

ропы считают, что принятие Турции в члены Евросоюза способно окончательно разрешить в Европе пресловутую проблему под названием “исламская угроза”.

Список использованных источников

1. Мамедов Р.К., Мамедов А.Г. Шенгенское право и Шенгенская виза (на азерб. яз.) / Научно-теоретический и практический журнал “Транспортное право”. – Баку, 2011. – № 4.
2. Шеатер Д. Тше идея оф Еуропеан Унитї. – Л., 1992.
3. Гаджи Джан. Право Европейского Союза (на турец. яз.). – Стамбул, 2013.
4. Шемятенков В.Г. Европейская интеграция. Учебное пособие. – М., 2003.
5. Озкан Ш., Сельджук Эмсен О. Теории экономической интеграции и Европейский Союз (на турец. яз.). – Анкара, 2007.
6. Европейское право. Под общ. ред. проф. Л.М. Энтина. – М., 2000.
7. Саурон Ж.Л. Ёмпрендре ле Траите де Лиссабоне. – Парис, 2008.
8. Мумджу А. Права человека и свобода общества (на турец. яз.). – Анкара, 2007.
9. Сельджук С. На пути к демократии (на турец. яз.). – Анкара, 1999.
10. Халук Гюнугур. Европейская интеграция после Лиссабонского соглашения (на турец. яз.). – Анкара, 2012.
11. Мамедова О.А. Международное частноправовое регулирование Турецко-Азербайджанских отношений. Монография (на азерб. яз.). – Баку, 2013.
12. Шаллстеин В. Буллетин дес ЁЕ, Септембер / Оьобре. – 1963. – Но.9/10.
13. Донї М. Ле дроит де ла Ёоммунауте ет де л’Унион Еуропеевне, де ЁЕЕ. – Брухеллес, 2001.
14. С. Демирель Девран. Информационное Агентство АВС (на турец. яз.). – Анкара, 2007.
15. Международные соглашения по правам человека и Турция в Европейском Союестве (на турец. яз.). – Стамбул, 2006.
16. Сочнев И.А. Перспективы вступления Турции в ЕС: социально-политические и социально-культурные аспекты. Автореф. дисс. – М., 2012.
17. Йавуз Ш. Политїал Ислам анд тше Weltаре (Решаф) Парти ин Туркеї // Ёомпаративе Политїс. Оьт. – 1997. – Вол.30. – Но.1. – П.61–68.
18. Риссе Т. А Ёоммунитї оф Еуропеанс: траннатионал идентитїс анд публик спшсерес. – УСА: Ёорнелл Университї Пресс, 2010.
19. Газета “Заман” (на турец. яз.). – 02.01.1987.
20. Газета “Миллиет” (на турец. яз.). – 04.02.1987.
21. Турецкий Уголовный Закон. – Анкара, 2013.
22. Бжезинский З. Великая шахматная доска. Господство Америки и его геостратегические императивы. – М., 2000.
23. Халис Чевик. Трагедия древних земель. Средний Восток в международной политике (на турец. яз.). – Конья, 2005.

References

1. Mamedov R.K., Mamedov A.G. Shengenovskoe pravo i Shengenovskaja viza (na azerb. jaz.) / Nauchno-teoreticheskij i prakticheskij zhurnal “Transportnoe pravo”. – Baku, 2011. – № 4.
2. Shheater D. Tshhe idea of European Unitj. – L., 1992.
3. Gadzhi Dzhhan. Pravo Evropejskogo Sojuza (na turec. jaz.). – Sтамbul, 2013.
4. Shemjatenkov V.G. Evropejskaja integracija. Uchebnoe posobie. – M., 2003.
5. Ozkan Sh., Sel’dzhuk Jemsen O. Teorii jekonomicheskoy integracii i Evropejskij Sojuz (na turec. jaz.). – Ankara, 2007.
6. Evropejskoe pravo. Pod obshh. red. prof. L.M. Jentina. – M., 2000.
7. Sauron Zh.L. Ёомprendre le Traite de Lissabone. – Paris, 2008.
8. Mumdzhu A. Prava cheloveka i svoboda obshhestva (na turec. jaz.). – Ankara, 2007.
9. Sel’dzhuk S. Na puti k demokratii (na turec. jaz.). – Ankara, 1999.
10. Haluk Gjunugur. Evropejskaja integracija posle Lissabonskogo soglashenija (na turec. jaz.). – Ankara, 2012.
11. Mamedova O.A. Mezhdunarodnoe chastnopravovoe regulirovanie Turecko-Azerbajdzhanskih otnoshenij. Monografija (na azerb. jaz.). – Baku, 2013.

