



Maximilian Shepelev
D.Sc. (Political Science), Professor,
Southwest State University
94, 50 Let Oktyabrya Str., Kursk, 305040, Russia
ma_shepelev@mail.ru
ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9891-0912>

Regional integries in the crisis of globalism

Abstract. The article deals with geopolitical and geoeconomic features of the crisis of the economic element of globalism, formed at the modern stage of globalisation. This system of globalism was paradoxically focused on anti-systemic approaches to solve the conflicts and contradictions, because indeed it is dominated by the procedures of exclusion not integration. The procedure of exclusion and restrictive standards destroyed the liberal democratic foundations of the global governance. Deep conflict inside the globalism system, as an origin of strategic instability, produces de-globalisation. The crisis of globalism can create the situation similar not only to the beginning of the 20th century, but to the end of the 15th century, when modern Euro-centric world system was born. Also the article analyses competition between transoceanic («America - Atlantic - Europe, Asia - Pacific ocean - America») and transcontinental («Pacific ocean - America - Atlantic ocean», «Atlantic ocean - Eurasia - Pacific ocean») integrational projects, and the possibility of forming a new regional integries in this context.

Keywords: Globalisation; Crisis; Globalism System; Large space; Regional Integries; Transcontinental Integration Projects; Transoceanic Integration Projects

JEL Classification: F29

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V164-05>

Шепелев М. А.

доктор політичних наук, професор, професор кафедри міжнародних відносин та державного управління, Південно-Західний державний університет, Курськ, Російська Федерація

Региональні інтегрії в умовах кризи глобалізму

Анотація. У статті розглянуто геополітичні та геоекономічні особливості кризи економічного виміру глобалізму, сформованого на сучасному етапі глобалізації. У контексті осмислення перспектив нової хвилі регіоналізму, з урахуванням хвилеподібної динаміки глобалізаційного процесу, на основі концепції «великих просторів», розкрито місце і роль конкуренції регіональних інтегрий у формуванні нової моделі світоустрою, заснованої на принципах альтер-глобалізму.

Ключові слова: глобалізм; криза; система глобалізму; «великі простори»; регіональні інтегрії; трансконтинентальні інтеграційні проекти; транскеанські інтеграційні проекти.

Шепелев М. А.

доктор политических наук, профессор, профессор кафедры международных отношений и государственного управления, Юго-Западный государственный университет, Курск, Российская Федерация

Региональные интегрии в условиях кризиса глобализма

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются геополитические и геоэкономические особенности кризиса экономического измерения глобализма, сформированного на современном этапе глобализации. В контексте осмысления перспектив новой волны регионализма, с учётом волнообразной динамики глобализационного процесса и на основе концепции «больших пространств», раскрывается место и роль конкуренции региональных интегрий в формировании новой модели мироустройства, основанной на принципах альтерглобализма.

Ключевые слова: глобализм; кризис; система глобализма; «большие пространства»; региональные интегрии; трансконтинентальные интеграционные проекты; транскеанские интеграционные проекты.

1. Problem statement

Brexit, US 2016 presidential election, and first decisions D. Trump as U.S. President became contusive symptoms of the crisis of globalism, which were found in late 20th - beginning of 21st century. New global geopolitical situation puts on the agenda future of the recent integration process.

2. Review of studies and publications

The crisis of globalisation attracts increasing attention among scholars since the end of 20th century, resulting in the emergence of the new term «de-globalisation»[1]. Most important studies of the issue include those by J. Galbraith (1999), O. H. Belorus (2003), W. Bello (2002), I. Wallerstein (2003), A. S. Panarin (1999-2003), N. Ferguson (2005), M. A. Shepelev (2001), and more recent works by P. Barbieri (2016), P. van Bergeijk (2011), L. Klepatsky (2015), J. Sapir (2011), M. Troyjo (2016). However, even half a century earlier many of geopolitical aspects of the future crisis of globalisation were foresing and described by one of the major European thinkers Carl Schmitt in his work «Nomos of the Earth» (1950). As soon as this problem became evident, especially since the last year, it turned into subject of many scientific

and journalistic articles. In fact, while in the nineties of the 20th century globalisation became the mainstream of scientific discourse, now we have every evidence to believe that soon themes of the crisis of globalisation and coming of de-globalisation will occupy this position.

