

*from numerous wars of conquest. After formation of a state, which went through several stages of development, violence shifted from a foreign policy act to a domestic policy factor of confrontation of ruling and enslaved classes.*

*Karl Kautsky also explained formation of states and classes that appeared simultaneously, through wars of conquest. Class and caste social structures are based on tribal differentiation. In the course of time special system of coercion and exploitation applied to conquered tribes turns into a state. Violence is a powerful factor of political and economic transitions, which also can cause deeper social changes – in particular transformation of class structure of society.*

*Franz Oppenheimer distinguished six main stages of state development. At first there was supremacy of non-systematic and non-institutional violence with predatory aims. Herewith pastoralist tribes acted as a subject and agrarian tribes – as an object. Then chaotic destructive attacks gave place to gradual regulation of relations among tribes that resulted in institutionalization of the tax system. In course of time ethnic groups consolidated territorially. The authorities strengthened control over territories under their jurisdiction. And finally a nation state formed.*

*Friedrich Ratzel underlined the naturalness and importance of conflicts for development of human society. He defined the opposition between agrarian and pastoralist tribes as an essential precondition for state formation. Political energy, aggression and organized nature of pastoralists compensated for inability to state formation of agrarians. At the same time material culture of the latter was much richer. Consolidating of these opposite cultures as a result of conquest gave rise to the first state formations.*

*Thus despite certain shortcomings – in particular absolutization of violence role in state formation – violence theories contain detailed analysis of political violence mechanism as a major factor of state formation. Advocates of these concepts discover internal and external aspects of violent political struggle. Political violence, which is one of the major resources of power, has been always used by the political elite for implementation of its own will. Its role is especially significant at crucial moments of history associated with formation, transformation or destruction of large political entities. Genesis of a state and institutionalization of a political power system is one of such fundamental processes.*

**Key words:** *political violence, state, war, social class, class conflict, economic exploitation, social differentiation, social inequality.*

УДК 327

**Manko V.**

post-graduate student of  
the department of international relations  
Oles Honchar Dnipropetrovsk national university  
(Dnipropetrovsk, Ukraine),  
E-mail: lera.moonko@gmail.com

## THE SOURCE BASE OF POWER CONCEPT RESEARCH IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

**Abstract.** *The article deals with the source base of the one of main concepts in modern international relations – the concept of powers by J. Nye. The history of international relations mostly connected with the military power and economic influence. That changed after World War II. The researchers and experts all over the world began to study culture and cultural ties as a method of influence in the sphere of foreign affairs. It appeared to be as powerful as «hard power» methods. In the end of 90s in XX century J. Nye developed the concept of «soft power» that combined the cultural influence, public diplomacy, the power of NGOs and so on. The researcher based his concept on the works of H. Morgenthau, H. Arendt A. Gramsci. So it is important to study the works of these experts to understand the concept of power and its role in modern leaders' politics. It is also important, because the new concept of J. Nye «smart power» combines the methods of both – «soft» and some of «hard power».*

**Key words:** *power, influence, «soft power», «hard power», «smart power», culture, military power, international relations, economic.*

For a long time the main means of state influence in the international arena were

economic factors and military power. In the sphere of international relations more familiar is the concept of «hard power». «Hard power» implies a forced approach to international political relations, especially concerning the use of military force [1]. «Hard power» or «hard power» – the ability to coercion due to military and economic power of the country [2]. «Hard power» does not lose the key value in a world where states seek to protect their independence and parastatal groups, such as terrorist organizations, are willing to resort to violence. In the end of XX century another type of influence - the «soft power» gained popularity. The term «soft power» has become one of the most fashionable concepts of modern political science, and most defined it as one of the promising areas of foreign policy. «Soft power» became increasingly important for narrowing the range of new supporters of terrorism, and to address issues that require multilateral cooperation. But modern world situation shows the lack of resources of the «soft power» policies. It appears to be important to use all the resources that country acquires to improve itself on the world arena. That includes methods of «hard power» like defense policies, cyber wars, economical influence and the instruments of «soft power» in right proportions and using right channels to implement it.