12. Shhallstein W. Bulletin des ЁЕ, September / Oьobre. – 1963. – No.9/10.
13. Donj M. Le droit de la Ёоммунауте ет де л’Union Europeenne, de YEE. – Bruhelles, 2001.
14. S. Demirjel’ Devran. Informacionnoe Agentstvo AVS (na turec. jaz.). – Ankara, 2007.
15. Mezhdunarodnye soglashenija po pravam cheloveka i Turcija v Evropejskom Soobshhestve (na turec. jaz.). – Sтамbul, 2006.
16. Sochnev I.A. Perspektivy vstuplenija Turcii v ES: social’no-politicheskie i social’no-kul’turnye aspekty. Avtoref. diss. – M., 2012.
17. Javuz Shh. Politїal Islam and tshhe Weltare (Reshhaf) Partj in Turkej // Ёомпаративе Политїс. Оьт. – 1997. – Vol.30. – No.1. – P. 61–68.
18. Risse T. A Ёоммунитї of Europeans: trannational identities and publi# spshseres. – USA: Ёornell Universitj Press, 2010.
19. Gazeta “Zaman” (na turec. jaz.). – 02.01.1987.
20. Gazeta “Milliet” (na turec. jaz.). – 04.02.1987.
21. Tureckij Ugolovnyj Zakon. – Ankara, 2013.
22. Bzhezinskij Z. Velikaja shahmatnaja doska. Gospodstvo Ameriki i ego geostrategicheskie imperativy. – M., 2000.
23. Halis Chevik. Tragedija drevnih zemel’. Srednij Vostok v mezhdunarodnoj politike (na turec. jaz.). – Kon’ja, 2005.

Makhmudova O.A., PhD in Law, Department Head of the Azerbaijan Institute of Strategic Studies (Azerbaijan, Baku), matlabm@yandex.com

The integration of Turkey into the European Union: the supporters and opponents

Presented to your attention an article on “Turkish flag should fly over Brussels: supporters and opponents” is devoted to one of the most important issues of international policy, acceptance of Turkey into the European Community. The article discusses the position of leading world powers and the opinions of influential politicians on this issue in the context of its supporters and opponents. The author proposes to discuss their position readers and vision on this issue, making appropriate scientific generalization and reasoning for its conclusions extensive academic and journalistic literature.

Keywords: European Union, the Republic of Turkey, the Copenhagen criteria, geopolitical interests, religious issues, integration, Middle Eastern draft Treaty on European Union.

Махмудова О.А., доктор філософії по праву, завідувача відділом, Азербайджанський інститут стратегічних досліджень (Азербайджан, Баку), matlabm@yandex.com

Питання інтеграції Туреччини в Європейський Союз: прихильники і противники

Представлена на вашу увагу стаття на тему “Турецький прапор повинен майорити над Брюсселем: прихильники і противники” присвячена одній з найважливіших проблем міжнародної політики, прийняттю Туреччини в Європейське Співтовариство. У статті розглядаються позиції провідних держав світу і думки впливових політиків з даного питання в контексті її прихильників і супротивників. Автор пропонує на обговорення читачів свою позицію і бачення з даного питання, робить відповідні наукові узагальнення і аргументує свої висновки великою науковою і публіцистичною літературою.

Ключові слова: Європейський Союз, Турецька Республіка, Копенгагенські критерії, геополітичні інтереси, релігійні проблеми, інтеграція, Середньосхідний проект, Договір про Європейський Союз.

* * *

УДК101.1

Aliyev N. Q.

