in its infancy".[10] System analysis of the situation under consideration reveals that the abovementioned 'phase of development' as a substance has emerged in the setting of a complex transition period of fundamental changes in the civilization dimension.

On January 15, 2015, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted the Resolution on the "Appeal of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to the United Nations, the European Parliament, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the Parliamentary Assembly of OSCE, the Parliamentary Assembly of GUAM, and the Parliaments of the world on recognition of the Russian Federation as an aggressor state".

That important documentary statement to the global society notes that "Ukraine remains an object of military aggression by the Russian Federation, which it carries out through support and provision of large-scale terrorist attacks... Taking into account the norms of the UN Charter and the United Nations

---

[9] **Igor Makaruk. "Waves of Democratization in the Context of Modern International Relations". ["Demokratyzacijni xvyli, v konteksti sučasnyx mižnarodnyx vidnosyn"] Hileya, no. 29 (2009): 384–86.**
[10] **Ibid.**

General Assembly Resolution 3314 (XXIX) (Definition of Aggression) adopted on December 14, 1974, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine recognizes the Russian Federation as an aggressor state"[11].

Four years passed. Geopolitical and geostrategic analyses of the intricate situation, both inside and outside the country, began to be gradually reduced to a logical common denominator. Clearly, the world order which reigned over the past centuries is gradually becoming a thing of the past, approaching its Rubicon, the point that is going to be a line in the sand. Both romantics and pragmatists understand that. However, it is another thing that worries us, namely, that Ukraine, its territory, state attributes and people are becoming such a Rubicon.

We shall try to pay attention to the position of the reference point, which allows the state of Ukraine not only to survive, but to strengthen institutionally and positionally, toughen up, to become a high hope for the whole world as well.

Regarding the origin of the conflict, today, we thoroughly understand that it will be impossible to avoid the clash of two worlds. And here is a vast space of reflection for romantics, who clearly see the confrontation between two systems, past and future, evil and good, totalitarianism and democracy, a nearly romantic, eternal struggle for the right to be free[12].

This vitally important aspect determines the state and nature of today's Russian-Ukrainian conflict which revolves around the desire of the overwhelming majority of Ukrainians to be free, democratic, civilized people and not subject to some tyranny. "Russian expansionist policy in the former Soviet republics, which the Russian Federation in the person of its current Moscow government considers

---

[11] **"The Resolution on the "Appeal of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to the United Nations, the European Parliament, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the GUAM Parliamentary Assembly and national parliaments about the recognition of the Russian Federation as an Aggressor State," accessed April 20, 2019. https://mfa.gov.ua/en/press-center/news/32652-zvernennya-verkhovnoji-radi-ukrajini-do-organizaciji-objednanih-nacij-jevropejsykogo-parlamentu-parlamentsykoji-asambleji-radi-jevropi-parlamentsykoji-asambleji-nato-parlamentsykoji-asambleji-obse-parlamentsykoji-asambleji-guam-parlamentiv-derzhav-svitu-p.**

[12] **Igor Makaruk, "The Russian-Ukrainian Conflict: on the Brink of New Global Challenges". ["Rosijs′ko-ukrajins′kyj konflikt: na porozi novyx hlobal′nyx vyklykiv"] Фirtka.if.ua, February 27, 2016. http://www.firtka.if.ua/blog/view/rosijskoukrainskij-konflikt-na-porozi-novih-globalnih-viklikiv201040.**

to be in the range of its own 'exclusive interests', has emerged on the way to the natural efforts of the Ukrainians. Hence, the performance of violent coercion activities towards Ukraine's Eurasian integration endeavors under the auspices of the Russian Federation and the total blockade of Kyiv's course on European and Euro-Atlantic integration. Such a policy of Russia, which has been implemented since the early 2000s, did not provide for the formation of truly equal, partnership and parity relations between Moscow and Kyiv, and was aimed at transforming Ukraine into a client of Russia, which would move in the wake of Russian policy"[13].

The tumultuous and tragic events which occurred in February 2014 were a turning point that began to blow Russia's geostrategic plans up. In retaliation, Ukraine received direct aggression from Putin's totalitarian regime – the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent country was violated; Crimea has been annexed[14] as well as a military conflict in Eastern Ukraine has been engineered[15]. For the first time in the years of independence, Ukraine suffered substantial losses (human, territorial, economic, material), having slipped into a so-called 'hybrid' warfare[16] with another country, which was previously considered to be a strategic partner and guarantor of territorial inviolability under the Budapest Protocol.

Some pro-Russian analysts try to convince the world community that the conflict in the East of Ukraine is an intra-state one, in the worst-case scenario it is a 'local-peripheral' Russian-Ukrainian

---

[13] **"The Russian-Ukrainian conflict: Present State of Affairs, Repercussions, and Pace of Developments Prospects," ["Rosijs′ko-ukrajins′kyj konflikt: stan, naslidky, perspektyvy rozvytku podij,"] accessed April 20, 2019. http://www.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/files/category_journal/analytic_5_6_Ukr_Ros_2014_site_s.pdf.**
[14] **"Launch of the Crimea Annexation by the Russian Federation: As Was the Case," ["Počatok aneksiji Krymu Rosijs′koju Federacijeju: jak ce bulo,"] accessed April 20, 2019. https://www.5.ua/suspilstvo/pochatok-aneksii-krymu-rosiiskoiu-federatsiieiu-iak-tse-bulo-165258.html.**
[15] **Oleksandr Pavlichenko and Oleh Martynenko, eds., The Armed Conflict in Ukraine: Military Support by the Russian Federation to the Illegal Armed Formations "DPR" and "LPR" [Zbrojnyj konflikt v Ukrajini: vijs′kova pidtrymka nezakonnyx zbrojnyx formuvan′ «DNR» ta «LNR» z boku Rosijs′koji Federaciji] (Kyiv: Ukrajins′ka Hel′sins′ka spilka z prav ljudyny, 2018) https://helsinki.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Vijskova-pidtrymka-zvit-dlya-sajtu1.pdf.**
[16] **Volodymyr Artiukh, "Fog of 'Hybrid War': Why Thinking Hybrid is Harmful" ["Tuman «hibrydnoji vijny»: čomu škidlyvo myslyty hibrydno,"] Spilne, no. 10 (2016): 124–32.**

