

## СЕКЦІЯ 1.

# СУЧАСНИЙ МІЖНАРОДНИЙ ПОРЯДОК: ВИКЛИКИ, ЗАГРОЗИ, ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ

*Hopej Malwina*

*Instytut Studiów Międzynarodowych Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego*

## SOVEREIGNTY AND ORDER: A VISION OF THE FOURTH GEOPOLITICAL ORDER

**Анотація.** Стаття зосереджена на змінах, що відбуваються у міжнародному просторі, вплив яких можна спостерігати на національному, міжнародному (іноземне втручання у вибори), а також на індивідуальному (зміни в ідентичності) рівнях. Ці перетворення могли б віщувати четвертий геополітичний порядок.

**Ключові слова:** державний суверенітет, геополітичний порядок, іноземне втручання у вибори.

**Abstract.** This paper is focused on changes occurring in the international space the impact of which can be observed at a national, international (foreign electoral intervention), as well as individual (changes in identity) levels. These transformations could foreshadow the fourth geopolitical order.

**Keywords:** Sovereignty, geopolitical order, foreign electoral intervention.

Globalisation and the information revolution have contributed to the limiting of not only a state's capacity to control a given space that used to be an exclusive attribute of a nation state, but also modifications of authority-citizen relations and the way in which sovereignty is understood – at the level of politics, economy, and culture. Nowadays, sovereign power is being limited as a result of bilateral and multilateral connections on a regional or a global scale. At the domestic level, sovereignty is limited not only by agreements concluded with other states and organisations, but also by transformations that take place in society, an example of which is network identity [5, p. 90-92].

This assumption is the starting point of this paper, whose role is solely to make a contribution to further considerations; in this paper, I would like to draw attention to two phenomena that have recently intensified and that perhaps will keep re-occurring in the nearest future, leading to further limitation of sovereignty, namely, electoral interventions conducted by foreign states and corporations. The impact of other entities on national elections has long been discussed, primarily in the context of weak states; nonetheless, the phenomenon of interfering in elections in the United States of America, which is considered the sole hegemon, is unsettling. Perhaps limited sovereign power of a nation state (as the basic actor of international relations) will become an element characteristic of the fourth geopolitical order.

Referring to John Agnew and Stuart Corbridge, it is possible to identify in the years 1815-1990 three orders where various combinations of spatial organisation of international relations prevailed. The third period (the years 1945-1990) is the Cold

War order, with the world divided into two dominant areas of influence [1, p. 13-22]. Towards the end of the third order, the structure of the US neoliberal presence in the international arena was two-fold: economic matters and security apparatus. Another phenomenon characteristic of that period was institutionalisation, an example of which is NATO and the IMF; however, over time, this 'supranational liberal order' started functioning independently of the USA, foreshadowing the fourth geopolitical order. At present, one can notice only an outline of the fourth period based on a new form of transnational liberalism. This is noticeable particularly in economy – the Doha Development Round commenced in 2001, and other agreements that constitute a continuation of a rise in the number of regional groups that has been observed since the 1980s due to international economic integration processes. At the economic and the institutional levels, a new geopolitical order may be said to have been formed; however, identification of other characteristic traits will not be possible in the nearest ten years or so, when it is possible to determine that these traits are not momentary changes but a trend that plays part in the formation of the new order.

Moving to titular sovereignty, one should mention foreign electoral intervention. It is a situation in which “one or more sovereign countries intentionally undertakes specific actions to influence an upcoming election in another sovereign country in an overt or covert manner that they believe will favor or hurt one of the sides contesting that election and which incurs, or may incur, significant costs to the intervener(s) or the intervened country” [4, p. 192].

In the years 1946-2000, the United States of America interfered in 81 foreign elections, while the Soviet Union or Russia interfered in 36 elections [3, 88-106]. However, since mid-1980s, the number of US interventions has fallen, while the number of Soviet/Russian interventions remains at the same level. There is no scientific research that would be more recent, but in 2018 it was observed [2, p. 36] that the most intense interventions using false information were conducted by China in the local elections in Taiwan, and by Russia in the parliamentary elections in Latvia. The third place is taken by the USA – Russia and Kremlin-related hackers responsible for, among others, running accounts in social websites, were accused of interfering in the American midterm elections. In virtually every elections of greater importance, administrators of social media outlets carry out operations consisting in deleting suspicious accounts or false content that may contribute to a shift in the results of elections.

In 2016, Dov H. Levin wrote that in order for the phenomenon of a great power interfering in foreign elections to take place, two conditions must be met, namely, the condition of a motive and the condition of an opportunity. Firstly, a great power has to notice that a candidate or a party running in elections constitutes a threat for its interests due to views and interests being significantly different from the great power's preferences. Secondly, an important state actor must be cooperating with the great power and providing it with information on the most effective intervention methods. If any of these conditions is not met, a great power does not interfere in a given election [4, p. 189-202].