Doctoral student, Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of the National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan (Azerbaijan, Baku), aliye@socar-germany.de

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE STATE SOVEREIGNTY IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION: THE DIALECTIC OF CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN AZERBAIJAN

This article attempts to explain the change and transformation of the sovereignty of nation states which occur under the pressure of globalization in the modern world. As an example of the post-Soviet state, Azerbaijan and its transformation of state sovereignty is the object of analysis of this article. The first part of this article highlights the problems associated with the definitions and interpretations of controversial concepts of “globalization”, “sovereignty”, the dialectic of continuity and change in the content and form of the sovereignty of nation states; also, the myths about the “disappearance”, “irrelevance” and “obsolescence” of the state sovereignty are debunked. The second part describes the emergence and dynamics of complex socio-political, cultural and economic development paths of the national sovereignty (with

four types of transformation of the nation state) of Azerbaijan. The particular attention is given to the transformation processes occurring since the collapse of the Soviet Union. The general conclusion of the paper is that the globalization does not undermine the base of sovereignty of nation states; it rather enhances it, as effective sovereignty is a strong precondition for the globalization itself.

Keywords: Azerbaijan, state sovereignty, globalization, transformation, dialectic of continuity and change, non-state actors.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

1. Definition and Interpretation of Basic Concept

The sovereignty is one of the controversial concepts in modern social, political and legal sciences. Particularly strong debates among scholars of international relations are about the nature and evolution of the concept of sovereignty. Although we are aware that this is appropriate in this context, but we have no intention to give here another definition for the term “sovereignty” or “globalization”. Thus, we confine ourselves to a critical assessment of some methodological principles regarding the definitions of “essentially contestable concept of sovereignty” [1]. Indeed, many people use this concept regardless of its meaning, though the clarity and accuracy of the meaning of sovereignty are important methodological requirements for the definition and implementation of the concept: “Nothing is today more greatly needed than clarity upon ancient notions. Sovereignty, liberty, authority, personality – these are the words, of which we want alike the history and the definition; or rather we want the history because its substance is in fact the definition” [2, p.314]. Another thought may also serve as a methodological requirement in specifying the term sovereignty. Concerning the importance of history in determining any social phenomenon, Nietzsche says that it is possible to define only things that have no history [3, p.13]. Taking above mentioned ideas into consideration we may conclude that, first, the precision of the concept of “sovereignty” is closely related to the dialectics of unity of history of origin and theory of the concept, without which it is difficult to determine the interrelationship of continuity and changes in the evolution of the concept of sovereignty. Second, it is important to distinguish the original or “the core meaning” of the concept from a variety of additional, secondary, even quasi-meanings, which have overgrown as a result of complex social and conceptual metamorphoses. Some scholars, comparing it with another “elusive” term, notice that “the concept of sovereignty has been used not only in different senses by different people or in different senses at different times by the same people, but also in different senses by the same person in rapid succession” [4, p.4]. Therefore, the meaning of sovereignty in each historical case is to be driven from the context, because it has no universal definition, which would be taken unanimously by all parties involved in the debate on sovereignty [5]. Different studies attempted to openly discredit not only the concept of sovereignty, but also the theory of state sovereignty [6]. Others stated that “the sovereign nation states are fading away”. Some even declared that “the problem of sovereignty today is meaningless for the social sciences”, that the term “has lost its value and analytical relevance”. Finally, sovereignty was described as “perforated, desecrated, cornered, extinct, anachronistic, and bothersome” [7]. The disadvantage of such “condemnations of sovereignty” is that, firstly, they have been poorly grounded in terms of logical argumentation. Secondly, instead of explaining and justifying scientifically the complex political and legal concept “sovereignty” and of discovering the reasons why sovereignty