3. The purpose of this article is to examine the conditions and possible guidelines for the development of integration processes under the crisis of the globalism system.

4. The main results of the research

Firstly, globalisation means sledding through the constant conflicts and contradictions with reshuffling of social balance by specifically organised, ordered interaction, based on common regulatory norms and values. Thus, it is the impulsive force of the order, the organisation of human relations on a global scale. This global cooperation is primarily economic based, embodied at the present stage in the economic system of globalism.

The contemporary global economic and political development is characterized by the fact that in the process of globalisation, and on the basis of post-industrial technological revolution in 1960-90-ies, new form of economic and

social system emerged based on the so-called «global triad»: «Global state - Global corporation - Global international organisation.» Its main characteristics are: global open markets with the autonomy of the post-industrial economy as the only pole of economic power; increasing dependence of the global economic situation on the situation in the countries-leaders of globalisation; dominance of global states and global corporations as the key elements of the system of globalisation, forming certain military-economic symbiosis; powered integration, geoeconomic wars and global quasi-forced coordination of national strategies and policies as key ways to maintain unity of the system; global discrimination, global exploitation of information and intellectual resources, financial, economic and social terrorism of global states and global corporations [2]. It has technological (latest information and telecommunication technologies), economic (separation of production profit from the production of real wealth), and social (consumptive competition) basis, producing highly atomized, socially polarized society, a kind of anti-social jungle - the realm of «one-dimensional man» (Homo oeconomicus).

Globalism, as O. H. Belorus defined it, is «a transitional stage of the development of global civilization» [2, p. 38]. Therefore, the dominance of the economic system of globalisation can be seen as a kind of global frontier situation, or bifurcation point, which defines its strategic instability and high insecurity. In the current situation it produces «the intellectual crisis of globalisation,» as A. Monk pointed out [3].

Social source of strategic instability of the economic system under globalism is defined by two opposing trends: decreasing diversity and growth differences in the levels of life. «Differentiation of income and quality of life in individual countries and nations, as well as globally, currently is higher than it was in the fifteenth century» [4, p. 16]. The logic of global market competition produces higher socio-economic polarization on the global scale, which increases the conflict potential, and undermines the existing world order. According to Oxfam, in 2009, 1% of the population, i.e. 70 million richest people, owned 44% of combined wealth, and in 2014 - already 48% (average \$2.7 million per person). Almost 1/2 (46%) of the remaining 52% of global wealth is concentrated in the hands of 1/5 of the population. «By 2016 the combined wealth of the 1% richest people in the world for the first time may exceed the total of the rest 99% of inhabitants of the planet. Now only 80 of the richest people (0.000,001% of the population) have as much as the poorest 3.5 billion people (50% of the population)» [5]. And in 2015 the gap between the largest and smallest countries by GDP (PPP) - China and Guinea-Bissau (island states in Oceania and the Caribbean are excluded) made up 7285 times [6]. «It turned out that fatal contradictions spilled out of state borders, and affected at the global scale, changing from inter-classes to cross-country, or rather into the conflict between two worlds: rich countries and poor countries,» Y. N. Pakhomov point out [7, p. 12].

This polarization is evident in trend-circuit economy of post-industrial centre. Mutual direct investment constitutes up to 74.5% of all accumulated foreign direct investment to the EU economy. Mutual export and mutual import of the EU countries, estimated in USD 6,929.48 billion, makes out 60.8%, and the trade turnover between the countries in NAFTA, which is estimated in USD 2,216.3 billion, makes out 40.03% of their total exports and imports. There striking difference is seen in the figures of internal trade for less developed countries: for members of ASEAN (USD 606.59 billion, or 24.46%), African Union (USD 157.81 billion, or 24.96%), EEU (USD 115.01 billion, or 10.61%), SCO (USD 158.21 billion, or 3.25%), and SAARC (1.9%). [8] However, it is clear that these figures can hardly say about sustainability of post-industrial centre economies, falling into state of strategic instability. This reminds the situation on the eve of the World War One, when the developed trade relations and economic interdependence did not prevent the outbreak of the global armed conflict.