By means of that it is important to study resource base of the concept. The article includes the analysis of the works of H. Morgenthau, H. Arendt, A. Gramsci, J. Mearsheimer and others.

Certain provisions of one of the main theorists of U.S. foreign relations Hans Morgenthau were considered. He described political power as «a psychological relationship between those who possess and those who must obey it. First, it enables the control of the latter by acting on his thoughts». According to the theory of Morgenthau power submission has three reasons: waiting for benefits, fear of incurring losses, respect or love for the person or laws. Power can be performed using threats, laws, charismatic authority or combinations thereof. Political power should be distinguished from power, understood as the direct use of physical violence. The threat of physical violence is a natural part of politics. But violence means giving up political power in favor of military or pseudo-military force. In foreign policy military power as a threat or potential - the most important financial factor that ensures the political power of the state. The use of physical violence replaces the psychological relationship between the two entities that are the basis of political power, the physical relationship between them, in which one is strong enough to determine the actions of another. It is because in the case of using physical violence the psychological moment disappears, there is the need to distinguish military power and political power [3, p. 84].

The mistake is to equate political power to direct use of force or at least to a successful threat of force and not consider the role of charisma, which can be attributed to the neglect of prestige as an independent element in international politics. However, the understanding of certain phenomena of international politics is impossible without consideration of human charisma, charisma or any institution, such as the Government or the U.S. Constitution, which generate people's trust in themselves and thereby may affect their freedom [4, p. 43]

Particular attention should be given to the study of Hannah Arendt, who went from the traditional comparison of power to violence. She argues that the state cannot be based only on harsh methods of rule and influence. For example the authority of the church, by Hannah Arendt, can be achieved without the use of power and violence [5, p. 58]. Important for us is Hannah Arendt's research in the field of communication policy concepts. Communication, refers to Hannah Arendt, is not only as a verbal interaction or as the ability of persuasion through language, symbols and signs, but also is an opportunity to exercise power itself. Politics and governments, in her deep conviction, must be creative element, the space in which there is an active people search of ourselves in the correlation of ourselves to others. This concept can find a basis for further study of «soft power» of the politic or the country.

Another American researcher J. Mearsheimer indicates that «... to avoid intimidation and hatred was the best strategy for the United States. Generosity towards the countries that suffered lost and good will for peace is the key victory of the United States in the twentieth century» [6, p. 43].

The issue of «power» and «influence» on the world stage also were developed by Y. Davidov, and J. Stoessinger, E. Carr. Edward Carr defined the category of power as «the ability to use the material resources of the state to force others to do what they otherwise would not do» [1]. Resembling to Carr's definition was given by American political scientist John Stoessinger: «Power in international relations is the state's ability to use the material and non-material resources so as to affect the behavior of other states» [7, p. 27].

Yuri Davydov reminds that «Military power is only one possible option of the existence and use of force within the country or in the outside world» [8].

The most attention, in our view, should be given to A Gramsci's research. Indeed, long before the problem of «soft power» was discussed in the circles of American intellectuals and experts, the Italian Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci in his «Prison notebooks» raised the question of hegemony and means of implementation. He distinguished between hegemony in civil society and the hegemony of the state and argued that the hegemony of the state based on the use of force, while civil society is achieved through persuasion and consensus.

The concept of cultural and ideological hegemony of Gramsci was developed in the late 1970-1980's. and was widespread in the circles of Western European and American neo-conservatives and the «New Right». They tried to use this concept as a means of undermining the left and liberals [9].

According to Gramsci, the power of the ruling class rests not only on violence, but on consent. The mechanism of power is not only coercion, but persuasion. To master property as an economic base is not enough – the domination of owners thus is not automatically guaranteed as the stable government.

