

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2022-2-34>

EVOLUTION OF THE WORLD ORDER SYSTEM

Yevhenii Taran,

Ph.D. in Political Science,

Associate Professor at the Department of Global and National Security of the Educational and Scientific Institute of Public Administration and Civil Service of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1822-6978

evgeniy-t@ukr.net

Abstract. In this article, the author examines the history, stages and features of the formation of such a phenomenon as "world order". The events in history that became decisive in the creation of such a system of relations between countries, which would establish certain rules of behavior that should be mandatory for all countries, are analyzed. It is noted that the violation of these rules led to major international conflicts, which had catastrophic consequences for the countries of the world. It is pointed that the system of world order, which was formed after the Second World War, was modified with the of the Soviet Union collapse, and with the attack of Russia on Ukraine it was collapsed, since there are no examples of violent rejection of the sovereign states territories in modern European history. The conclusions state that Ukraine's place in the new system of the world order should be subjective, that is, Ukraine, as a full-fledged member of the world community, should be able to make its own decisions regarding its domestic and foreign policy and independently determine its vector of development.

Key words: world order, new world order, League of Nations, UN, World War I, World War II.

Introduction. The problem of world order is an extremely urgent issue of international relations and the subject of political research today. The very term "world order" is quite conditional. According to the statements of researchers of the world order, a single concept that would satisfy the requirements of specialists does not exist to this day. At the same time, the problem of a world system that would ensure the peaceful coexistence of milking states has been on the agenda for several centuries in the world's leading countries. From historical experience, it becomes clear that for many years, mankind began to form such rules of coexistence between countries that could ensure peace as much as possible and prevent military conflicts. At the same time, the violation of established norms often led to full-scale conflicts with massive destruction of infrastructure, economic decline and great human casualties. Because of this, the search for a certain system that would satisfy all countries and would be able to efficiently prevent armed conflicts continues to this day. Conventionally, this phenomenon was called «world order».

Main part. The study of various systems of the world order is connected with a number of related directions, in particular, they include the study of non-state actors of international relations, the effects of globalization processes on the political, economic and cultural spheres, the interdependence of the countries of the world, etc. Because of this, many scientists were engaged in the research of these issues. One of the most outstanding researchers of this phenomenon is H. Kissinger, who in his work «World Order. Reflection on the nature of nations in the historical context» notes that there was no world order. At the same time, he clarifies that, in his modern understanding, the phenomenon of «the world order» was proposed four centuries ago at the Westphalian Peace Conference. The rules of coexistence of European countries after the Thirty Years' War were defined there. At the same time, there were also Chinese and Islamic systems of international order in other parts of the world, and at that time Muscovy was not involved in the European community yet (Kissinger, 2017: 71).

Another researcher of the world order – the British international theorist H. Bull believes that the world order is a product of the 20th century, since by the second half of the 19th century. there was no political system that could cover the entire world as a whole. Therefore, they talk about world order, referring to «the sum of various political systems that brought order to different parts of the world» (Iali, 2009: 161).

Taking into account the above, the purpose of the article is a thorough analysis of the historical principles of the world order and the investigation of the current situation in the world, which is characterized by Russia's military actions against Ukraine, as well as the determining the prospects of the world order that will be built in the near future.

Methods. To achieve the research goal, there was used a set of general scientific methods: theoretical methods – to determine the conceptual foundations of the world order; systemic method – for researching the main factors that influenced to the change in the system of the modern world order; the structural-functional method was useful for the analysis of the world order historical systems.

With the help of methods of analysis and synthesis, the peculiarities of the modern system of the world order were revealed, and the prospects of the future system of the new world order were proposed.

The method of systematization was used to formulate conclusions.

Results and their discussion. In order to understand the nature of the origin and predict further prospects for the development of the world order system, it is necessary to apply the very phenomenon of «world order», to investigate the interpretation of various specialists of this level, to understand the basic principles of its construction and to determine the importance of changing the world order system in the modern world.

Before examining the place of order in world politics, it is necessary to understand such concepts as «order as such», «social order» and «political order». Having understood the phenomenon of "order", we can further understand what social order is and one of its varieties – political order.