conflict which does not significantly affect the stability of the international relations system and does not pose a threat to the global security system.

Today it is already obvious that the Ukrainian-Russian conflict has a global dimension, turning into a large-scale 'frozen conflict' which threatens the security and stability of not merely the European continent, but the entire world system as a whole. In addition, this conflict may establish a precedent in the foreign policy of countries that already have such 'frozen' conflicts[17].

In the key aspect of devising international systems, the Ukraine-Russia war has become a litmus test which has revealed a significant failure and unwillingness to adequately and effectively act on global challenges of the main institutions of the world security system, those institutions that are directly accountable for vital security and the functioning of various types of international systems. One of the main institutions of the global security system is the United Nations Security Council[18]. It is this steering, global body that is called upon to ensure compliance with the peaceful coexistence of actors in international relations that has failed to find consensual solutions in order to prevent the fuelling of confrontation at the highest level of the security system. This is posited by the President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko in his interview to the Australian TV channel ABC, "The conflict in Eastern Ukraine has demonstrated the ineffectiveness of the post-war global security system, including the UN Security Council. And that's because one of the permanent members, who has veto power, is the aggressor"[19].

---

[17] **Anne de Tinguy, "Frozen Conflicts Are an Instrument of Russian Influence" ["Zamorǒzeni konflikty – ce instrument vplyvu Rosiji"], The Ukrainian Week, no. 14 (April 2017): 36–37.**
[18] **United Nations Security Council.**
[19] **Petro Poroshenko. "The Conflict in Ukraine Has Demonstrated the Ineffectiveness of the UN Security Council". ["Konflikt v Ukrajini prodemonstruvav neefektyvnistʹ Rady bezpeky OON,"] accessed April 20, 2019. http://tyzhden.ua/News/125730.**

Discussion.

It is natural, that given this, more and more scholars come to unanimous understanding that after the world crossed the threshold of the third millennium and entered the phase of the first quarter of the century, when there is a systemic deepening of crisis phenomena, the world community has experienced "a certain crucial turning point". This phenomenon may be qualified as the period of "some qualitative transformations that change the essence and meaning of the political structuring of the world" in the system of international relations. Particular attention is drawn to the fact that "there are obvious signs of the Westphalian world system foundations destruction which existed (with certain changes) for three and a half centuries"[20].

The key measure, determining feature of this transition period is that due to certain objective reasons the gradual formation of a new architectonics of the new world setting occurs, the defining elements of which have not clearly been formed yet – i.e. have not yet acquired a systematic and sustainable character. This primarily concerns the current, rather ambiguous situation in the field of international security and world stability implementation at the time when the Russian aggressive policy violates all norms of sustainable safe coexistence.

Consequently, the world community has been caught in the need to find a new paradigm for developing a system of international relations that would meet the latest, often unpredictable, challenges of our time. Accordingly, the necessity to find effective mechanisms for the practical implementation of this paradigm arose, which, as life has shown, is one of the most difficult problems in general.

If one proceeds on the basis that the term pragmatism derives from the Greek words πρᾶγμα, πρᾶγματος which mean "deed", "act", it is the active yet effective functioning that is lacking in consensus-based decision-making in many countries, which usually observe how the situation in the

---

[20] **Kategories of political science [Katehoriji polityčnoji nauky] (2002): 619–20.**

international arena will evolve. An example of this could be the non-unanimous international community's reaction to Russia's aggression against Ukraine[21]. After all, the philosophy of pragmatism is based on human action or practical activity. At the same time, the philosophy of pragmatism is not limited to the study of people's practical activity solely; it is both a fairly clear and harmonious system of views on virtually all aspects of being, if we take as a whole, and a traditional philosophical knowledge. In particular, this fully applies to the new level of international relations. Among the countries that most consistently embody a pragmatic approach to the problem of international relations system development in the context of the dynamic course of democratization processes one may mention, first of all, the USA, England, Germany and Japan. It is these leading countries of the world that may be considered pragmatists in applying the new approaches to the development of a modern international security system, which, as we know, has already got new measurement criteria.

An empirical analysis of the transitional period in the system of international relations gives grounds to assert that a pragmatist in international relations is essentially an entity that builds and applies a system of actions, affairs and views to obtain practically common beneficial results. In this sense, pragmatism acts as such, which denies the objective character of truth, and the genuine truth is the one that gives practically useful results.

Through this lens pragmatism, theoretically, can be utilized in solving many conflict situations, especially those that threaten international security and increase confrontation, which in turn, may lead to exacerbation of crisis phenomena and slowing down the integration-globalization processes. The study of the main aspects of pragmatism in the actions of international entities has revealed that they often lack consistency in preventing or avoiding threats which are destabilizing in nature.

