

**341.231**

kupec.svtlana@rambler.ru

**Semchyshyn S. .**, graduate student of international relations, the Lviv National University Ivan Franko (Ukraine, Lviv), kupec.svtlana@rambler.ru

### **Sovereignty in international relations theory**

The main approaches to the interpretation of the concept «state sovereignty» in the theory of international relations are concerned. In particular, characteristics of criticism the ideas of representatives of the traditional course of the political thought are examined. Consideration is focused on the analysis of the impact of globalization on the transformation of the state sovereignty in the international relations.

The topicality of the theoretical understanding of the problem of state sovereignty nowadays is due to the reconsideration of the role of state in the system of international relations. The use of comparative and systemic methods of scientific knowledge allowed us to examine the subject of the study comprehensively, in the development and interaction with other phenomena. On this basis there was made an attempt to reveal certain regularities and tendencies in the interpretation of sovereignty of state and the impact on it of the processes of globalization by the representatives of different approaches of the theory of international relations.

Both the representatives of traditional and of modern schools of the theory of international relations agree on the opinion that the institute of sovereignty in the process of historical development is subjected to transformation that they, in

particular, denote through the notion of reinterpretation and reconstruction. This transformation, however, does not touch the fundamental bases of sovereignty and does not lead to its «end».

**Keywords:** sovereignty, state, international relations, globalization.

• „

,

.

(

,

),

kupec.svtlana@rambler.ru

«

»

,

,

.

.

:

,

,

,

.

,

,

,

.

,

,

.

—

.

—

.

,

— , , — , — ,

, ,

,

.

, ,

.

.

,

.

,

,

,

.

.

,

.

,

.

,

.

,

.

,

.

,

.

,

.

.

,

,

.

,

.

,

.

,

.

.

,

,

,

,

,

.

1)

2)

«

» [1, .29].

[2, .245].

[3, .65].

[4].

[5].

[6].

[7].

[8, .85].

( . , . , . )

— ,

« — ».

, , ,

.

, ,

. ,

.

, ,

.

, ,

.

,

.

,

, ,

,

, ,

, ,

,

,

.

,

.

,



[9].

( . , . ,

· , · ), ,

· ,

·

· ,

· , , ,

,

' [10, .41].

— ,

, ,

, , ·

·

, ,

, ,

, · —

, ,

· , ,

· ,

,

· ,

,

· :

·

(

— )

·

，  
，  
： ，  
，  
， « »，  
，  
，  
，  
— ，  
( ’ ， ， )，  
，  
« ， ，  
»， —

[11].

[12].

[13].

«

»,

[14].

«

».

[15, .201].

« »

·  
: « — » [16, .167].

, «

»

[16, .167].

( )

·

,

·

,

:

,

,

,

,

,

·

,

,

?

,

,

,

,

,

,

:

—

,

·

·

,

«

» [9],

,

«

,

» [17].

·

,

[18, .245].

») [19].

[20, .136–137].

( )

:

1. Clark I. Globalization and International Relations Theory. – Oxford University Press. – N.Y. – 1999.
2. Morgenthau H. Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. – N.Y. – 1978.
3. Krasner S. Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy. Princeton: Princeton University Press. – 1999.
4. Waltz K. Globalization and American power // The National Interest. – 2000. – P.46–55.
5. Gilpin R. The Challenge of Global Capitalism: the World Economy in the 21th Century // Princeton: Princeton University Press. – 2000. – .65–76.
6. Inayatullah and Blaney. Realizing Sovereignty // Review of International Studies. – 1995. – 21(1). – P.14.
7. S rensen G. Sovereignty: Change and Continuity in a Fundamental Institution // Political Studies. 1999. Vol. XLVII. – P.590–604.
8. Theories of International Relations. – N.Y. – 2001.
9. . . : // . . . – 2008. – C.14–42.
10. Wendt A. Identity and Structural Change in International Politics. – L.: Lapid and Kraticwil. – 1996.
11. . // . – 2005. – 3. – C.58–57.

12. Agamben, Giorgio and Homo Sacer. 1998. Sovereign Power and Bare Life. Stanford University Press. Critical Approaches to Security in Europe. A Networking Manifesto. – December 2006.
13. Little R. The English School Contribution to the Study of international Relations // European Journal of International Relations. – 2002. – 6. – P.395–422.
14. Mendelsohn B. English School, American Style: Testing the Preservation-seeking Quality of the International Society // European Journal of International Relations. – 2009. – 15 (2). – .291–318.
15. Buzan B. From International to WorldSociety? English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalization. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 2004.
16. Sylvester C. Feminist theory and international relations in a postmodern era. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 1994.
17. . . // . . . – 2008. – .104–128.
18. Bryson V. Feminist political theory. An introduction. The Macmillan press ltd. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire. – 1992.
19. Thomson J.E. State Sovereignty in International Relations: Bringing the Gap between Theory and Emperical Research // Intarnetional Studies Quarterly.1995. – 39 (2). – P.230.
20. Axford B. The Global System: Economics, Politics and Culture / Cambridge. – 1995.