After understanding these phenomena, it will be possible to proceed to the consideration of the «world order» phenomenon.

Thus, defining the concept of «order», the British international theorist H. Bull in the work «Anarchic Society. The study of order in world politics» notes that order can be formed by a certain number of things, which are put in the simplest and most general form and are related to each other in a certain way, and their relations are not random in nature.

Thus, a row of books standing on a shelf constitutes order, but the same cannot be said for a pile of books on the floor (Bull, 1977: 3).

At the same time, in dynamic systems, to which the international system belongs, the connections between elements, despite their structural stability, also have a dynamic nature, are repeated while maintaining the qualitative certainty of the system in changing situations. Accordingly, any order, regardless of the scale of the ordered object, has spatial limitations. In other words, any order has its limits and it is very important to establish where they lie (Iali, 2009: 161).

H. Bull understands order in social life as «a pattern of human activity that supports elementary, primary or universal goals of social life» (Bull, 1977: 3).

These goals mean the three basic values of all social life – to preserve human life from violence, to ensure the fulfillment of agreements and agreements between people, and to guarantee the right to property.

If we characterize the social order as a human order, then it is necessary to note also the essential fact that its effectiveness and stability depend on the level of support of this order by those to whom it extends. An effective and stable social order is a type of order in which there is a consensus in society regarding the main parameters. If there is no consensus, and the order is coercively maintained by society or a large part of it, or at all, imposed by force, then it will inevitably begin to collapse if such force disappears or weakens. An example can be the collapse of the Soviet Union after an attempt to introduce democratic values into society.

Political order is a type of social order and is defined as the structure of the system of social relations, which ensures the concentration of the integrity of one or another social system – from a small group of people to the world society as a whole.

Such an order is reproduced through the adoption and implementation of management decisions depending on the situational conditions that have developed in this historical period.

So, after considering and defining the concept of «order» and its varieties – «social» and «political», it is possible to focus on the study of its specific variety – order in world politics.

With slight variations, «world order» is interpreted in the classic works of H. Morgenthau (Morgenthau, 1973), R. Aron (Aron, 2000) and K. Waltz (Waltz, 1979) as a certain system of relations between countries, which is established through the ratio of the potentials of the great powers.

At the same time, the states themselves had such an idea about these potentials, which did not always coincide with the officially declared one. They also correlated their actions with possible consequences. Such views on the interpretation of the world order prevailed not only in the theory of international relations, but also in politics in the first three or four decades after the end of the Second World War.

According to J. Ikenberry, a key feature of the world order is the presence of universally recognized rules and principles by which the subjects of international relations are guided in their relations with each other. He even introduces the concept of «constitutionality» or «unconstitutionality» of certain international orders, emphasizing that an order based only on the balance of power is «unconstitutional» (Ikenberry, 2001: 22).

Applying an institutional approach to the interpretation of the «world order» phenomenon, the dean of the School of Public and International Affairs of Princeton University, Ann-Marie Slaughter, believes that the world order is «a system of global governance that institutionalizes cooperation and restrains conflicts to such an extent that it allows all countries and their peoples to provide peoples with a more stable peace, well-being, management of the Earth's resources and minimum standards of human dignity» (Slaughter, 2004: 166)

Analyzing the research of Ukrainian scientists, we can note the approaches to the phenomenon of «world order» by A. Mishchenko, who, having studied the problems of the world order, singled out its key characteristics, namely:

- legitimacy, which, among other things, demonstrates the extent to which key persons with real power and political influence agree with the rules and principles of international relations;
- the mechanism of making changes, which means the existence of a clear formalized process and procedure for formulating, modifying and implementing new rules and principles for all players of the world political system;
- the balance of forces, which implies a certain physical capacity for defence and aggression (Mischenko 2020: 45).

At the same time, a change in the world order system can be characterized by a number of signs. Thus, summarizing the theoretical foundations of the new world order, O. Dashevskaya concludes that researchers share a common opinion about the exacerbation of conflicts in the world, in particular against the background of social inequality and the strengthening of international terrorism, which may result in the transition of the status of conflicts from a regional to a global one (Dashevskaya 2015: 60).