---

[21] **Nazarii Polishchuk. "World Countries Response to the Military Aggression of the Russian Federation in Ukraine". ["Reakcija krajin svitu na vijsʹkovu ahresiju RF v Ukrajini,"] Info-Light, March 18, 2014.**
http://infolight.org.ua/content/reakciya-krayin-svitu-na-viysvkovu-agresiyu-rf-v-ukrayini

Systematicity may lie in a certain theoretical plane that is based on the positions of a pragmatic approach to the solution of the problem under consideration. If we try to solve this situational problem theoretically as a certain path from one extreme point to another, then we can positively achieve our goal.

In this case, one extreme point can be called a "point of reference" (this may be the predicted moment from which a threat to a certain destabilization or confrontation in the field of international relations theoretically poses). The other, opposite point, we can define as "implementation point of the theoretical hypothesis" (this is the way we may refer the moment of positive solution of the problem). Having analyzed the specified configuration, we arrive at the conclusion that the given path from the "point of reference" to the "implementation point of the theoretical hypothesis" can be divided into five stages, or mini points.

The first stage – "Admissible manifestation phase" – is characterized by the emergence of certain, unambiguous, destabilizing elements in the relations between the international entities. In this case, against the backdrop of stable relations, there manifest minor misunderstandings between the states as international actors. Considering this angle in the globalization-integration dimension, we are led to the realization of what the origin and nature of these petty malentendus should raise flags. Minor disagreements may be too inconsiderable, and the international actors may not give them priority. But a natural sense of anxiety over the future of international security should force a country with democratic values, which is based on pragmatic beliefs of international relations development, to seek the source of such misunderstandings.

Thus, at the "Admissible manifestation phase" which is the first in our study, there has been a slight exacerbation in the relations between the international entities. We can predict that this seemingly volatile misunderstanding could become of a lasting nature and trigger the conflict between these actors, which could lead to large-scale destabilization of the situation in a certain region.

An important factor that we cannot but take into account is the specific case of the countries of the same system or different ones. If the countries belong to a single one, for instance, a democratic system, then the risk exposure factor is much smaller. If the situation becomes more acute between the countries belonging to different systems (both democratic and totalitarian), then the risk factor is too high. The indicated risk factor is smaller when countries belong to the same system, though this system is not a democratic one, but it is higher than in the single-system democratic countries.

The second stage is the "Problem formulation phase" wherein the problem is formulated as well as the nature of its origin is empirically studied. This stage is important in the sense that it is where the core of a subject crystallizes. A successful solution to this problem lays the foundation for the further tactics accuracy. The smaller the margin of error in the second stage is the lesser will be the false actions carried out in the subsequent stages of the study on this aspect as also the more realistic and effective will be the actions performed in planning and actually overcoming the problem situation.

Thus, the "Problem formulation phase" defines the purport of follow-up actions and behavior in a given setting. At this stage, the problem itself and the nature of its origin should be clearly identified. That is, to be able to anticipate the consequences of the problem emergence and development in this aspect as well as the subject's situational activities accuracy, one should have a good sense of the issue, its nature, origin and what causes it.

This phase is all too essential to the study and requires the involvement of the relevant potential resources, since the analysis being carried out cannot allow for significant errors. Each false tendency in the analysis may lead to inadequate and erroneous actions, which in turn can result in fuelling a rapid escalation of the problem. In such a case, the situation may become uncontrolled by the international actors, which will require enormous efforts and mobilization of significant resource potential for resolving it.

The third stage – "Hypothesis formulation phase" – is the one at which the theoretical hypothesis of problem solving is formed on the basis of the results obtained from the study and defining of the problems in the second stage. Upon achieving the results of the second stage, having analyzed and determined the cause of this problem emergence, the international entity starts to develop and form a theoretical hypothesis or several hypotheses, which shall be deemed mere possible ways to overcome the predicted crisis phenomenon in relations with other international actors.

This is the stage of correct decision-making, an important part of the way on which the version of the admissible right decision is formed.

The fourth stage – "Decision-making phase" – is characterized by the fact that it analytically and critically examines the hypothesis and its theoretical foundations with the prediction of a possible degree of efficiency, which is heavily involved in successful implementation of a given hypothesis.

At this stage the definite decision is made, as also is an optimal behavior determined under specific anticipated conditions that may arise. This decision cannot be an emotional one; it should be purely pragmatic and stipulate the actions that will lead to an appropriate and positive solution of the problem in the international actors' relations.

The fifth stage – "Hypothesis implementation phase" – is, in fact, the final one, as it provides for the implementation of the theoretically developed hypothesis aimed at achieving the end of the set goal[22]. The practical side of this stage is directly related to the entire spectrum of theoretical studies, which underlie the implementation of the developed plan for the settlement or prevention of conflict situations. After all, a negligible destabilization in the plane of one system can impinge on the entire system of international relations with all its subsystems; therefore, the practical realization of the theoretical hypothesis is central to building ties on the basis of peaceful coexistence.

---

[22] **Makaruk, "Democratic Developments", 14.**

Ultimately, the pragmatization hypothesis may intrinsically be multistage or the one that consists of a few separate and definite parts. After the first practical step it may well be necessary to make adjustments, if certain positions of the second stage were false. There may also be, depending on the situation, several options for the second stage in order to continue the implementation in the most optimal path.

The institution of the OSCE's European security system was even more ineffective. This institution, which was supposed to play a leading role in the resolution of the Ukrainian-Russian conflict, could not offer any proper and effective manners that were capable of minimizing the global challenges posed by the conflict.