“can have different meanings for different people belonging to different cultures, who practice different specialized and professional competences for the different periods of history”, some scientists have, however, because of its ambiguity, made wrong conclusions and urged to reject or replace it with another concept [5, p.143]. We align with the thought that “the origin and history of the concept of sovereignty is closely related to the nature, origin, and history of the state” [8, p. 2]. We also insist one methodologically distinguish between the changes in the forms of these institutions and the changes, occurring in the minds of theorists of sovereignty. A distinguished researcher has noticed that “as the concept of sovereignty has various conflicting meanings, it never creates identical patterns in the minds of different scientists” [9;10; 4]. Thus, the contestable nature of the concept cannot serve any reason to abandon that concept. As aptly highlights one scientist that “if we were to abandon all essentially contested terms in political science the field would be severely impoverished” [10, p.113]. The proper approach to sovereignty therefore may consist in challenging both the traditional and one’s own idea about sovereignty until a clear or less ambiguous meaning of the concept in question is reached. Certainly, our conception is in line with that of Samantha Besson, who points out that: “The idea here is, on the contrary, to consider the capacity of adaptation of both the concepts of sovereignty and state. Both may be withheld and remain important in practice. No one can deny that the state remains one of the key elements of the international order or that it is necessary to have a sovereign or ultimate authority to settle conflicts” [11, p. 5]. The most contemporary theories of sovereignty suffer from one general methodological shortcoming, which philosophers of ordinary language call “descriptive fallacy”, i.e. an erroneous assumption that there exists something in reality, which corresponds to the concept “sovereignty” [12, p.283–313]. We distinguish three opposing positions on this issue. First are the followers of state sovereignty or “state-centrists”, who consider sovereign states as the main loci of supreme political power and the future society. According to them, sovereignty is perceived in its standard definition as “the rule of power within a given territory”, more accurately, the rule of state power within a given territory [13, p.16–17]. It is actually the core meaning of sovereignty. Obviously, this approach is similar, but not identical with the classical approaches to sovereignty. The second position is represented by the advocates of radical conceptualization of sovereignty. They consider the concept of state sovereignty as “obsolete” and “outdated” and, therefore, they reject it. Finally, the third position, which can be defined as moderate, aims to prove the compatibility of national states with the profound changes taking place under the influence of globalization in social, economic, political and cultural aspects of modern life. The reasons of the theoretical misconceptions that we have dealt with so far are anchored in violating philosophical principles of formation of abstract and concrete concepts in the field of social and political sciences, i.e. in inability to distinguish between generic and specific categories. Thus, the proponents of profound changes in the concept of “sovereignty” adhere to the nominalists understanding the nature of the concept. They argue that the concept is not more than just a general name used to classify or categorize different things. So the conceptual understanding of the change of sovereignty comes as a re-

sult of historical discontinuity between the various subjective classifications of sovereignty. In other words, the existence of categories and concepts depends on our description or language. Since everything is flowing and changing, there is nothing constant in the world. The realists, on the contrary, believe that sovereignty is the permanent feature of the political life, because the categories or types of “objects” exist independently from our sentences, i.e. from our language. In other words, realists distinguish between “forest” and “trees”, while nominalists see only the trees. This is why realists consider conceptual changes as variations of the core meaning of the concept sovereignty, which remains unchanged and constant in their space–time dimensions. It is necessary therefore to distinguish between the constant and changing ingredients of the concept of sovereignty. Although the institution of sovereignty is changing over time, there are constitutive features that remain unchanged. According to D. Sorensen, the constant features and vital elements of continuity, the founding core meaning of sovereignty is a constitutional independence enjoyed by states, which have territory, population and government.

2. The Transformation of the State sovereignty of Azerbaijan

The transformation processes often occurred in the modern and contemporary history of Azerbaijan. The causes of these transformations originated from the necessity to match to the rapidly changing conditions of South Caucasus region. The changes firstly happened in the values and social spheres, and then led to the political and economic reformation. We propose to distinguish 4 stages of the transformation process in the historical and cultural evolution of Azerbaijan:

1. The period of the South Caucasus Khanates that were losing their independence, and the establishment of power of the Russian Empire.
2. The establishment of the state independence of Azerbaijan in 1918.
3. The loss of independence during the Soviet era.
4. The reestablishment of the state independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

However, due to the limited frame of this article, we will briefly touch upon the 3–rd and 4–th stages of transformation of the state sovereignty of Azerbaijan in the context of the latest waves of globalization started since the 1990–s. We assume that the globalization should not be seen as the sole reason of the transformation of sovereignty, as it is asserted by hyper–globalizers. There are many definitions of globalization. Though often controversial, each of them emphasizes a particular aspect of this complex phenomenon [17]. According to our working definition globalization mostly means an expansion of social relations in the interdependent world, the globalization of the local and localization of global events, the creation of patterns of social interactions, occurring under the influence of developed economic, technological and cultural innovations [18; 1]. On the globalization issue we adhere to the classification, developed by Cochrane and Pain who divide modern debates into three groups [19, p.22–24]. But unlike them, we distinguish hyper–globalists in a specific subgroup, since not all the globalists decrease or deny the state sovereignty. First are the globalists, who perceive globalization as an inevitable social process, in which national economies, politics and cultures are seen as a part of a network of global flows. The