At the same time, N. Gruschinska, singling out signs of a change in the world order, defines «interference in the internal affairs of another country, attempts to impose culture, ensuring global and regional security, ethnic separatism» (Gruschinska, 2014: 30).

As V. Onishchenko notes, «the world order is not formed by someone's will, but is structured in a broad sense by power relations: civilizational confrontations, the struggle for resources, for power, and finally – wars» (Onishchenko, 2020: 40).

Next, we will consider certain events in history, which are considered to be the reasons that influenced forming the world order of those times through creating certain norms of interstate cooperation.

Thus, the already mentioned Westphalian world system was formed in 1648, as a result of signing of the Peace of Westphalia, which marked the end of the Thirty Years' War. This treaty established a system of relations between European countries.

According to the results of the conclusion of the Treaty of Westphalia, the existence of national interests of states was recognized, and the principle of the need to consult on the solution of certain critical issues was also declared. The main feature of the Westphalian agreements was that now only states, and not empires, dynasties or religious denominations, became the main subject of international relations. It was at that time that the concept of state sovereignty was formed, which does not lose its relevance even today. Each state received the right to organize its life in internal politics and to implement the principles of its national sovereignty in foreign affairs.

The signing of the «Peace of Westphalia» marked an important event in the history of international law, since the principles laid down in it, namely: the equality of states, the concept of sovereignty, the solution of international problems by peaceful means, significantly influenced the system of international relations that existed at that time. Despite the fact that these principles have undergone significant changes in modern relations, they are still reflected in the system of international law.

Consequently, the Peace of Westphalia had a significant impact on the developing international law and diplomacy. The main principles that were laid down in its foundation marked the onset of the new modern era and a new era of the practice of international relations (Shumskyi, 2020: 84).

The next system, which is considered to have formed the new European order, was the Viennese system. It was formed after the Napoleonic wars at the Congress of Vienna in 1814-1815. According to its norms, the European order was ensured by the Fourth Union, which was represented by the largest states of the continent – Great Britain, Prussia, Austria and Russia. Over time, the recently defeated France was also involved in the diplomatic conferences called the «Concert of Europe». That is, the European order was formed by the five largest European states, and each of them primarily pursued its national interest (Kissinger, 2017: 46).

One of the goals of the system, which was developed at the Congress of Vienna, is to prevent the unification of Germany, which France was primarily concerned about. However, German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck was able to unite Germany and the entire system developed at the Congress of Vienna could not prevent this (Kissinger, 2017: 65).

After the end of the First World War, the Versailles Peace was concluded and the Versailles-Washington system of world order was formed, which was designed to determine the order on the European continent. To ensure peace between countries, the League of Nations was formed, which was the beginning of forming a collective security system. This World Order was based on the general approaches and principles that were proposed by American President Wilson. At the same time, this system did not involve the use of elements of force to ensure order in the world. As H. Kissinger noted: «Rarely is a diplomatic document so inconsistent with its purpose as it was with the Versailles Treaty. Too punitive for conciliation and too lenient to check Germany's renewed ambitions. The Versailles Treaty doomed exhausted democracies to constant concern about the irreconcilable and revanchist Germany and the revolutionary Soviet Union» (Kissinger, 2017: 71).

As a result, the interests of Germany and the USSR, which consisted in the desire to achieve world domination, became the determining factor of the international politics of that time. Neither the League of Nations, nor the developed system of international law at that time could prevent these intentions, which resulted in the Second World War.

After the Second World War, the Yalta-Potsdam system of world order was formed by the winner countries – the USA, the USSR and Great Britain. This order «was based on a new balance of forces and interests of the countries that won the war, primarily the USSR and the USA» (Krushynskiy & Manzhola, 2007).

Territorial conquests and acquisitions in Central and Eastern Europe were secured under the USSR. The Soviet Union considered these territories to be a zone of its interests before the Second World War and was able to achieve what it desired after its end.

If after the First World War the maintenance of world order at the institutional level was entrusted to the League of Nations, then similar tasks were assigned to the United Nations.

The very structure of the UN, namely the principle of forming the Security Council, reflected the dominance of those states that were winners in the Second World War, that is, the transfer of the management of this organization and the world order to the hands of the great powers, that is, giving them priority in international affairs.