Thus, the state, no matter class would be dominant, stands on two pillars – the power and harmony. Regulations, which reached a sufficient level of understanding Gramsci called hegemony. Hegemony is not frozen, once achieved, status but is subtle and dynamic, is an ongoing process. The «state hegemony is wearing the armor of coercion». In other words, coercion is only armor in much more substantial content. Moreover, hegemony implies not only consent, but friendly (active) agreement in which citizens want what want the ruling class. Gramsci defines that «state is a whole set of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class justifies and maintains its dominance, while ensuring that the active consent of the governed» [10, p. 132].

It is not just about politics, but about the fundamental qualities of modern Western society. This is evident from the fact that other great thinkers came to similar conclusions using a completely different approach. Heidegger came to the idea, similar to what Gramsci called the problem of «hegemony»: namely, how to rule implicitly by «moving equilibrium» time blocks of various dominant social groups, using the «nonviolent coercion» (including the so-called mass or popular culture), so as to manipulate subordinates groups against their will, but with their consent for the benefit of a tiny part of society [10, p. 141].

Hegemony is based on the «cultural core» of society, which includes a set of ideas about the world and man, good and evil, beautiful and disgusting, a lot of symbols and images, traditions and prejudices, knowledge and experience of many centuries. While this kernel is stable, the society has «stable collective will», aimed at preserving the existing order. Undermining the «cultural core» and the destruction of the collective will is the condition of the revolution.

Creation of conditions is a «huge number of books, pamphlets, magazine and newspaper articles, conversations and disputes that endlessly repeated in his gigantic

combine to form a long-term effort from which comes the collective will» [8].

It is necessary to affect the everyday consciousness, «small» thoughts of the average person. And the most effective way to influence is the relentless repetition of the same statements so they can be used to and were taking with no reason, but with faith. «The masses as such, by Gramsci, cannot absorb the philosophy other ways except as faith». He drew attention to the church, which supports religious beliefs through incessant repetition of prayers and rituals [10, p. 107].

One of the representatives of the neo-Marxism R. Cox, being a follower of A. Gramsci believes that in different historical periods, the most powerful state establishes its hegemony in the world and thus regulates the international order. In the XIX century it was England, now – the United States. This hegemony is supported not only by force, and economic instruments, but also ideological means, of a hegemonic ideology becomes dominant in the world. Thus, to explain world politics we should consider the role of base and superstructure in unity [11, p. 123]. R. Cox distinguishes the concept, in which the «dominant force» penetrate the structures of civil society and the appropriate elements of popular movements, and the version according to which civil society is a place where «those who do not benefit from the globalization of the world economy, can express their protest and seek alternatives» [12].

It is the work of A. Gramsci that J. Nye relies on in his research. The essence of the concept of «power» the author compares with the weather, which determines everything, but whose influence is not always subject to rational explanation or mathematical calculations. In general, refers to the tools and resources that enable participants in international relations to achieve their goals.

Thus to «hard power» the economic and military power is related. A «soft power» is characterized by three main components: first, culture (defined as a set of significant value to society and is not reducible to mass culture - Hollywood products and fast food), and secondly, political ideology, and third, foreign policy (understood as diplomacy in the broadest sense). The first two components - historically constituted nation's heritage, the third - the subjective factor is introduced by politicians that are currently in power. The options of latter part of «soft power» prone to much larger fluctuations than the first two of its components [13, p. 32].

Basis and «hard power», and «soft power», as a subject of international relations, is the ability to achieve their objectives by influencing the behavior of other actors. The difference between them lies in the tools: the projection of «hard power» is due to forcing and imposing their will (using economic resources or the threat of force), while the effective action «soft power» is formed through the mechanisms of coordination of foreign policy actions and involvement in Cooperation wider nature, usually on the basis of common values that promote cooperation.

The most important characteristic of «soft power» is its relative independence from the visible direct impact of state and government. «Hard power» is much more tied to state policy. Therefore it is relatively difficult to manipulate the first power, and much easier - the second. As a result, the effect of the action of «soft power» - unlike, for example, economic sanctions or military action is more amorphous and its harder to plan. But we should always look at the results of using both.