Strategic instability of the economic system under globalisation is also caused by deep tension between the global technosphere (material basis of globalisation) and

traditional civilization, which is overcoming unification trend, and is even intensified within differentiation, regionalization, indigenization trends. Facing the conflict with social development, produced by the global technosphere, traditional civilization produce tension in the system of globalism. For example, the principles of neo-liberalism oppose culture-centric traditional civilization, engender the phenomenon of indigenization. The latter do not deny liberalization, yet is trying to mediate differences between Westernization and globalisation and traditional values, like Confucian ethics in China or Shia Islam in Iran.

The growth sector of the New economy undermines the ability to develop of the real sectors of the global economy, and produces the «order in chaos». Exacerbating inequality in income and opportunities, promoting industry and «culture» of violence, paradoxically, we are expecting to strengthen global dominance by improving the tools of «managing chaos». Ignacio Ramon noted that to determine our current era the concept of «geopolitics of chaos» is the most applicable. It is accompanied by mutation of power, rising power disorganisation and anaemia, superseded expectations for a «new world order», leading to the anxiety and confusion, surge of irrationality, and cultural pessimism. He defines the emergence of new type of totalitarian ideology as «global free modes». «Relying on the dogma of globalism, they do not allow any other policy, ignoring the social rights of citizens for the reason of competitiveness. An increasing ability of global capitalism to produce social inequalities contributed to the mass indignation and riots». [9, p. 45-47]

Conflict within the system of globalism produces de-globalisation. Contributing to the instability and inefficiency of the global institutions, deep tension between global and national levels of the world system causes the crisis, emerging at the centre of the system - in the United States. O. G. Belorus in 2003 wrote about the growing crisis of globalism, as he considered «the absence or ineffectiveness of global institutions of governance (global crisis)», the opacity of the process of global decision-making and their detachment from real people's interests as one of the indicators [2, p. 219]. According to him, «the crisis and conflict of social globalism is based upon the anonymous protest against global governance of the world» [2, p. 220]. Thus, the crisis of globalism is primarily the crisis of governance.

Crisis means the inability of the system to function (i.e., to respond adequately to internal and external challenges in the form of demands and support), and to develop (i.e. to be directed properly to the orderly change, leading to qualitative systemic shift) as a result of important infraction of internal relations and relations with the environment. Manifestation of the crisis is the internal strain of the system, resulting in the inability of the controls to make appropriate decisions and ensure their implementation.

The crisis of globalisation inevitably causes the crisis of the political system of mondialism, which emerges as a product of the development of the economic globalism. The main problem of the mondialism system is its inability to cope with the growing globally social opposition to globalisation - both inside nation-states, and between post-industrial world and the rest of the world. Global social policy is still a subject of political debate, as global system still lacks mechanisms of social partnership. There is also no effective balance between the poles of the globalised world. System of mondialism was paradoxically using anti-systemic approaches to solve conflicts, as it is not dominated by integration as by exclusion, pushing outside «rogue states», making them to act in anti-systemic way. It worth to note that under de-globalisation «losers», mainly - most poor countries, tend to fall out again like they did under globalisation [10].

The procedure of exclusion and restrictive standards destroy the liberal democratic foundations of the political system of the mondialism. Its ideological justification was directly linked to the ideals of equality of the Nations, and their right to collectively build their future, according to the UN principles. It was the only value-based approach possible to erect universal system under global modernization, yet never

implemented in reality. But currently global governance is split between the formal equality of people and nations, and the elitism, which is the foundation of so-called «esoteric globalism.» The concepts of «democracy», «human rights», etc. widely used by the agents of globalisation, are applied to establish global hegemony at neototalitarian basis. K. Schmitt warned about this threat of «universalist, covering the whole world general concepts, that are the typical instruments of interventionism in international law» [11, p. 509]. This universalism covers up the scraping of global modernization, depriving mondialism of the option to run global governance on democracy basis. As a general outcome, integrative capabilities of the system are eroding.

As a result, the crisis of democracy emerges at every level of governance, reflected in double standards and attempts to implement various forms of «managed democracy» (as opposite to sovereign democracy). It identifies the crisis of the whole political system of mondialism. This crisis develops from centre to periphery, from the global institutions down to the level of nation-states. Everywhere democratic rhetoric conceal anti-democratic, plutocratic content of the political process (when the minority consisting of rascals, controls the majority composed from idiots).