Those local wars that took place in the second half of the 20th century, as a rule, took place from the favourable position of these powers. At the same time, they were often supported by them. Because of this, the UN is not an effective tool in conflict resolution. Gross violations of international law and ineffective implementation of the aggressive actions of certain states led to the largest conflict in Europe after the Second World War (Taran, 2022: 191).

As can be seen from the international situation, those provisions of the world order, which were proposed to the international community by the winners of the Second World War, were not binding for them. They can apply coercive force to every member of the world community, but not to themselves. An example of such a policy is the principle of using the right of veto in the UN Security Council. That is, if there is a conflict between two states that are permanent members of the Security Council, the unanimity rule makes the United Nations completely inefficiently (Diurozel, 1995).

Features of the world order, which was formed after the Second World War, were the following:

- the world order was «bipolar» – until 1991, only two states – the USA and the USSR – had the most significant influence on world political processes;

- after the collapse of the USSR, a «unipolar» world was established for a decade and a half, where the USA was able to concentrate a very broad range of leadership – from technological, financial and military to scientific and cultural.

In general, the evolution of international relations after 1945 took place under the conditions of two orders – first, bipolar, which lasted from 1945 to 1991, and then unipolar, sometimes called pluralistic, which was formed after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

On the one hand, the Yalta-Postdam agreements were quite shaky, since their effectiveness depended on the ability of the interested parties to ensure their actual implementation, primarily not by international legal, but by political methods and means of economic and military-political pressure. That is why the elements of regulating international relations with the help of threatening with force or through using it were clearly expressed in the post-war decades. The Yalta-Potsdam order existed for more than half a century and was destroyed with the collapse of the USSR.

The Yalta-Potsdam order is considered bipolar. The bipolar order reflected the simple fact that after the Second World War, the USA and the USSR were separated from other states in terms of their military, political, economic and ideological potential. Although the myth of the proximity of the two «superpowers» in terms of their combined potential was quite widespread among Soviet and domestic researchers until recently, which gave them an opportunity to compete «on equal terms», in fact, the United States always led in the distance, and the USSR tried to «catch up and overtake», as a result of which it became exhausted and died due to exhaustion of its vital forces (Potekhin, 2016).

Analyzing the bipolar structure of the world, it can be said that it could be both confrontational and cooperative and based not on opposition, but on cooperation of the «powers». But in fact, from the beginning of its formation until the mid-80's of the 20th century. The Yalta-Postdam system was almost always confrontational. Only in 1985, when M. Gorbachev came to power in the Soviet Union, this system began to transform into cooperative bipolarity, which eventually ended with the destruction of the Soviet Union.

In the conditions of confrontation, international relations sometimes became acutely conflictual due to the preparation of rivals to repulse a hypothetical mutual attack and an unlikely attempt to survive in the flames of an expected nuclear war. This stimulated in the second half of the 20th century an arms race of an unprecedented scale. Confrontation during the Cold War is a relationship between countries in which the actions of one side are systematically opposed to the actions of the other.

This does not exclude periodic cooperation between warring subjects in certain directions of relations.

Although international contradictions were often based on geostrategic interests, fear of the enemy's first strike and mistrust of his «true» intentions, outwardly the Soviet-American rivalry looked primarily like a confrontation of ideals and moral values. The ideals of equality and social justice – in the «world of socialism» and the ideals of freedom, competition and democracy – in the «free world». Sharp ideological polemics brought additional intransigence to international relations. Soviet propaganda attributed to the United States a desire for world domination, on the way to it they must destroy the USSR, and American propaganda convinced the Western public of Moscow's intentions to spread communism throughout the world. Ideologicalization had the strongest impact on international relations in the 1940's and 1950's. Later, the ideology and political practice of the «superpowers» began diverging in such a way that, at the level of official attitudes, the global goals of rivals continued to be interpreted as irreconcilable aggression, and at the level of diplomatic dialogue, the parties learned to negotiate, guided not by ideological concepts, but by arguments about achieving the situation of mutual security in the nuclear age (Potekhin, 2016).

The USSR and the USA were indisputable superpowers by the criterion of their ability to destroy life on Earth.