Foreign policy can strengthen or weaken the effectiveness of «soft power» - such as the war in Iraq has caused, according to John Nye, a blow to the attractiveness of the U.S. in much of the world. Similarly, Soviet intervention in Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968) have negatively affected the perception of the people, even the «socialist camp» [13, p. 120].

Importantly, the impact of «smart power» differs depending on the level of socio-economic development of society and its susceptibility to events in the world. Among the processes that reinforce the importance of «smart power» in world politics, should provide information: dissemination of information leading to the expansion of «receiving



areas» signals that exist across national borders.

For J. Nye the world politics is a «three-dimensional chess game board». Victory can be achieved, abounding both in horizontal and in the vertical plane. The upper part of the scheme - «classic» international relations based on the balance of power capacity. In this projection the world seems unipolar to the author.

Intermediate characterized by multipolarity - is the economic relations between states. And on the lower level are transnational elements of world politics: terrorism, international crime, environmental threats. Loses the one who plays only in the plane of traditional international relations. Shall not succeed and those actors who play in three-dimensional space, but use «inadequate» resources and instruments. To win on the lower level one must require the resources of «soft power» [13, p. 5].

J. Nye also assesses American resource base of «soft power», highlighting the main pillars. The first pillar of the U.S. – the attractiveness of American culture and lifestyle. The author points on the leadership of the U.S. based on metrics such as the number of immigrants accepted, the amount of released TV production, the number of foreign students in the U.S. and the number of Americans among the Nobel laureates in physics, chemistry and economics. The second pillar of «soft power» U.S. – American political ideology, in whole or in part to her sympathetic half of the respondents [13, p. 34].

Despite the gap in military and economic field, Europe is the major competitor of the U.S. in the struggle for hearts and minds. European Languages, perception of Europe as an oasis of prosperity, the highest in the world of socio-economic development, as well as French wine, Swiss European resorts and reliability - all images associated with the cultural attractiveness of Europe and Europeans. The political values of «soft appeal» and (what distinguishes Europe from the United States) orientation of European politicians to cooperate in solving international issues involving multilateral institutions, the emphasis on non-military conflict resolution - resistant features European image in the international community.

Among Asian countries, J. Nye identifies Japan, which, in his opinion, has a lot of resources «soft power». One of the leading places in the world by number of registered patents, the first place to assist foreign countries, the highest life expectancy - it's winning image of Japan in the eyes of the world. A distinctive feature of Japanese «soft power», especially in the developing world is its successful experience of modernization, achieving comparable to American and European levels of economic development without compromising the original Japanese culture.

An interesting is the correlation between the «soft power» and «hard power» of Japan. Despite the economic downturn in 90s, the attractiveness of the country as a whole has increased even more than in the economic boom of the 1980s. Another popular Japanese steel appliances, cars, architecture, fashion, food, art, animation. Improved overall perception of Japan. «Soft power» frames internal orientation to preserve its culture, preserving the features of business ethics and lifestyle. Such internal installation prevents Japan's claim to its more widespread impact [13, p. 3].

The most effective way to build «soft power» by J. Nye is public diplomacy. Central role in its implementation belongs to information resources and control information flows. J. Nye identifies three dimensions of public diplomacy:

- first - the daily lighting directed American foreign policy actions;
- second - «strategic dialogue», which refers to focused discussion of the most important U.S. political themes;
- third - development of direct contacts with foreign audiences by means of exchanges of scientific scholarship programs that allow foreign citizens personally acquainted with the United States.

Works by other authors broaden understanding of «soft power» in world politics. These include, primarily related research constructivists - J. Mattern and S. Lukes.

In the study of power and strength of S. Lukes there are three «cards» based on the

features of the three views of power: pluralist (one-dimensional), critics of pluralism (two-dimensional) and three-dimensional look.

One-dimensional view of power focuses on:

- conduct;
- decision-making;
- (key) issues;
- observable conflicts;
- (subjective) interests, seen as policy preferences, revealed politychnymoyu participation.

From this perspective, it is important to analyze the observed conflicts between organized interests on specific political issues.