The definitions presented by Levin imply that both sides of foreign electoral interventions are nation states that vary in terms of their respective potential. However, what about a situation where one of the sides is a corporation operating in a virtual space, while the other is a hegemon?

In January 2021, Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter suspended accounts of the president of the world's most powerful country – the United States of America. Were corporations allowed to deny one of the most powerful people in the world his right to freedom of speech? Acting on the principles of the federal and state law, Facebook and Instagram violated the constitutional right to freedom of speech. The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which prohibits restrictions of the free exercise of religion, freedom of the press, speech, the right of the people to petition and to assemble, entered into force in 1791. It is not without significance that Donald Trump's views are very far away from those of Mark Zuckerberg's, and American society is divided in terms of political preferences, facilitating the occurrence of a condition of an opportunity.

The question is, how to determine the limits of freedom of speech so that citizens' rights are not restricted, while protecting the sovereignty of the state at the very same time? One should bear in mind that geopolitics is not confined to a territory, an example of which is the concept of geopolitical analysis understood as a structure and culture where the importance of popular culture and mass media is taken into account. In the third geopolitical order, the significant role of international organisations started to be recognised; therefore, it was agreed that non-state actors can serve functions in an international system. Perhaps in the fourth order, a similar role will be played by representatives of other non-state actors, such as transnational corporations?

The impact of corporations on the domestic situation of weak states is noticeable, particularly, if it is a negative impact and it leads to a change in legislation, and, consequently, a lower quality of citizens' life. However, I would venture to say that people's lifestyle in the 21st century and the fourth geopolitical order are substantially different to those of the preceding period. This is largely due to globalisation and the information revolution, owing to which the network society and the network identity have been formed. This type of identity is a result of an individual living her life more in the virtual world than the actual one, and starting to identify with the virtual world of her choice, consequently, considering website users or online group users members of her community.

In this understanding, identity (or rather one of the possible options in the Western societies) has complicated my question about the way in which a state's sovereignty could be protected without limiting its citizens' rights. Identity is the most important category that regulates the relationship between a person and the world – this assumption made by Manuel Castells shows why freedom of speech in the context of restrictions imposed on social media is so important for modern society. It also allows one to imagine reactions to implementation of national legislation intended to regulate rules for publishing content on social websites, aiming at minimising or excluding the phenomenon of electoral interventions carried out by other states, but

also situations where administrators or owners of such websites are denying politicians who are legally in power their right to freedom of expression.

### References

1. Agnew J., Corbridge S., *Mastering Space. Hegemony, territory and international political economy*. London, 1995.
2. *Democracy Facing Global Challenges. V-Dem Annual Democracy Report 2019*.
3. Levin D. H. Partisan Electoral Interventions by the Great Powers: Introducing the PEIG Dataset. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 36 (1), 2019.
4. Levin D. H. When the Great Power Gets a Vote: The Effects of Great Power Electoral Interventions on Election Results. *International Studies Quarterly*, 60 (2), 2016.
5. Szczepański M. S., Śliz A. *Tożsamość w świecie na rozdrożu*, Libor G., Wódz J. ed. *Niedokończone tożsamości społeczne: szkice socjologiczne*, Katowice, 2015.

**Юзик Анастасія**

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка*

## ОСОБЛИВОСТІ СУЧАСНОГО БЕЗПЕКОВОГО ДИСКУРСУ У МІЖНАРОДНИХ ПРОЦЕСАХ

**Анотація.** Подано генезу та теоретичні основи дослідження концепції дискурсу у науці про міжнародні відносини. Розглянуто особливості безпекового дискурсу та проаналізовано його практичний вимір на прикладі процесів сек'юритизації, десек'юритизації, стратегічних наративів, що є ключовими інструментами сучасної зовнішньої політики держав.

**Ключові слова:** дискурс, міжнародна безпека, сек'юритизація.

**Abstract.** The genesis and theoretical foundations of the study of the concept of discourse in the science of international relations are presented. The peculiarities of the security discourse are considered and its practical dimension is analyzed on the example of the processes of securitization, desecuritization, strategic narratives, which are the key tools of modern foreign policy.

**Keywords:** discourse, international security, securitization.

Сучасні виклики міжнародного порядку потребують нових підходів до вивчення та розуміння міжнародних відносин, які забезпечуватимуть належні експланативні основи для важливих міжнародних процесів. Гібридизація міжнародних відносин та відхід від етатизму викликали сумніви щодо ефективності звичних методів аналізу та поставили дослідників перед дилемою: притримуватися методології позитивізму, проте визнати нездатність прогнозувати тенденції через постійну мінливість міжнародного середовища, чи застосувати альтернативну прагматично-гносеологічну установку – постпозитивізм – та значно розширити межі пізнання й аналізу.

Дилема, що згодом переросла у наукову полеміку, відбувалася у 1980–90 рр. та у теорії міжнародних відносин отримала назву четвертої, або мета-теоретичних дебатів. Результатом наукового диспуту стало виокремлення