The Yalta-Potsdam order was distinguished by some manageability of international processes. In terms of bipolarity, it was based on the agreement of the positions of only two states, which simplified negotiations. The USA and the USSR acted not only as individual states, but also in the role of group leaders – NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Bloc discipline allowed the Soviet Union and the United States to guarantee the fulfillment of «their» part of the accepted obligations by allied states in the respective bloc (Potekhin, 2016).

A well-known American political scientist, a professor at the University of Chicago, a specialist in international relations J. Mearsheimer, after researching the threats to world security after the end of the Cold War, points out that only two great powers were in a state of rivalry throughout the Cold War, and the world system had a more peaceful character, because with such a system, as a rule, they demand loyalty from small countries, which with a high probability leads to the formation of rigid alliance structures. Smaller states are thus protected from each other and from attack by a rival great power.

A bipolar system has only one option through which war can begin. A multipolar system has many of such options. Because of this, other things being equal, war in a multipolar system is statistically more likely than in a bipolar one. A war in a multipolar world, where minor systems or a single major power may be involved, is unlikely to cause as much destruction as a conflict between two major powers. However, small wars always have the potential to expand into large wars (Mearsheimer, 1990).

After the annexation of Crimea, the Yalta world system practically ceased to exist, while the current UN could not cope in the face of such threats.

The revision and displacement of the borders of the sovereign state – Ukraine, through annexing the Crimean Peninsula with the subsequent spread of armed aggression to the southeastern regions of Ukraine, became a real challenge that Russia threw to the existing world order and the civilized world, in particular.

After the end of the Second World War, European history did not know cases of violent seizure of the territories of sovereign states.

Russia declared the post-Soviet space a zone of its special interests, up to the possibility of invading the territory of neighboring states. Russia's interests included the transformation of Ukraine into a fully-fledged geopolitical bridgehead for the West for the further expansion of US interests in Europe.

Thus, Ukraine found itself at the intersection of the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian paradigms of transforming the world order of the international security system

The usual world order, which was founded after the Second World War and was built on multilateral institutions, ceased to meet its purpose and really protect the rights of individual small nations that cannot survive alone.

Because of this, today's requirement is the creation of another World Order, which most likely will not be unipolar or bipolar. It will be multipolar, where every state, regardless of its intentions and territory, the state of the economy and the power of its army, will have equal rights in it. There should not be any equal and even more equal ones, as it is the case with the UN Security Council and its permanent members, who could become not only participants, but also initiators of conflicts.

The main principles on which the world order should be based are democratic ideas, and not authoritarian attitudes, the equality of all participants in the world community, and not the privileges of any individual countries.

One of the biggest problems of the UN Security Council was the voting system. Yes, one of the countries that started the conflict has the right of veto, and the UN is unable to pass a resolution on the ceasing hostilities.

Because of this, a number of state representatives point to the need to reform the UN Security Council, as Russia's actions prompt the need to create a new system for ensuring peace and organizing the world order on the planet.

The guarantee of the new world order should be its efficiency and reliability with mutual consideration of interests. «World order of the XXI century. should be based on the mechanisms of collective solution of key problems, on the priority of law and broad democratization of international relations». The strengthening of the role of international institutions and mechanisms in the world economy and politics, including the «G-7» and the UN, is emphasized, which needs immediate reform, taking into account the problems that arose around the annexation of the Crimea by the Russian Federation (Matvieieva, 2016).

However, the existing system of international law, which is based on treaties containing in the very principle of their conclusion the possibility of violation, will not be able to solve this issue. It is clear that today a fundamentally new system of coexistence of states is needed, which is able to ensure the efficiency of the general principles of their behavior on the world stage (Taran, 2022: 192).

Today, it is necessary to take into account the number of participants in international relations, which is constantly growing, along with the influence on world political processes. For example, multinational corporations and their leaders are considered to be new actors of world politics that have appeared as part of transforming the structure of the modern international system. Multinational corporations protect various transnational groups that cannot be reduced to the interests of individual states or national societies. The growing role of non-state actors in the system of the emerging new world order is considered as one of the components of the formation of a democratic political process in the field of international relations, which ensures the achievement of a compromise of various subjects of world politics, the creation of common, universally recognized and observed rules. Multinational corporations are considered to be a fact that confirms the emergence of new trends in the formation of a new world order and is interpreted as the emergence of a «social international order», which represents a new form of evolution of the structure of international relations, which is distinguished by the power relations of the actors of world politics, which is no longer based on the principle «dominance – subordination» (Becker, 2001: 773).