Consequently, today's world security structure is facing a number of global challenges that threaten to destroy the entire historical location of the world order. From a large list of global challenges, we can identify several most significant ones that pose the tremendous risks to the current system of international relations. This is where we move on to a pragmatic vision statement of a comprehensive approach to the situation assessment with reference to the Russian-Ukrainian conflict.

Firstly, a precedent has been set that makes it possible for the military force employment to resolve disputes between the states as leading external relations actors. That is, the entire legal framework of the international relations system is being fundamentally destroyed, all the systemic value principles that provided the opportunity to refrain from aggression and violations of agreements between states are being neutralized. Once again, the theory of "democratic peace" is on the agenda, which states that democratic states do not fight each other[23]. In other words, the theory is confirmed by the underlying premise that the aggressor a priori is not a democratic state, hence the threat to the stability of the international system.

---

[23] **Melvin Small, and J. David Singer, "The War Proneness of Democratic Regimes," Jerusalem Journal of International Relations 1, no. 4 (Summer 1976): 50–69.**

Secondly, reasonable opportunity to effectively control the proliferation of nuclear arms, including in the most dangerous and problematic territories, is minimized, as there is no credible mechanism capable of preventing indiscriminate proliferation of nuclear weapons. This aspect becomes relevant at a time when the precedent has been set for non-compliance with the Budapest Memorandum, according to which Ukraine renounced the world's third nuclear potential. Moreover, one state was attacked by another one that was the guarantor of security and territorial integrity of the subject of the memorandum. The above was confirmed by the statement of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon at the Nuclear Security Summit in the Netherlands, "Security assurances were a fundamental condition for Ukraine's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons"[24].

As of today, any security guarantees may be questionable and will not be embraced as lacking an effective mechanism to comply with them. This once again builds for us an understanding of the treaty principles degradation of developing the system of peaceful coexistence between international legal entities, and particularly when the fundamental principles are trespassed against by a nuclear-weapon state.

There is a threat of 'frozen', anarchistic conflict in the center of Europe, which will be a perpetual menace to destabilization of the situation in the entire Baltic-Black Sea region – the area that is postured as a future centre for the resolution of multilayered security issues.

If nowadays any European politician defers to the opinion of pro-Russian analysts that Ukraine is a buffer zone between the two worlds (the civilized West and the wild East), then this point of view is erroneous and wrong-headed one. After all, the Russian aggressive regime regards Ukraine not as a buffer of Europe, but as a possible staging ground for further expansion of its influence on the continent, undermining the dominant European and civilizational values in order to bring down the

---

[24] **Inna Zavhorodnia, "UN Secretary-General: Nuclear Weapon States Have Violated Their Duties towards Ukraine," ["Hensek OON: Jaderni deržavy porušyly zobovjazannja pered Ukrajinoju,"] Ukrpravda, March 24, 2014. https://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2014/03/24/7020170/**

European Union. It is disunity within pivotal questions among the leaders of today's Europe that contributes to the aggressive plans of the Russian regime.

The Russian propaganda has repeatedly voiced a message about the strong spiritual unity of Russian and artificially united Europe, which will fall apart at the first destabilizing factors. The first such developments were the terrorist attacks in European cities, which have led the Europeans to understand their vulnerability and helplessness against the potential threat. The second issue was the wave of Arab refugees to Europe from the Middle East, where the situation was intensely destabilized also due to the direct intervention of the Russian military machine.

Under the circumstances, pragmatically approaching the issue of security, Europe cannot expect Ukraine to turn into a zone that will protect the Old World from aggressive encroachments of Asian and Horde Russia.

Fourthly, there is a threat that the conflict may escalate to a totally new level, that is, the Ukraine-Russia conflict may lead to a confrontation between the civilized West and Russia itself. Pragmatists of international relations are aware that at the "manifestation phase"[25] there is a clear polarization of the understanding of value approaches to the formation of an effective security system. Permanent alliances emerge that split the world, pushing it towards a new Cold War. Russia has been mustering all its resources as well as those of its current allies to struggle overtly at the global level against the as yet civilized world.

As opposed to Russia's aggressive plans, regional leaders have been emerging who are trying to resist possible Russian expansion (Poland, the Baltics). These countries became the closest allies of Ukraine, because they understand, unlike Germany, Italy and France, the actual danger that the Russian supremacist regime poses to them.

---

[25] **Igor Makaruk. "Pragmatism Features of Modern International Relations System" ["Osoblyvosti prahmatyzmu sučasnoji systemy mižnarodnyx vidnosyn"] Journal of the Sevastopol National Technical University, no. 100 (2009): 183.**

Against the background of these processes, the faith of the states in each other is being rapidly lost, because there is no effective contractual framework that could serve as a basis for compliance with agreements in a peaceful, low-level conflict format. Nowadays, the issue regarding the non-confrontational format is not even touched on. It is considered to be utopian at this stage of building a system of peaceful coexistence within the framework of international relations. It is about minimizing the grand challenges facing the world.

These events are the result of the fact that both the EU and NATO, in their time, pragmatically interpreted and studied the threats and challenges that Russia, as a militarized, authoritarian aggressor with a powerful nuclear potential, can carry to the world and the entire system of international relations. No analytical steps have been developed to study and predict possible manifestations, which have obviously called for and provoked the current situation, which is already so grave that the world has moved to the stage of not returning to the past value issues in the field of state-to-state relations security.

The entire international treaty system, which was the basis of the first level of maintaining the peaceful coexistence system of all external relations actors, was at stake. After all, Russia's expansionism, without proper resistance from the community of nations and international security institutions, may receive motivational levers to expand its invasion of the other sovereign states' territories, which may be potentially targets of Great Russian supremacist interests.