second group is traditionalist skeptics, who deny the novelty of globalization and consider it as a myth. Some of them totally deny globalization. In this regard the concepts of Marxist–traditionalists and radical political economists can serve as examples [20, p.235–236]. Other traditionalists state that we are witnessing the economic changes, which are just a result of regionalization growth and interactions between geographically neighboring states, but not globalization. Therefore, they insist nation states remain strong central actors in the domestic and foreign policy of countries, and the national economies continue play a primary role. The traditionalists reject the possibility of a global culture in any relevant sense [21, p.14–15]. Finally, third group of transformists aim to take the middle ground between globalists and traditionalists. On one hand, transformists state that the current changes do not mean the entry into a completely new, unrecognizable era of changes towards a global economy, culture and politics. On the other hand, they do not agree with the proposal that nothing has changed. On the contrary, they believe that the current global transformations are the result of “range of complex interconnected relationships” [19, p.23]. Thus, the hyper–globalizers argue that the traditional nation state becomes “artificial”, unable to effectively manage the economic and other international transactions, because the power is moving from the state to various private and public actors, especially to the private markets players.

The rapid collapse of the USSR awakened a national consciousness of Azerbaijani people and made the restoration of the state independence inevitable. The crisis of the ruling Communist Party and government structures were deepening and the national movement was enlarging. The situation was aggravated by the worsening of Armenian–Azerbaijani conflict, which began in Nagorno–Karabakh, where ethnic Armenian separatists decided to violently separate this region from the country. They were supported by Armenia and the Armenian Diaspora communities abroad. This process led to a large–scale war. As a result, the entire Azerbaijani population of Armenia, Nagorno–Karabakh and neighboring regions became refugees. They fled to the various regions of Azerbaijan, most of them to the capital city Baku. This process led to social disruptions and further decline of the local authorities.

Nowadays there are many efficient measures to create an atmosphere of stability and economic prosperity in the country. Today one may say that the period of economic transition in Azerbaijan has been completed. During this time the direction has been taken to Euro–Atlantic integration. Over the recent years the country was able to overcome the isolation from the rest of the world and ensure its rapid development. Also, the information blockade, which Azerbaijan experienced after the collapse of the USSR, was broken. The basics for democratic development, rights and freedoms of population are secured by the country’s national Constitution. During the years of independence Azerbaijan has become an open country for the rest of the world. It has a membership in many international organizations. Particularly, Azerbaijan has become a member of such major organization, as the United Nations (also of its specialized structures, such as UNESCO, UNICEF and etc.). Within a membership of this organization various social, educational and other projects have been implemented [25]. Azerbaijan is expanding its membership in various

European institutions and organizations [26]. Thus, the country has become a member of OSCE and Council of Europe; it has joined Helsinki Final Act, the Paris Charter and has signed Convention on Human Rights. This cooperation is also related to the field of democratic processes under the institutions of human rights and civil society building. Entry into these structures imposes certain obligations on the country, which has to democratize its national legislation. In all these integration processes the building of civil society plays an important role, as no integration into the European structures is possible without a strong civil society. Civil society in Azerbaijan is based on various non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which have a broad spectrum of activities. The state encourages their activities and considers them as partners [27]. The only condition is to function within the law system of the country. In order to weaken the foreign influence on the local NGOs, the state has decided to finance their activities. For this purpose the Council of State Support to NGOs under the President of Azerbaijan Republic was established. Also, the Board Charter was adopted [28]. Also, Azerbaijan arranges various conferences and public debates on problems of civil society building. Along with the Euro-Atlantic integration, the government of Azerbaijan has decided to conduct balance policies regarding the nearest neighboring countries – Russia and Iran. The great importance is given to the integration of Azerbaijan to the countries of the former Soviet camp. For instance, Azerbaijan is a member of CIS and under the charter of this organization Azerbaijan has broad social, political, legal, educational and economic ties with other member countries, specifically with Russia. Participation in GUAM, uniting Georgia, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan and Moldova, is also another form of cooperation with former Soviet countries. Azerbaijan also actively participates in other international organizations, e.g. the Non-Aligned Movement. There are state-level cooperation with all countries of the world. The trade is expanding, more diplomatic missions are opening. There is an active cooperation in the framework of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) on the issues of education, science and culture (IS-ESCO) [29]. A synthesis of global, national and religious values, happening in modern Azerbaijan, ultimately leads, on the one hand, to the progress of the nation and to its consistency to the modern life style, and on the other hand, to the revival of traditions, which are reformed within time spans.