Conclusion. The above analysis suggests that the world order is a set of rules of international communication that are established and enforced by leaders through instruments of power. The world order took its evolutionary path from a group of «great powers» to a bipolar world, and then to a unipolar one. Currently, the world order system is moving towards a non-polar or a multi-polar world, or, in general, towards a new structure.

For Ukraine, it is currently necessary to determine its place in the system of formation of the New World Order. First of all, its full subjective sovereignty is important for Ukraine, since Ukraine is on the battlefield of the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian paradigms of transforming the world order of the international security system. Russia, at any cost, including through military intervention, is trying to keep Ukraine in its sphere of influence, despite the minimal possibility of winning such competition.

The present demonstrates the importance of Ukraine for both major power centers, since the presence of Ukraine in the orbit of one or another world player will mean that this actor will be able to determine the future not only of the Eurasian region, but also of the whole world in general.

References:

1. Aron R. (2000). *Myr i viina mizh natsiiamy* [Peace and war between nations]. Translated from Franch. Kyiv: Yunivers [in Ukrainian].
2. Becker D. (2001). *Democracy and International Relations* // American Political Science Review. Vol. 95. № 3 [in English].
3. Bull H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society. A Study of Order in World Politics*. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, [in English].
4. Dashevskya O. (2015). Novyi svitovyi poriadok: teoretychni kontseptsii [New world order: theoretical concepts]. *European Political and Law Discourse*, 2. Vol. 4, 59–64. URL: <https://eppd13.cz/wp-content/uploads/2015/2015-2-4/10.pdf> [in Ukrainian].
5. Diurozel Zh.-B. (1995). *Istoriia dyplomatii vid 1919 roku do nashykh dniv* [History of diplomacy from 1919 to the present day]. Translated from Franch by Ye. Marichev, L. Pohorielova, V. Chaikovskyyi. Kyiv. Osnovy [in Ukrainian].
6. Hrushchynska N. (2014). Rozvytok suchasnoho svitovoho hospodarstva u protsesakh formuvannya novoho svitovoho ekonomichnoho poriadku [The development of the modern world economy in the processes of forming a new world economic order]. *Visnyk Sumskoho derzhavnoho universytetu. Ser.: Ekonomika*, 2, 28-34. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VSU_ekon_2014_2_5 [in Ukrainian].