Two-dimensional view:

- decision-making and control of the political agenda (not necessarily through decisions);
- issues and potential problems;
- observable (overt and covert) conflict;
- (subjective) interests, seen as policy preferences or abuse

Three-dimensional view:

- decision-making and control of the political agenda (not necessarily through decisions);
- issues and potential problems;
- observable (overt or hidden) and latent conflicts;
- subjective and real interests [14, p. 29 - 30].

Lukes distinguishes between two types of power: first - the ability to influence the world, the second - the ability to dominate other beings [14, p. 25].

J. Mattern complements J. Nye's theory and fills the gaps in the description of what constitutes an «appeal» in the context of «soft power». The researcher points out that attractiveness is» sociolinguistically constructed 'truth' about the appeal of some idea; an interpretation that won out over many other possible interpretations through a communicative process» [15, p. 585].

J. Mattern said that if any entity wishes to ensure its existence, it must by all means defend own socio-linguistic matrix. In the absence of such protection, this matrix will be erased parts by part by alternative, competing or conflicting realities (interpretations). For example, according to the researcher, following the events of September 11, 2001 the U.S. imposed on the use of the phrase «war on terror» and used it to rally support for the Allied military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq.

As noted by J. Mattern, those opposed the «war on terror» as a legitimate and morally righteous act of self-defense on the one hand and illegal acts of terrorists - on the other. This contrast clearly marked «good and compelling» state America that fights against own «wretched and evil» enemies [15, p. 600]. It also shows how the phrase «war on terror», called to create the reality of appeal and approval of American politics, was tallies with the interpretation that clearly separates good and evil - «you're either together with us or with the terrorists». According to the researcher, it is the use of so-called «representative power»: in this opposition there was hidden a trap for those audience members who did not want to be «on one side with evil» and thus destroy the belief that reinforce their sociolinguistic matrix. As a result, they were forced to accept the interpretation imposed to them [15, p. 614].

Researching the «hard power» in the field of military power we need to take a closer look. As J. Nye said: «There is much more to military resources than guns and battalions and more to military behavior than fighting or threatening to fight. Military power resources have long been used to provide protection to allies and assistance to friend» [16, p.25]. This part of military force is important when country want to implement the policy of «smart power» in its foreign affairs politics. J. Nye uses as the base of his

«hard power» research the works of J. Muller, R. Aron, R. Schultz and F. Hoffman [16, p. 32-33] who wrote about changing role and methods of modern wars. In the conclusion J. Nye considers that «defense» and «assistance» as the parts of «hard power» can be used in the policy of «smart power». The similar situation is with economy - it can be used both ways: as the «hard» resource (like trade or finance blockade) or as «soft» – loans and financial help. Also the high level of attractiveness of the country is mostly based on the economic level of development.

So, in order to study in detail the concept of «smart power» by J. Nye, you must consider source base and pay attention not only adherent-scientist, but also consider the work of scholars that influenced the development of the concept. Because of that there were reviewed the works, related to power on the world stage of hegemony, influence, and military violent methods. To understand the concept of «smart power» one should examine the concepts of «hard power» and, especially, «soft power».

#### CITATIONS:

1. Гукасов А. В. «Жесткая» и «мягкая» сила как инструменты внешней политики США [Электронный ресурс] / А. В. Гукасов. – Режим доступа: [www.pglu.ru/science/researches/nii-panin/vestnik/v1/Gusakov\\_A\\_V.pdf](http://www.pglu.ru/science/researches/nii-panin/vestnik/v1/Gusakov_A_V.pdf) (дата обращения: 20.07.2015)

2. Най Дж. Soft power, или «мягкая сила» государства [Электронный ресурс] / Дж. Най. – Режим доступа: [www.situation.ru/app/j\\_jn\\_42.htm](http://www.situation.ru/app/j_jn_42.htm) (дата обращения: 20.07.2015)

3. Моргентау Г. Политические отношения между нациями: борьба за власть и мир Теория международных отношений: Хрестоматия / [ Сост., науч. ред. и коммент. П.А. Цыганкова ] ; Г. Моргентау. – М.: Гардарики, 2002. – С. 72–88.