Fifthly, both global and regional established security systems are being fundamentally destroyed. What we see is that no international relations actor is able to guarantee the security and inviolability of its borders, especially if it does not possess a nuclear reserve. Ukraine felt amply the inability of the world security system to solve global crisis phenomena at the first, analytical level, and at the second, practical, one when the diplomatic crisis begins, as well as at the third level of military aggression. The policy of belligerent solution of confrontation poses a considerable threat to the

system of foreign affairs, provoking its self-destruction, because the fundamental principles of peaceful coexistence are being plunged. Henceforth, a stronger actor can dictate his will with impunity to another international legal entity.

The Ukrainian-Russian war has put many overarching issues on the agenda to which there are no even the most satisfactory resolutions so far. The urban community is monitoring the conflict with the hope that it will gradually evolve and resolve itself. Though, it won't because there are a number of global challenges on the agenda that need to be addressed within the framework of collective security, with mechanisms that will not allow the use of force in developing bilateral or multilateral relations.

In view of the foregoing, we address the fundamental question, "What has to be done next and how to create the present for a future international security system of a whole new level?" Moreover, how can a pragmatic understanding of the new phenomenon of planetary security be enhanced? Today, only a real-life multi-faceted pragmatism can become a premise of looking for ways to design a new security engineering model both on the continent and worldwide as a whole. New mechanisms are required to develop reliable tools for preventing the resolution of conflicts by force at various levels. Perhaps, it will be surprising for our descendants to know that in the first quarter of the twenty-first century the main problem of the global society was the sovereign security of the external relations actors.

CONCLUSIONS.

The methodology under consideration is a pragmatic approach to the development and adoption of practical solutions by political actors in the system of international relations. This pragmatism in addressing conflict situations that threaten international security plays a decisive role in designing a new system of international relations, in particular, in preparing accurate responses to the challenges of the modern world that is dynamically globalizing.

The theoretical basis of a pragmatic approach to the formation of challenges under consideration, facing the system of international relations, confirms Ukraine's miscalculations in foreign policy. This is supported by the experts' reviews[26] and the loss of some of the national interests[27]. The military conflict with the eastern neighbor has entered the phase of protracted hybrid war.

One of the aims of the study, which is being carried out in a broader format, was to attempt to comprehend, whether it was possible for Ukraine to avoid a conflict with the Russian Federation. We jumped to the conclusion that potentially the conflict could have been avoided, if Ukraine's foreign policy had been hewn to the proposed in 2010 study on developing a pragmatic approach to the formation of bilateral relations with partners with whom a conflict of interest was feasible.

However, this statement is a theoretical one. The pragmatic angle of the implementation of the proposed approach to solving a controversy, which is not predicted, but has already broken up, is being solved at another stage of the multilevel system.

In turn, it should be acknowledged that ideologized appraisals of the post-confrontational situation in the world have significantly delayed the awareness of the globalized age real challenges by the governing circles and the public in Western countries. The illusion of "victory in the Cold War"[28] eventually backfired on the interests of the U.S. and the European Union, preventing the timely transformation of the Western security structures and institutions in response to new threats and challenges.

For these reasons, the twilight zone of international relations has become protracted and largely unruly. A situation has been created that provides both positive opportunities for the formation of a

---

[26] **Edward Lukas. "Ukraine's Biggest Problem is a Corrupt Body Politic". ["Najbilʹša problema Ukrajiny – korumpovanyj polityčnyj klas,"] August 30, 2011. https://day.kyiv.ua/uk/article/den-planeti/20-rokiv-nezalezhnosti-zdobutki-i-prorahunki.**

[27] **Andrii Datsiuk, Valerii Sadoskyi, Oleksii Poltorakov, and Rena Marutian, Analysis of National Policy on Homeland Security and Defense of Ukraine [Analiz deržavnoji polityky u sferi nacionalʹnoji bezpeky i oborony Ukrajiny] (Kyiv, 2015). https://rpr.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Analiz-polityky-NB-pravl-final.pdf**

[28] **Oleksandr Avramchuk. "Big illusions, or Paradoxes of American Sovietology" ["Velyki iljuziji, abo Paradoksy amerykansʹkoji sovjetolohiji"] Ukraina Incognita NB!, July 11, 2016. http://incognita.day.kiev.ua/veliki-ilyuziyi,-abo-paradoksi-amerikanskoyi-sovyetologiyi.html**

new world order and significant crisis potential. It is obvious that the current transition phase of the international system makes it insufficiently adapted to the prevention and settlement of modern age global problems on a collective basis. The absence of effective mechanisms for synergy and taking into account the interests of a wide range of states has given rise to dangerous dynamics in the growth of global threats and challenges and is capable of spiraling out of the international community control. Modern political science characterizes the nature of the transition stage in international relations following no particular pattern; it is difficult to give it any comprehensive definition. Some foreign analysts label it a "new international disorder",[29] others qualify it "an amorphous security system that lacks the bipolar structure and ideological clarity of the Cold War"[30].

The uncertainty of the international relations system is largely due to the fact that the process of globalization is not over, and its human civilization consequences, to all appearances, have not been fully implemented yet. The challenges and differences caused by globalization have been arising in the intervening time. With no stable and predictable world order, the 'element' of globalization threatens to take free course.

Within this framework, the international political and academic community is vigorously promoting a debate on a desirable and feasibly achievable model of globalization processes evolution. Moreover, there is not only a theoretical dispute, but also an acute political competition of the projects on the globalization future development, mirroring collision of interests of different states, regions, socio-political as well as financial and economic actors in this focal question of the global affairs.