It is obvious that political system of mondialism has features of antinomistic system, which purpose is to maintain non-equilibrium state between global centre and global periphery, which in fact acquires a qualitative signs of confrontation of «civilization» and «barbarism.» The first is associated with the global technosphere, currently at post-industrial stage of development, and the second - with «backward», traditional civilization. This system preserves the new «global estates» as the basis of metaregional stratification of the global society.

Both developed, developing, and transitional societies, involved into the processes of globalisation of administration, are undergoing significant changes in political systems produced by the conflict between advocates of greaterer preservation of national identity, and advocates of integration and universalisation.

In 1990 E. Toffler predicted the split of voters into four different groups: «globalists», «nationalists», «regionalists», and «local patriots», each fiercely defending their interests and views, and look for allies [12, p. 294]. Political spectrum, indeed, is shifting towards this direction, further reflecting growing contradiction between desire to integrate into international structures, and desire to preserve national identity. Each society is living under deepening split between advocates and opponents of globalism as ideology and sociopolitical system. This split affects both operation of the political system of mondialism and evolution of the globalisation. Globalists and alter-globalists are becoming the dominant ideological forces in the global world. This fact is confirmed by every major election campaign in recent years in the Western world, culminating in the presidential elections of 2016 in the United States.

The growing protest movement against globalism and mondialism (including the euroscepticism) is directly related to the crisis of the global and American economies. At the beginning of the millennia I. Wallerstein wrote: «the world capitalist economy has now entered the final crisis - a crisis that may last up to 50 years» [13, p. 25]. In support of this claim we may notice an increase in financial earthquakes starting from the global debt crisis of 1982-1983, growing to the current permanent crisis from the year 2000 until now. Separate events here are concealing successive waves of the profound crisis of the whole system of global capitalism.

We should acknowledge that globalisation is not an irreversible process. It can be reversed, according to M. Simai, «because of the serious economic or political distractions, crises and conflicts, which can lead to the disintegration of the world economy, or the collapse of the existing institutional structures.» In proof of this thesis he cites the dynamics of economic internationalization, expressed in the difference between the growth of international trade and global production. Their values were: 1.1% (1870-1900), 1.8% (1900-1913),

1.4% (1913-1950), 2.8% (1950-1972), 1.2% (1972-1987), 3.8% (1988-1994) [14; 20].

Although the situation today is to certain extent reminiscent to the situation of the early twentieth century, fundamental differences exist: the crisis of internationalization of the early twentieth century was not accompanied by the crisis of the national state, on the contrary, led to the rise of nationalism and statism; that crisis unrolled while only weak, purely political «awakening of Asia» occurred, whereas now we are dealing with powerful impulses of orientalisation, which create a global alternative to Western, U.S.-centric model of globalisation.

Therefore, the ongoing crisis of globalisation may lead us not so into the beginning of the twentieth century, but rather to the end of the 15th century, when the modern world system was born. It seems that every condition for another geopolitical revolution are set, ready to move to new, «post-modern» world system. It is possible that new system will be built on the principles of «new regionalism», the «autarky of large spaces», and will be based on the interaction of civilizations. If geopolitical revolution of the late 15th - mid 17th centuries took the form of colonial expansion, the main mechanism of the second geopolitical revolution can become a geoeconomic war between the «large spaces».

It is logical that after the wave of globalisation we are going to encounter new wave of autarkisation of economy with the establishment of regional integration associations within «large spaces». It will be characterized by the collapse of the world financial system, of world trade and investment, with return to protectionist policies, resembling the situation of the 1920-30-ies. By the way, in 2001, the author of this article spoke about the impending crisis of globalisation, and noted that after the era of globalisation a new era of closed regionalism will come. If open regionalism of 1980-90-ies was an important mechanism of globalisation, the future closed regionalism will move in opposite direction [15]. Today, a symbolic statement of these changes was made in the decree by the new President of the USA D. Trump on the U.S. withdrawal from the agreement on the Trans-Pacific partnership. This project was real epitome of open regionalism and globalism.

Globalisation rose to its prominence as a fruit of Modernity, thus the end of this historical stage precludes the crisis of globalisation. Typically for the modern world system, every next wave of global expansion generates strong mondialisation emphasis linked to the attempts to create a global political «settings» on the globalised capitalist economy. This situation was already obvious at the turns of the twentieth and of the twenty first centuries. On the contrary, the trend of rising isolationism exacerbate the military-political rivalry among major regional states for global leadership. Since the development of the modern world system is determined by the planetary dualism, an escalation usually emerges as a clash of the leaders in bipolar world, with one representing continental, and the other - maritime worlds.