4. Locatelli A. Reading suggestions: Hans J. Morgenthau's Politics among Nations / A. Locatelli // Pubblicazioni – 2003. – №1. – P. 40-48

5. Селивёрстов В. Уроки правильного понимания насилия по Ханне Арендт / В. Селивёрстов // Культиватор. – М., 2010. – №1. – С.53-61

6. Mearsheimer J. J. The Tragedy of Great Power Politics / J. J. Mearsheimer // The Norton series in world politics. – W W Norton & Company Incorporated, 2001 – 555p

7. Stossinger J. G. The Might of Nations / J. G. Stossinger // World Politics in Our Time. – New York, 1969. – 449 p.

8. Давыдов Ю. Понятие «жесткой» и «мягкой» силы в теории международных отношений [Электронный ресурс] / Ю. Давыдов. – Режим доступа: [www.intertrends.ru/four/006.htm#14](http://www.intertrends.ru/four/006.htm#14) (дата обращения: 20.07.2015)

9. Дмитриев Т. Очарование «мягкой силы» [Электронный ресурс] / Т. Дмитриев. – Режим доступа: [www.politjournal.ru/index.php?action=Articles&issue=94&tek=3131&dirid=77](http://www.politjournal.ru/index.php?action=Articles&issue=94&tek=3131&dirid=77) (дата обращения: 20.07.2015)

10. Кара-Мурза С.Г. Манипуляция сознанием / С. Г. Кара-Муза. – М.: Эксмо. – 864 с.

11. Панченко М. Неклассические парадигмы изучения миропорядка / М. Панченко // Власть. – 2009. – № 4. – С. 121-127.

12. Cox R. Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations [Electronic resource] / R. Cox. – Access mode: [www.academia.edu/7203184/Robert\\_Cox\\_-\\_Gramsci\\_Hegemony\\_and\\_International\\_Relations](http://www.academia.edu/7203184/Robert_Cox_-_Gramsci_Hegemony_and_International_Relations) (Accessed 20 July 2015)

13. Nye S. J. Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics / J. S. Nye. – PublicAffairs: 2004. – 176 p.

14. Lukes S. Power: A Radical View / S. Lukes. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 192 p.

15. Mattern J. B. Why Soft Power Isn't So Soft: Representational Force and the Sociolinguistic Construction of attraction in World Politics / J. B. Mattern // Millennium: Journal of International Studies, – 2005. – Vol.33 – №3. – P. 583-612

16. Nye S. J. The Future of Power / J. S. Nye. – NY: Public Affairs, 2011. – 300 p.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Gukasov A. V. «Zhestkaya» i «myagkaya» sila kak instrumenty vneshney politiki SShA [«Hard» and «soft» power of the US foreign policy tools] [Electronic resource] – Access mode: [www.pglu.ru/science/researches/nii-panin/vestnik/v1/Gusakov\\_A\\_V.pdf](http://www.pglu.ru/science/researches/nii-panin/vestnik/v1/Gusakov_A_V.pdf)

2. Nay Dzh. Soft power, ili «myagkaya sila» gosudarstva [Soft power, or «soft power» of the state] [Electronic resource] – Access mode: [www.situation.ru/app/j\\_jn\\_42.htm](http://www.situation.ru/app/j_jn_42.htm)

3. Morgentau G. Politicheskie otnosheniya mezhdru natsiyami: bor'ba za vlast' i mir

Teoriya mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy: Khrestomatiya [Political relations between nations: the struggle for power and the world of International Relations Theory]; G. Morgentau. – M.: Gardariki, 2002. – S. 72–88.