In turn, we can state that the pragmatism of international relations determines the privacy of democratic values of civil society; therefore, it makes sense to employ the findings in further profound study of the democracy role in the age of the globalization processes and the subsequent

---

[29] **Serhii Korsunskyi. "A New World Disorder: ben venuto!" ["Novyj svitovyj bezlad: laskavo prosymo"], Dzerkalo tyzhnia. September 9, 2018. https://dt.ua/international/noviy-svitoviy-bezlad-laskavo-prosimo-287793_.html**
[30] **Hans Binnendijk, ed., Strategic Assessment 1999: Priorities for a Turbulent World (Washington: Institute for National Strategic Studies, 1999), XII.**

transformation of democratic processes on the planet. The creation of possibilities of simulating and predicting the trends of democratic systems development and transformation, both nowadays and tomorrow's, which will mirror the democratic processes status as well as further paths of the society democratization, remains pertinent. Namely, the development of the "fourth wave" of democratization, its foundations, vision statement, propagation and development in the biased aspect of international relations pragmatization.

Despite the cosmopolitan diffusion of democracy in the world, there are significant differences in the establishment of common conceptual and ideological approaches to the democracy comprehension in its entirety, both as a phenomenon and with respect to democratization processes, which began rapidly to develop at the turn of the last century and at the dawn of the 21st century.

Proceeding from the fact that democratic processes do not have a single conceptual approach and taking into account that one of the main tasks of the international relations system is the safe conditions for the coexistence of its subjects, in this context it is possible to generalize that it is here that the main reasons for the democratization processes continue to evolve in an amplitude or in a wave-like manner may be hidden. Therefore, it makes perfect sense that the absence of coherence regarding the foundations of democratization processes and, consequently, the ways of their further development, could lead to an extreme aggravation of situations within those countries that were embarking on the path of democratic development. This, in turn, gave rise to a situation of crisis, which led to the retreat of democratic forces under the weight of authoritarian trend, and generated what Samuel P. Huntington labeled a "reverse wave"[31].

This is where the new solution comes from. It can be theoretically developed through the lens of that what will make it possible to find a solution ensuring the democratization processes to develop less amplitude-like. That is, to create conditions under which the reverse waves will cause minimal threats

---

[31] **Samuel P. Huntington, The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991).**

to the democratization processes, in turn, influence upon the system of international relations properly.

There is a regular connection between the dynamic development of democratization processes and generating the system of international relations to a new orbit which will open the door to resolving a large number of international overarching issues.

Phase-by-phase study of democratic theories is directed towards minimization of the wave-like development of further democratization processes due to the fact that these processes are closely interconnected with the development of the international relations system, which is formed on the new principles of global security. This aspect of the study has led to the conclusion that the stability of international relations system is directly related and largely dependent on the wave-like development of democratization processes. Hence the logical statement that the smaller the amplitude of the waves of democratization, the more stable the system of international affairs is.

The study achieved a theoretical balance between the details of the term 'democracy' and the conceptual principles of the 'theory of the democratic world' in the context of pragmatization of international relations. In this perspective, the pragmatism of the external affairs system acts as such that denies the fairness of truth, and the real truth is the one that yields practically useful results, i.e. contributes to the further development of democratization processes, which, in turn, increase the possibility of forming the conditions for the transition of countries from a non-democratic regime to a democratic one.

From the perspective of further study on the complex, multi-layered basis for creating conditions for the formation of a unified European security system, it is imperative to come to grips with the goals and objectives of the system regarding potential threats. It is apparent that there is a need for a large-scale generalization of threats and new challenges that will come from non-European civilizational formations. In the present instance, it bears mentioning and properly appraise the situation at the

micro level (Ukraine and its conflict with Russia) in order to effectively apply the results at the macro level (the pan-European security system and threats from undemocratic international actors).

Huntington warned that the Crimea could cause a split in Ukraine. However, it is possible that a new Ukraine will begin to emerge because of the Crimea or due to the downfall of the notorious empire, which is increasingly being talked about.[32] What is meant here is sheer, though deep, civilizational rift.

Without any reasonable doubt, if the experience of present-day conflicts of various risk degrees is not taken into account systematically, including in the territory of Eastern Europe (Ukraine), the general system of European security may be badly suffered by imbalance, which, in turn, may have devastating consequences.

The generalization opens a lot of logical questions that require detailed and in-depth responses and will be premised on subsequent scholarly researches in light of all the previous ones done, both theoretical and practical experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. "5 kanal." "Launch of the Crimea Annexation by the Russian Federation: As Was the Case." ["Počatok aneksiji Krymu Rosijsʹkoju Federacijeju: jak ce bulo"] https://www.5.ua/suspilstvo/pochatok-aneksii-krymu-rosiiskoiu-federatsiieiu-iak-tse-bulo-165258.html.

2. "The Russian-Ukrainian Conflict: Present State of Affairs, Repercussions, and Pace of Developments Prospects" ["Rosijsʹko-ukrajinsʹkyj konflikt: stan, naslidky, perspektyvy rozvytku podij"].http://www.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/files/category_journal/analytic_5_6_Ukr_Ros_2014_site_s.pdf.