The economy has also undergone great transformations. After full collapse of Soviet economy Azerbaijan stepped on the path of economic crisis. Therefore, building up a new economy and further its integration into international market became a serious need for country's further existence and development. First of all, these changes concerned the oil sector. The contracts, considering production, transportation and refining oil, were signed.

The main achievement was the realization of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline, which began to deliver Caspian raw oil to the world markets [30]. The achievements in the oil sector resulted in the awakening of other sectors of economy, which were related to oil industry. This also attracted foreign investors in this sector. Other sectors of economy – agriculture, construction, manufacturing – also began to develop. Banking sector also had a progress.

In order to integrate into the world economy Azerbaijan actively cooperates with such international organizations as the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). As an example of cooperation with these organizations one can note six credits, which were allocated to Azerbaijan till 2005 [31]. Transformations and integration processes have also affected the field of education. Azerbaijan decided to join Bologna process and has achieved this goal. The admission to higher education institutions of the country is carried out on the basis of tests system; the secondary education is switched to 11-year schooling system; new types of secondary education have been introduced (e.g., private schools, schools with different specializations, high schools, colleges, seminaries, lyceums). Bachelor's, Master's and Philosophy Doctor's degrees have been introduced in universities. [32] Thus, the rapid development of the world and complicated socio-political processes created a need for continuous transformation of Azerbaijan. Lately this transformation process has been intensified due to world globalization, open borders, communication systems and country's integration into the new world order structures.

References

1. Samantha Besson, *Sovereignty in Conflict*, in: *European Integration Online Paper (EIoP)* vol.8, No. 15, 2004, pp. 8–9. <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/>. The notion of “essentially contestable concept” owes its original formulation to: William Gallie. *Essentially contested concepts*, in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56, 167 (1956).
2. Harold J. Laski *The Foundations of Sovereignty and Other Essays*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1921, p. 314, quoted in F.H. Hinsley, *Sovereignty*. New York: Basic Books, 1966, p. viii.
3. F. Nietzsche, “Guilt”, “Bad Conscience” and the Like, in *On the Genealogy of Morals*, New York, 1969, quoted in Jens Bartelson, *A Genealogy of Sovereignty*. Cambridge University Press, 1995, p. 13.
4. M.R. Fowler and J.M. Bunck, *Law, Power, and The Sovereign State: The Evolution and Application of the Concept of Sovereignty*. USA, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995, p. 4.
5. “There exists perhaps no conception the meaning of which is more controversial than that of sovereignty. It is an indisputable fact that this conception, from the moment when it was introduced into political science until the present day, has never had a meaning which was universally agreed upon”. Louis Henkin, cited in Winston P. Nagan and Craig Hammer, “The Changing Character of Sovereignty in International Law and International Relations” *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law* 43, no. 1 (2005): 142; Nagan and Hammer, supplement: p.143: “Indeed, there are at least 13 different overlapping meanings of the term sovereignty”. Nagan W. P. and Hammer C. “The Changing Character of Sovereignty in International Law and International Relations” *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law* 43, no. 1, 2005. www.milestonesforlife.com/thetaxistand/sov.pdf.
6. Joseph A. Camilleri and Jim Falk in *The End of Sovereignty? – The Politics of a Shrinking and Fragmenting World* (Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1992, pp. 1–68; Michael Ross Fowler and Julie Marie Bunck, *Law, Power, and the Sovereign State. The Evolution and the Application of the Concept of Sovereignty* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995, pp.4–32; 64–82; John Hoffman, *Sovereignty*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1998, pp. 11–42; However, even in the scientific debates of the 1950s W. J. Rees argued that “among contemporary political theorists there is a trend of avoiding the concept of sovereignty”. Rees, W. J. “IV. – The Theory of Sovereignty Restated”. *Mind* 59, No. 236. Oxford University Press, 1950. Pp.495–521; 495: ““There is a tendency among present-day political theorists to work without the aid of the concept of sovereignty”.
7. M. R. Fowler and J. M. Bunck, *Law, Power, and The Sovereign State: The Evolution and Application of the Concept of Sovereignty*. USA, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995, pp. 1–2 ff, with references to the appropriate sources.