4. Locatelli A. Reading suggestions: Hans J. Morgenthau's Politics among Nations // Pubblicazioni – 2003. – №1. – P. 40-48

5. Seliverstov V. Uroki pravil'nogo ponimaniya nasiliya po Khande Arendt [Lessons from a proper understanding of violence by Hannah Arendt] // Kul'tivator. – M., 2010. – №1. – S.53-61

6. Mearsheimer J. J. The Tragedy of Great Power Politics // The Norton series in world politics. – W W Norton & Company Incorporated, 2001 – 555r

7. Stossinger J.G. The Might of Nations // World Politics in Our Time. – New York, 1969. – 449 r.

8. Davydov Yu. Ponyatie «zhestkoy» i «myagkoy» sily v teorii mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy [The notion of «hard» and «soft» power in international relations theory] [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: [www.intertrends.ru/four/006.htm#14](http://www.intertrends.ru/four/006.htm#14)

9. Dmitriev T. Ocharovanie «myagkoy sily» [The charm of «soft power»] [Electronic resource] – Access mode: [www.politjournal.ru/index.php?action=Articles&issue=94&tek=3131&dirid=77](http://www.politjournal.ru/index.php?action=Articles&issue=94&tek=3131&dirid=77)

10. Kara-Murza S.G. Manipulyatsiya soznaniem [Manipulation of consciousness]. – M.: Eksmo. – 864 s.

11. Panchenko M. Neklassicheskie paradigmy izucheniya miroporyadka [Non-classical paradigm of world order] // Vlast'. – 2009. – № 4. – S. 121-127.

12. Cox R. Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations [Electronic resource] – Access mode: [www.academia.edu/7203184/Robert\\_Cox\\_-\\_Gramsci\\_Hegemony\\_and\\_International\\_Relations](http://www.academia.edu/7203184/Robert_Cox_-_Gramsci_Hegemony_and_International_Relations)

13. Nye S. J. Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. – PublicAffairs: 2004. – 176 p.

14. Lukes S. Power: A Radical View. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 192 p.

15. Mattern J. B. Why Soft Power Isn't So Soft: Representational Force and the Sociolinguistic Construction of attraction in World Politics // Millennium: Journal of International Studies, – 2005. – Vol.33 – №3. – P. 583-612

16. Nye S. J. The Future of Power. – NY: Public Affairs, 2011. – 300 p.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Balmasov S. Ustoyit li Rossiya protiv «gazovoy Antanty?» (Does Russia stand against the «gas Entente?») [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://argumentiru.com/politics/2014/08/361742>. (Accessed 20 July 2015)

2. Galstyan A. Bitva za Alzhir: Ocherednoy udar po Rossii (Battle of Algiers: Another blow to Russia) [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://echo.msk.ru/blog/galstyanareg/1392094-echo/>. (Accessed 20 July 2015)

3. Kasaev E. Chertova dyuzhina (Baker's Dozen), Oil&Gas Journal Russia. – 2008. – №8. – S. 24–30.

4. Ofitsiyniy sait Forumu krain-eksporteriv hazu (The official website of the Forum of Gas Exporting) [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: [www.gecf.org/gecfmembers/gecf-countries](http://www.gecf.org/gecfmembers/gecf-countries). – (Accessed 20 July 2015)

5. Hallouche H. The Gas Exporting Countries Forum: Is it really a Gas OPEC in the Making? [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: [www.oxfordenergy.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/NG13-TheGasExportingCountriesForumIsItReallyAGasOpecInTheMaking-HadiHallouche-2006.pdf](http://www.oxfordenergy.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/NG13-TheGasExportingCountriesForumIsItReallyAGasOpecInTheMaking-HadiHallouche-2006.pdf). (Accessed 20 July 2015)

6. Kasayev E.O. The Myth of a Natural Gas OPEC [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-myth-natural-gas-opec-8082>. – (Accessed 20 July 2015)

7. Vladimirov M. Why is a natural gas OPEC not possible? [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: [www.jhubc.it/ADMISSIONSBLOGDOCUMENTS/MVladimirov%20MA\\_Thesis.pdf](http://www.jhubc.it/ADMISSIONSBLOGDOCUMENTS/MVladimirov%20MA_Thesis.pdf). – (Accessed 20 July 2015)

**Манько В. И.**, аспирантка кафедри міжнародних відносин, Дніпропетровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара (Дніпропетровськ, Україна), E-mail: [lera.moonko@gmail.com](mailto:lera.moonko@gmail.com)