---

[32] **Boris Drogomyretskyi, "Huntington Has Warned Us..." ["Hantinhton poperedžav…"] Ukrpravda, July 15, 2014. https://www.pravda.com.ua/columns/2014/07/15/7031876/**

3. Artiukh, Volodymyr. "Fog of 'Hybrid War': Why Thinking Hybrid is Harmful". ["Tuman hibrydnoji vijny: čomu škidlyvo myslyty hibrydno"] Spilne, no. 10 (2016): 124–32.

4. Avramchuk, Oleksandr. "Big Illusions, or Paradoxes of American Sovietology" ["Velyki iljuziji, abo Paradoksy amerykansʹkoji sovjetolohiji."] Ukraina Incognita. NB!, July 11, 2016. http://incognita.day.kiev.ua/veliki-ilyuziyi,-abo-paradoksi-amerikanskoyi-sovyetologiyi.html.

5. Binnendijk, Hans, Richard L. Kugler, Charles B. Shotwell, and Kori Schake, eds. Strategic Assessment 1999: Priorities for a Turbulent World. Washington: Institute for National Strategic Studies, 1999.

6. Datsiuk, Andrii, Valerii Sadoskyi, Oleksii Poltorakov, and Rena Marutian, Analysis of National Policy on Homeland Security and Defense of Ukraine. [Analiz deržavnoji polityky u sferi nacionalʹnoji bezpeky i oborony Ukrajiny] Kyiv, 2015. https://rpr.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Analiz-polityky-NB-pravl-final.pdf

7. Drogomyretskyi, Boris. "Huntington Has Warned Us..." ["Hantinhton poperedžav…"] Ukrpravda. https://www.pravda.com.ua/columns/2014/07/15/7031876/.

8. Fedunyak, Sergiy. "Prospects of Ukraine's NAM Membership within the Context of Current Security Trends." ["Perspektyvy pozablokovosti Ukrajiny u konteksti sučasnyx tendencij u sferi bezpeky."] Actual Problems of International Relations 111, no. 1 (2012): 32–6. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/apmv_2012_111%281%29__6

9. Hoffman, Frank G. Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid War. Arlington, VA: Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, 2007.

    http://www.potomacinstitute.org/images/stories/publications/potomac_hybridwar_0108.pdf

10. Hoffman, Frank G. "Preparing for Hybrid Wars". Marine Corps Gazette 91, no. 3 (March 2007): 57–61.

11. Humanitarno-naukove znannja: komunikatyvni zasady. Materialy Mižnarodnoji naukovoji konferenciji 6-7 žovtnja 2017 r. – Chernivtsi: Chernivetskyi nats. u-tet, 2017. – 463 s.

12. Huntington, Samuel P. The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press. 1991.

13. Huntington, Samuel P. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

14. Hvat, Ivan. "'East Slavic Orthodox Civilization.' What Benefits Await Ukraine?" ["Sxidnoslovjans′ka pravoslavna cyvilizacija». Jaki ž blaha čekajut′ na Ukrajinu?"] Accessed April 20, 2019. https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/25110478.html

15. Kącka, Katarzyna, ed. Stosunki międzynarodowe. Wokół zagadnień teoretycznych. [International relations. On theoretical issues.] Toruń: Drukarnia Wydawnictwa Naukowego UMK, 2014. https://repozytorium.umk.pl/bitstream/handle/item/2871/stosunki-m 2014m.pdf?sequence=1.

16. Kategories of political science [Katehoriji polityčnoji nauky]. M., 2002.

17. Kissinger, Henry. World Order: Reflections on the Character of Nations and the Course of History. The Penguin Press, 2014. Amazon Digital Services LLC.

18. Kornienko, Sofia. "The Jacket is Bursting at the Seam." ["Pidžak rvet′sja po švu."] Accessed April 20, 2019. https://www.svoboda.org/a/25362031.html

19. Korsunskyi, Serhii. "A New World Disorder: ben venuto!" ["Novyj svitovyj bezlad: laskavo prosymo."] Dzerkalo tyzhnia, September 9, 2018. https://dt.ua/international/noviy-svitoviy-bezlad-laskavo-prosimo-287793_.html.

20. Lukas, Edward. "Ukraine's Biggest Problem is a Corrupt Body Politic." ["Najbil′ša problema Ukrajiny – korumpovanyj polityčnyj klas."] Day, August 30, 2011. https://day.kyiv.ua/uk/article/den-planeti/20-rokiv-nezalezhnosti-zdobutki-i-prorahunki.

21. Mahda, Yevhen. Hybrid War: To Survive and To Win. [Hibrydna vijna: vyžyty i peremohty.] Kharkiv: Vivat, 2015.

22. Makaruk, Igor. "'Waves of Democratization' in the Context of Modern International Relations." ["«Demokratyzatsiini khvyli» v konteksti suchasnykh mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn."] Hileya, no. 29 (2009): 384–86.

23. Makaruk, Igor. "Democratic Developments in the Context of Growing Pragmatism in International Relations (conceptual dimension)." ["Demokratyzacijnyj rozvytok v umovax pragmatyzacii systemy mižnarodnyx vidnosyn (konceptualnyj vymir)".] PhD diss. abstract, Institute of World Economy and International Relations in Kyiv, 2010.

24. Makaruk, Igor. "Pragmatism Features of Modern International Relations System." ["Osoblyvosti prahmatyzmu sučasnoji systemy mižnarodnyx vidnosyn."] Journal of the Sevastopol National Technical University, no. 100 (2009): 182-84.

25. Makaruk, Igor. "The Russian-Ukrainian Conflict: on the Brink of New Global Challenges." ["Rosijs′ko-ukrajins′kyj konflikt: na porozi novyx hlobal′nyx vyklykiv."] Фirtka.if.ua, February 27, 2016. http://www.firtka.if.ua/blog/view/rosijskoukrainskij-konflikt-na-porozi-novih-globalnih-viklikiv201040.