8. F. Hinsley, *Sovereignty*. Second edition. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1986.

9. Vernon A. O'Rourke, *The Juristic Status of Egypt and the Sudan*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1935, p.10. Quoted from: M. R. Fowler and J. M. Bunck, *Law, Power, and The Sovereign State: The Evolution and Application of the Concept of Sovereignty*. USA, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995, p. 4.

10. Marc Williams. "Rethinking Sovereignty", in Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs (eds.), *Globalization: Theory and Practice*. London, 1966. On the critique of the "abandonment thesis" of sovereignty, see: John Hoffman, *Sovereignty*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota press 1998, pp. 14–15.

11. Samantha Besson, *Sovereignty in Conflict*, in: *European International Online Papers (EIOP) vol.8, 2004*, http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2004_No15.

12. W.G. Werner and J. H. De Wilde. *The Endurance of Sovereignty*, in: *European Journal of International Relations (EJIR)*, vol.7 (3), 2001.

13. Philpott, Daniel. *Revolutions in Sovereignty*. Princeton: Princeton University Press 2001; Sirine Shebaya. *Global and Local Sovereignties*. In: *Public Reason 1 (1)*: 125–140, 2009: "Contrary to what is widely claimed, sovereignty is not in need of radical reconceptualizing. Rather, if we scrutinize our traditional understanding of sovereignty, we can find within it the solution to problems associated with sovereignty", idem, p. 127.

14. Sørensen G. *Sovereignty: Change and Continuity in a Fundamental Institution* // *Political Studies*. 1999. XLVII. PP. 590–604.

15. Kathleen Claussen and Timothy Nichol. *Reconstructing Sovereignty: The Impact of Norms, Practices and Rhetoric*. In: *The Bologna Center Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.10, spring 2007.

16. Vincent Depaigne. (Dis-)Locating Sovereignty? States, Self-Determination and Human Rights. In: *The Bologna Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.10, spring 2007.

17. Jan Aart Scholte. *What Is Globalization? The Definitional Issue – Again*. In: *Centre for the Study of Globalization and Regionalization (CSGR)*, University of Warwick, UK. CSGR Working Paper No. 109/02. December 2002, 1–34 pp. <http://www.csgr.org>.

18. Held, D. and McGrew, A. *Globalization/Anti-Globalization*. Cambridge: Polity, 2002. Our working definition slightly modifies that given by Held and McGrew.

19. Cochrane, A. and Pain, K. "A Globalising Society?"; In: D. Held (ed.), *A Globalising World? Culture, Economics, Politics*. London: Routledge, 2000.

20. More on the debate about globalization, see: Mauro F. Guillen, *Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble? A Critique in Five Key Debates in the Social Science Literature*. See: *The Annual Review of Sociology*, 2001. 27:235–60; Grinin L.E. *Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization*. See: Ilyin M.V., Kudryashova I.V. (eds.), *Sovereignty. The transformation of concepts and practices*. Moscow: MGIMO University, 2008, p. 104–128.

21. Chamsy el-Ojeili and Patrick Hayden. *Critical Theories of Globalization. US-UK*: Palgrave Macmillan 2006.

22. Held et al., *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity, 1999.

23. *Constitutional Act on State Independence of the Republic of Azerbaijan* www.azerbaijan.az/portal/history/histdocs/documents/09.pdf.

24. *Nato's Relations with Azerbaijan*. www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49111.htm.

25. *UN in Azerbaijan*. unic.un.org/imucms/baku/11/475/un-in-azerbaijan.aspx.

26. *The European Union and Azerbaijan*. eeas.europa.eu/delegations/azerbaijan/documents/cover_eng_final.jpg.

27. Ali Hasanov: *Civil society building is one of the main policy priorities of Azerbaijan* www.trend.az/news/politics/2042515.html.

28. *The Support of Civil Society in Mass Media*. www.azerbaijans.com/content_1742_ru.html.

29. Aliyev I. *The cooperation of Azerbaijan with ISESCO is strong*. mir24.tv/news/politics/3905374.

30. *SOCAR has exported 13,85mln. tons of oil through Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan*. www.aze.az/news_socar_eksportirovala_po_81695.html.