New regionalism precludes discarding of mondialist prospects of human development. It involves the formation of a comprehensive reproductive units of the world economy. In reality they correspond to the formations, when the continents connect the oceans, such as «Pacific - America - Atlantic», «Atlantic - Eurasia - Pacific» [16, p. 14-15]. This model was the foundation of 1823 Monroe doctrine, which, according to K. Schmitt, «is in the modern history of international law the first and still the most successful example of an international legal principle of the large space» [11, p. 494]. The formation of such basic units can be traced in the integration practice of economic associations like ASEAN, NAFTA, and MERCOSUR, as well as in the projects from «greater Europe from the Atlantic to the Pacific», to Chinese initiative «One Belt, one Road» to the Eurasian Economic Union. In fact, should economic integration of the European, Eurasian, and East Asian spaces succeed, it will produce an immense transcontinental unit, negating five centuries long dominance of maritime powers.

This model is the opposite to the model of the integrative function by the oceans, like the relationship «America -

Atlantic - Europe», institutionalised in military-political block of NATO, and its economic pillar - EU (same duality was simultaneously established in CMEA as economic pillar of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation). The same transoceanic model is behind APEC project, Trans-Pacific, and Transatlantic partnerships, both currently under heavy political debate. In fact, we see the failure of the last projects promoted by Obama administration, as well as Trump's claims about the effectiveness of NATO, are associated with the rise of the new regionalism.

A. Monk, proclaiming «triumph of the nationalist nihilism over cosmopolitan romanticism» [3], is drawing the line between Trump's success and demand for the ideal American of the future in line with Samuel Huntington theory - the ideal of WASP nationalism, based on the protection and strengthening of the qualities that defined America since its inception. But in a broader sense, the global world according to Huntington is a world divided along cultural lines into spheres of influence and responsibility between the core states of the regional civilizations. This is the civilisation dimension of the «new regionalism», global version of the traditional «European concert»

What is the difference between regional integries and modern integration associations? First of all, the former are based on the idea of «international legal inadmissibility of intervention by foreign forces into large space, with its own established order». They are in contrast with the model of open regionalism that is entirely compatible with the system of globalism and is its major component. Therefore, the strategic advantage of regional integries comparing to the existing integration projects is that they are able to protect the sovereignty of their members. Some current integration projects have a potential to transform into regional integries; ASEAN in South-East Asia, SCO and Eurasian Economic Union in Eurasia, NAFTA in North America, MERCOSUR and CELAC in Latin America, and African Union in Africa. But, despite the high levels of economic integration, such prospects look dubious for the EU, as it is facing the choice between its commitment to transatlantic solidarity with the United States and inclination to join large space from the Atlantic to the Pacific, where «Economic space of the New Silk Road» will play central role. In fact, Europe may once again turn into a small peninsula in the Far West of the Old World, as it was prior to the 16th century - another clear indication of the end of Modernity.

Global powers will emerge as a nucleus of the successful integries under transoceanic and transcontinental models. Those powers represent self-sufficient units with global spheres of influence and global aspirations for expansion. High degree of their self-sufficiency is backing their quest for global leadership and global hegemony, as well as making global development more steady. U.S. globalist elites are interested to implement transoceanic model «America -

Atlantic - Europe» as a tool to protect the status of the U.S. as global power. Transcontinental model «Atlantic - Eurasia - Pacific» is leaning towards a *jus publicum europaeum* of the New time, replicating the European concert at the global scale, according to polycentric model of interacting civilizations, with «core states» of regional civilizations playing roles similar to the old European great powers. Despite contradictions between them, they are conscious of their special responsibility to maintain sustainable global development. The success of this model depends primarily on the ability to develop a mutually acceptable model for the balanced development of Russia, China, India, Iran, and Turkey - the leaders of major traditional civilizations. Of course, the US and the West in general will make every effort to prevent this.