26. Makaruk, Igor. "Conceptual Issues Theoretical Foundations of Security in International Relations." 4th International Scientific Conference «COOPERATION BETWEEN UKRAINE AND LITHUANIA IN CONDITIONS OF THE RUSSIAN THREAT», Kaunas, (2016): 39–44. http://nato.pu.if.ua/old/1/4.pdf.

27. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine. "Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine on convening consultations in accordance with the Budapest Memorandum." Accessed April 20, 2019. https://mfa.gov.ua/en/press-center/comments/9591-zajava-mzs-ukrajini-u-zvjazku-zi-sklikannyam-konsulytacij-vidpovidno-do-budapeshtsykogo-memorandumu.

28. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine. "The Resolution on the "Appeal of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to the United Nations, the European Parliament, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the GUAM Parliamentary Assembly and national parliaments about the recognition of the Russian Federation as an Aggressor State." Accessed April 20, 2019. https://mfa.gov.ua/en/press-center/news/32652-zvernennya-verkhovnoji-radi-ukrajini-do-organizaciji-objednanih-nacij-jevropejsykogo-parlamentu-parlamentsykoji-asambleji-radi-jevropi-parlamentsykoji-asambleji-nato-parlamentsykoji-asambleji-obse-parlamentsykoji-asambleji-guam-parlamentiv-derzhav-svitu-p.

29. NATO Strategic Communications » (NATO StratCom COE), Forensic study, Features of Russia Information Onslaught in Ukraine and the Baltics in the Course of the Russian-Ukrainian Armed Conflict, 03.03.2016, (Estonia).

30. Pavlenko, Yuriy. "Globalization and Civilization Shift of the Present." ["Hlobalizacija ta cyvilizacijni zrušennja sʹohodennja."] International Economic Policy, no. 1 (2005): 100–20.

31. Pavlichenko, Oleksandr, and Oleh Martynenko, eds. The Armed Conflict in Ukraine: Military Support by the Russian Federation to the Illegal Armed Formations "DPR" and "LPR". [Zbrojnyj konflikt v Ukrajini: vijsʹkova pidtrymka nezakonnyx zbrojnyx formuvanʹ «DNR» ta «LNR» z boku Rosijsʹkoji Federaciji.] Kyiv: Ukrajinsʹka Helʹsinsʹka spilka z prav ljudyny, 2018, https://helsinki.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Vijskova-pidtrymka-zvit-dlya-sajtu1.pdf.

32. Polishchuk, Nazarii. "World Countries Response to the Military Aggression of the Russian Federation in Ukraine." ["Reakcija krajin svitu na vijsʹkovu ahresiju RF v Ukrajini."] Info-Light, March 18, 2014. http://infolight.org.ua/content/reakciya-krayin-svitu-na-viysvkovu-agresiyu-rf-v-ukrayini.

33. Poroshenko, Petro. "The Conflict in Ukraine Has Demonstrated the Ineffectiveness of the UN Security Council." ["Konflikt v Ukrajini prodemonstruvav neefektyvnistʹ Rady bezpeky OON."] Accessed April 20, 2019. http://tyzhden.ua/News/125730.

34. Przeworski, Adam. Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

35. Pukhkal, Oleksandr. "Modernisation of Political System of Ukraine: State-Administrative Measuring." ["Modernizacija polityčnoji systemy Ukrajiny: deržavno-upravlinsʹkyj vymir."] Public Administration and Local Government 3, no. 6 (2010). Accessed April 20, 2019, http://www.dridu.dp.ua/vidavnictvo/2010/2010_03(6)/10pogduv.pdf.

36. Small, Melvin and J. David Singer. "The War Proneness of Democratic Regimes." Jerusalem Journal of International Relations 1, no. 4 (Summer 1976): 50–69.

37. Tinguy, Anne de. "Frozen Conflicts Are an Instrument of Russian Influence." ["Zamoroženi konflikty – ce instrument vplyvu Rosiji."] The Ukrainian Week, no. 14 (April 2017): 36–37.

38. Todorov, Igor. "Russia's Attempts to Destroy the System of International Relations and the Response of the West." ["Sproby rujnaciji Rosijeju systemy mižnarodnyx vidnosyn ta reakcija Zaxodu."] Millennia, no. 3 (2016): 58–66. http://www.ofitsynskyy.uzhgorod.ua/pdf/visnyk-kiu-3.pdf.

39. Tsependa, Igor. "Ukraine and Poland: Facing the 21st Century Challenges." Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University 1, no. 4 (2014): 21–6. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/jovspnu_2014_1_4_4.

40. Zavhorodnia, Inna. "UN Secretary-General: Nuclear Weapon States Have Violated Their Duties towards Ukraine." ["Hensek OON: Jaderni deržavy porušyly zobovjazannja pered Ukrajinoju."] Ukrpravda, March 24, 2014. https://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2014/03/24/7020170/.

41. Zinchenko, Volodymyr. "Modern Global World System and Liberal Model Crisis." ["Sučasna hlobalʹna svitova sytema i kryza liberalʹnoji modeli."] Gumanitarniy visnik Zaporizhkoi derzhavnoi inzhenernoi akademii 41 (2010): 161–68

http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/znpgvzdia_2010_41_15

DATA OF THE AUTHOR.

1. Igor Makaruk. PhD in Political Science, Associate Professor, International Relations Department, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University. Email: makiv45@gmail.com