**Источниковая база исследования концепции силы в международных отношениях**

**Аннотация.** В статье рассматривается ключевая база одного из основных понятий в современных международных отношениях - понятия «силы» Дж. Ная. История международных отношений в основном связана с военной мощью и экономическим влиянием. Все изменилось после Второй мировой войны. Исследователи и эксперты во всем мире стали изучать культуру и культурные связи как метод влияния в сфере международных отношений. Этот метод оказались столь же мощными, как и методы «жесткой силы». В конце 90-х годов XX века в Дж. Най разработал концепцию «мягкой силы», которая объединила культурное влияние, публичную дипломатию, власть НПО и т. д. Исследователь основывал свою концепцию на работах Г. Моргентхау, Х. Арендт и А. Грамши. Поэтом важно изучить работы этих специалистов, чтобы понять концепцию власти и ее роль в политике современных лидеров. Это также важно, потому что новая концепция «умной силы» Дж. Ная сочетает в себе методы как «мягкие» так и некоторые из «жесткой силы».

**Ключевые слова:** власть, влияние, «мягкая сила», «жесткая сила», «умная сила», культура, военная мощь, международные отношения, экономика.

**Манько В. І.**, аспірантка кафедри міжнародних відносин, Дніпропетровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара (Дніпропетровськ, Україна), E-mail: lega.moonko@gmail.com

**Джерельна база дослідження концепції сили у міжнародних відносинах**

**Анотація.** У статті розглядається джерельна база одного з основних понять в сучасних міжнародних відносинах – поняття «сили» Дж. Ная. Історія міжнародних відносин в основному пов'язана з військовою міццю і економічним впливом. Все змінилося після Другої світової війни. Дослідники і експерти в усьому світі стали виявляти культуру та культурні зв'язки як метод впливу в сфері міжнародних відносин. Ці методи виявилися настільки ж потужними, як і методи «жорсткої сили». В кінці 90-х років XX століття в Дж. Най розробив концепцію «м'якої сили», яка об'єднала культурний вплив, публічну дипломатію, владу НУО і так далі. Дослідник базував свою концепцію на роботах Г. Моргентхау, Х. Арендт та А. Грамші. Тому важливо вивчити роботи цих фахівців, щоб зрозуміти концепцію влади і її роль в політиці сучасних лідерів. Це також важливо, тому що нова концепція «розумної сили» Дж. Ная поєднує в собі методи як «м'які» так і деякі з «жорсткої сили».

**Ключові слова:** влада, вплив, «м'яка сила», «жорстка сила», «розумна сила», культура, військова міць, міжнародні відносини, економіка.

УДК 32.1, 321.01:355

**Бірюков Д. С.**

к.т.н., завідувач сектору,

Національний інститут стратегічних досліджень  
(Київ, Україна), E-mail: dmytro.biriukov@niss.gov.ua

**ПОНЯТТЯ «СТІЙКІСТЬ» В СУЧАСНИХ БЕЗПЕКОВИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯХ**

**Анотація.** Розглядається поняття «стійкість», яке за останнє десятиліття набуло концептуальних ознак в теорії та ствердилось в практиці національної безпеки провідних країн світу. Досліджується застосування даного поняття, по-перше, як політичної установки щодо забезпечення захищеності певних об'єктів безпеки, яка задекларована як ціль безпекової політики в стратегічних документах, по-друге, як властивість цих об'єктів, що має бути сформована задля зменшення наслідків безпекових криз, по-третє, як цільова установка у формуванні властивостей об'єктів безпеки шляхом розподілу зобов'язань між суб'єктами забезпечення безпеки.

**Ключові слова:** національна безпека, стійкість, безпекове партнерство, критична інфраструктура

**Постановка проблеми у загальному вигляді.** Кардинальні зміни, що вже відбулися, і ті, що продовжують стрімко відбуватися у системах глобальної та регіональної безпеки протягом останньої чверті століття, спричинили підвищений