5. Conclusions

The system of globalism, which is a product of the latest stage of globalisation, entered deep crisis, which probably equals the crisis of the whole modern world system. With may expect the world to enter similar geopolitical revolution as the one in the late 15th - mid 17th centuries, when the modern world system emerged. New geopolitical revolution will end current historical stage, and will open a new era. Complex set of trends and conflicts will define the contours of the future, with important role played by the rivalry between transoceanic and transcontinental integration models. geoeconomic Transoceanic integration projects are to consolidate the rule of the *Nomos of the Sea*, while the transcontinental projects signify the revenge of the *Nomos of the Earth*.

Ukraine is in the center of such collision. While assessing geopolitical place and role of Ukraine in the world, former chairman of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, academician V. M. Lytvyn in 2003 put a reasonable question: «is the choice between Europe and Eurasia is even relevant under such conditions? Moreover, does it really exist?» Then he came to the conclusion that for Ukraine such need do not exist. Moreover, he drew attention to the fact that «reckless, unconditional and irrevocable accession to the opponent's side would hardly contribute to the process of formation of optimal elements of European international politics, the balancing of the political situation in Europe and the world» [17]. These thoughts reflected then widespread belief that the idea of greater Europe from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean should be the basis of Ukrainian foreign policy, opted to solve the key external and internal political issues of the country, and that it is the only way out of the geopolitical situation, that Ukraine found itself in. However, political trends that emerged already in 2004 overturned the implementation of this project and destroyed the opportunities to be as an active subject of global geopolitics and to contribute to more secure, balanced and fair European and World order. It is much harder now to use an advantage of Ukraine being at the crossroads of Europe and Eurasia, yet such possibility is still not lost completely.

References

1. Bello, W. (2002). *Deglobalisation: Ideas for a New World Economy*. L.-N.Y.: Zed Books.
2. Belorus, O. G. (2003). *The Economic System of Globalism*. Kyiv: KNEU (In Ukr.).
3. Monck, A. (2017, January 16). View from Davos: The intellectual crisis of globalisation. *Centre for International Governance Innovation*. Retrieved from <https://www.cigionline.org/articles/view-davos-intellectual-crisis-globalisation>
4. Kuznetsov, V. A. (1998). What is globalisation? *World Economy and International Relations (Mirovaia ekonomika i mezhdunarodnie otnosheniia)*, 2, 12-21 (In Russ.).
5. Oxfam International (2015, January 19). *Richest 1% will own more than all the rest by 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/pressreleases/2015-01-19/richest-1-will-own-more-all-rest-2016>
6. The World Bank (2017). *GDP, PPP (current international \$)*. Retrieved from <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.PP.CD>
7. Pakhomov, Y. M. (2000). New world economic order in the light of geopolitics. *World Economy (Svitova ekonomika)*, 27, 3-12 (In Ukr.).
8. Eurasian Bank of Development (2017). *A database of regional integration by the Centre for integration studies of the Eurasian Development Bank*. Retrieved from http://eabr.org/r/research/centre/projectsCII/regional_integration/index.php?id_16=49161
9. Ramone, I. (2001). *Geopolitics of chaos*. Moscow: TEIS (In Russ.).
10. Barbieri, P. (2016, November 13). The Losers of Deglobalisation: Why States Should Fear the Closing of an Open World. *Council on Foreign Relations*. Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2016-11-13/losers-deglobalisation>
11. Schmitt, C. (2008). *The Nomos of the Earth in the right of the people jus publicum europaeum*. Saint-Petersburg: Vladimir Dal (In Russ.).
12. Toffler, E. (2003) *Metamorphosis of Power*. Moscow: ACT (In Russ.).
13. Wallerstein, I. (2000). Globalisation or the transition period? *Economic strategies (Ekonomicheskie strategii)*, 2, 15-25 (In Russ.).
14. Simai, M. (1997). *Globalisation. A Source of Intense Competition, Conflicts and Opportunities at the End of XX Century*. Boston, December.
15. Shepelev, M. A. (2001). The Crisis of globalisation: prospects for global geoeconomic processes and their political consequences. *Edges (Grani)*, 1, 86-92 (In Russ.).
16. Cheshkov, M. A. (2001). *The Problems of globalisation: reality, trends, forecasts*. Moscow: «Novyi vek» (In Russ.).
17. Lytvyn, V. (2003). Europe or Eurasia? *Voice of Ukraine (Holos Ukrainy)*, 113 (In Ukr.).

Received 27.03.2017