31. *Azerbaijan and IMF* [Http://library.aliyev-heritage.org/ru/642922.html](http://library.aliyev-heritage.org/ru/642922.html).

32. Ulker Mehdiyeva. *Educational development – investment in the future of Azerbaijan / study of political processes in the former Soviet space*. Information and Analytical Center. www.ia-centr.ru/expert/1354

Алієв Н.Г., докторант, Інститут філософії, соціології та права НАНА (Азербайджан, Баку), aliye@socar-germany.de

Трансформація державного суверенітету в епоху глобалізації: діалектика безперервності і зміни в Азербайджані

Зроблена спроба описати зміни і трансформації суверенітету національних держав, що відбуваються під впливом глобалізації в сучасну епоху. Як приклад з пострадянського простору, об'єктом аналізу даної статті є трансформація державного суверенітету Азербайджану. У першій частині цієї статті висвітлюються проблеми, пов'язані з визначеннями і інтерпретаціями спірних понять "глобалізація", "суверенітет", діалектика безперервності і змін у змісті та формах суверенітету національних держав, розвінчуються міфи про "зникнення", "іррелевантності", "застарівання" державного суверенітету. Усі матеріали та одиниці аналізу в першій частині відображають реалії та концепції трансформації національних держав. У другій частині описуються становлення і динаміка складних соціально-політичних, культурних та економічних шляхів розвитку національного державного суверенітету Азербайджану, у яких різняться чотири типи трансформації національної держави. Особлива увага приділяється трансформаційним процесам, які відбувалися, і продовжують відбуватися, після розпаду Радянського Союзу. У статті робиться загальний висновок, що глобалізація не підірває основи суверенітету національних держав, а навпаки, підсилює їх, бо ефективний суверенітет є надійною передумовою для самої глобалізації.

Ключові слова: Азербайджан, державний суверенітет, глобалізація, діалектика континуїтету і зміни, трансформація, недержавні актори.

Алієв Н.Г., докторант, Інститут філософії, соціології та права НАНА (Азербайджан, Баку), aliye@socar-germany.de

Трансформація государственного суверенитета в эпоху глобализации: диалектика непрерывности и изменения в Азербайджане

Предпринята попытка описать изменения и трансформации суверенитета национальных государств, происходящих под влиянием глобализации в современную эпоху. В качестве примера из постсоветского пространства, объектом анализа данной статьи является трансформация государственного суверенитета Азербайджана. В первой части этой статьи освещаются проблемы, связанные с определениями и интерпретациями спорных понятий "глобализация", "суверенитет", диалектика непрерывности и изменения в содержаниях и формах суверенитета национальных государств, развенчиваются мифы об "исчезновении", "иррелевантности", "устаревании" государственного суверенитета. Все материалы и единицы анализа в первой части отражают реалии и концепции трансформации национальных государств. Во второй части описываются становление и динамика сложных социально-политических, культурных и экономических путей развития национального государственного суверенитета Азербайджана, в которых различаются четыре типа трансформации национального государства. Особое внимание уделяется трансформационным процессам, которые происходили, и продолжают происходить, после распада Советского Союза. В статье делается общий вывод, что глобализация подрывает основы суверенитета национальных государств, а наоборот, усиливает их, ибо эффективный суверенитет является надежной предпосылкой для самой глобализации.

Ключевые слова: Азербайджан, государственный суверенитет, глобализация, диалектика континуитета и изменения, трансформация, негосударственные актеры.

* * *

УДК 327

Hamidov H.

doctor of Philosophy National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan, Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law (Azerbaijan, Baku), matlabm@yandex.com

THE NATIONAL LEADER HEYDAR ALIYEV AND THE POLICY OF ENERGY SECURITY OF AZERBAIJAN

This article discusses some of the issues about the role of Heydar Aliyev on Azerbaijan energy security, transportation of oil and geostrategic interests in the context of international relations and communication strategy. It is noted that one of the important factors in shaping the geopolitics of energy security is a problem. Solving this problem is of strategic importance for all countries in the world. According to the author, there are other features that arise in the regulation and implementation of this policy.

Keywords: Energy security, oil, geo-strategic interests, international relations, communications strategy.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

The return of the National Leader Heydar Aliyev again to the guidance of the republic rescued the people and state from the big tragedies and these were reason to the prosper-