7. Iali M. (2009). Poniattia ta pidkhody do tumachennia svitovoho poriadku [Concepts and approaches to the interpretation of the world order]. *Doslidzhennia svitovoi polityky. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. URL: <http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/16005/14-ljali.pdf?sequence=1> [in Ukrainian].
8. Ikenberry J. (2001). *After Victory. Institutions, Strategic Restrain, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton, N.J. [in English].
9. Kissinger H. (2017). *Svitovyi poriadok. Rozdumy pro kharakter natsii v istorychnomu konteksti* [World Order: Reflections on the Characters of Nations and the Course of History]. Translated from English by N. Koval. Kyiv: Nash Format [in Ukrainian].
10. Krushynskyi V., Manzhola V. (2007) *Mizhnarodni vidnosyny ta svitova polityka. 1945–1980. Daty. Podii. Fakty* [International relations and world politics. 1945–1980. Give. Events. The facts]. Kyiv. Lybid [in Ukrainian].
11. Matvieieva O. (2016). Transformatsiia svitovoho poriadku v umovakh hlobalnykh zahroz ta vyklykiv [Transformation of the world order in conditions of global threats and challenges]. *Naukovyi visnyk Dyplomatychnoi akademii Ukrainy*, 23, 113-119 [in Ukrainian].
12. Mearsheimer J. (1990). Why will we soon yearn for the Cold War URL: <https://www.theatlantic.com/past/docs/politics/foreign/mearsh.htm> [in English].
13. Mishchenko A. (2020). Novyi svitovyi poriadok: mizhnarodnyi diskurs (The New World Order: International Discourse). *Mizhnarodni vidnosyny: teoretyko-praktychni aspekty*, 6, 44-55. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/irtpa_2020_6_6 [in Ukrainian].
14. Morgenthau H. (1973). *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Fifth Edition. – N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf [in English].
15. Onyshchenko V. (2020). Henezys svitovoho ekonomichnoho poriadku [Genesis of the world economic order]. *Zovnishnia torhivlia: ekonomika, finansy, pravo*, 2, 38-55. doi.org/10.31617/zt.knute.2020(109)03 [in Ukrainian].
16. Potiekhin O. (2016). *Yaltynsko-potsdamska systema, «kholodna viina» ta sprobа yii reinkarnatsii/laltynska konferentsiia «Velykoi triiky» 1945 r. i evoliutsiia mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn u XX-XXI st.* [The Yalta-Potsdam system, the "Cold War" and an attempt at its reincarnation/Yalta conference of the "Big Three" in 1945 and the evolution of international relations in the 20th-21st centuries.] (pp. 77-79). Zbirnyk naukovykh prats, Kyiv: IVI NANU [in Ukrainian].
17. Shumskyi I. (2020). Vestfalska systemf yak vytyk novomodernoi systemy mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn [The Westphalian system as the origin of the new modern system of international relations]. *Almanakh mizhnarodnoho prava*, 23 [in Ukrainian].
18. Slaughter A.-M. (2004). *A New World Order*. Princeton and London [in English].
19. Taran Ye. (2022). Henezys systemy svitovoho poriadku [The genesis of the world order system]. *Scientific Perspectives*, 7(25), 190-199. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.52058/2708-7530-2022-7\(25\)-190-199](https://doi.org/10.52058/2708-7530-2022-7(25)-190-199) [in Ukrainian].
20. Waltz K. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. N. Y.: Reading: Adison Wesley, McGraw-Hill [in English].

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2022-2-35>

ЗАРУБІЖНИЙ ДОСВІД РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ФУНКЦІЇ ПУБЛІЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ ГРАЛЬНИМ БІЗНЕСОМ

Зоряна Топорецька,

кандидат юридичних наук,

доцент кафедри кримінального процесу та криміналістики

Навчально-наукового інституту права

Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка (Київ, Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2441-4852

zoriana_t@ukr.net

Анотація. У статті розглянуто зарубіжний досвід реалізації соціальної функції публічного управління гральним бізнесом на прикладі країн Європи. Соціальна функція публічного управління гральним бізнесом розглядається автором як компенсування суспільству негативних наслідків грального бізнесу суспільно-корисними проектами, які реалізуються та фінансуються за рахунок коштів, отриманих від грального бізнесу.

Проведене дослідження показує, що у всіх країнах Європи за рахунок надходжень від лотерей та азартних ігор фінансуються суспільно корисні проекти: охорона здоров'я, освіта, спорт, культура тощо.

Існують різні способи акумулювання та витрачання коштів. Зібрані кошти акумулюються в бюджеті держави (зазвичай в складі спеціального фонду), перераховуються на рахунок певного міністерства (позабюджетний державний фонд); перераховуються напряму в конкретний фонд (державний чи приватний) чи благодійну організацію або акумулюються і витрачаються самим організатором азартних ігор.

Акумульовані кошти витрачаються зазвичай напряму через перерахування коштів до певного фонду чи благодійної організації чи опосередковано – шляхом перерахування коштів на рахунок певного міністерства чи іншого державного органу, які розподіляють кошти між бенефіціарами. Для благодійних організацій характерне акумулювання і витрачання коштів самим організатором, який зазвичай є благодійною організацією.

Досвід країн Європи необхідно використати в Україні та прийняти закон, який би передбачав акумулювання коштів від ліцензійних платежів у сфері грального бізнесу у спеціальному фонді Державного бюджету України та витрачання їх на культуру, спорт, освіту, медицину тощо.

Ключові слова: азартні ігри, публічне управління, соціальна спрямованість, «добрі справи».