

UDC 321.01:316.259:316.32:339:97

Popkov V. V.

Prof., Dr. (Political Sciences)

Department of Political Science

Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University,

French Blvd., 24/26, Odesa, Ukraine

Tel.: (380482) 684373

E-mail: vpopkov951@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0519-4206>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18524/2707-5206.2022.35.259685>

Azaiev J. A.

Postgraduate student,

Department of Political Science

Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University,

French Blvd., 24/26, Odesa, Ukraine

Tel.: (380482) 684373

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18524/2707-5206.2022.35.259685>

**THE WAR AND THE WORLD-SYSTEM FATE. MODERN
INTERPRETATION OF IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN**

The Russian-Ukrainian war marked the Rubicon, on crossing which, the world has begun to change dramatically and irreversibly. This article is an attempt to comprehend the Russian-Ukrainian war in the context of the world-system methodology of I. Wallerstein. The authors consider the phenomenon of war and the phenomenon of revolution as key factors of historical change. The authors reconstruct the change in the geopolitical balance of power over long cycles of history, where the world war and the system of treaties after it are considered as starting points for new cyclic turns. The authors consider global changes in the world system order, starting from the period of the «Napoleonic Wars» and subsequent global wars of the XIXth — XXIst centuries. The article traces the role of World wars in the fate of the existing world-system. The Russian-Ukrainian war is seen as the initiation of the breakdown of the existing world order and the establishment of a world-system of a different type. This war has quite a clear geopolitical context, as any other great war in humankind's history. This context is a global geopolitical game that has engulfed almost the entire world community. Looking at Wallerstein's theory we can understand this game as the irreconcilable opposition of the dominant Occidental (Anglo-Saxon) world-system against attempts of the Oriental (China-centrical) system to brake the existing world order radically. World politology discusses attempts by the Chinese-Russian geopolitical alliance to receive the status of a new world-system core. As a result, there is a great increase in mutual tension between the two world-system cores.

Key words: world-system, world order, war, revolution, Wallerstan, Occidental, Oriental, Ukraine.

Introduction

This article began at the moment when gunshots were heard from the Black Sea coast of Odesa and an air raid siren was howling. Such a situation is very conducive to comparing the human and geopolitical dimensions of the war. The human dimension of any war is always tragic and irrational. These are suffering death, destruction, sorrow, and hatred. It is a challenge to the very meaning of life. Everything that in the military hell does not belong to the life of a man, the life of his relatives and friends, loses all value sharply.

The geopolitical dimension of war is quite different. Here, strategic calculations, supply chains, geographical maps, power combinations, and political reasons come to the fore. Unfortunately, the second dimension prevails in all wars, just as the historical life of any people is dominated not by their own hopes and aspirations, but by the logic imposed by their political elites.

The purpose of the article is to clarify the possible significance of the Russian-Ukrainian war as a factor in world-system historical changes in the context of I. Wallerstein's world-system methodology. This goal involves considering the dynamics of the development of world wars as triggers for geopolitical transformations.

We are convinced of this again, looking at the broke out on February 24, 2022, Russian-Ukrainian war. For all its tragedy, it is only an element of a grandiose geopolitical game. The meaning of this game is in the irreconcilable resistance of the Occidental (Anglo-Saxon) world-system against the Oriental (mainly Sino-centric) system, which is trying to establish itself. The Russian-Ukrainian war has become the point of bifurcation, which will either lay the foundation for some new, de-Westernized, world order or finally establish on the Russian ruins the world order based on the already existing five-century world-system model. However, the 21st century is able to bring something more original. As it can be seen from the very formulation of the question, in our analysis we proceed from the world-system methodology, which, in our opinion, is most fully and thoroughly set forth in the works of I. Wallerstein (Wallerstein, 2004).

Exposition

At the same time, following I. Wallerstein, we emphasize once again: that the current world-system has more than 500 years of natural development history, has great experience in the intensive foreign societies assimilation and geopolitical dominance, and has huge financial, economic, and human resources. At the same time, two major factors are constantly present in the life of this world-system, which is capable to change the world order profoundly and significantly. This is, firstly, the war and, secondly, the revolution. Most often they are closely intertwined. Especially when it comes to World Wars.

There have been at least five such wars in the last two centuries. This is, firstly, the totality of the «Napoleonic Wars» (some researchers call them the First World War), secondly, this is the «Great War» of 1914–1918. (in the traditional lexicon — World War I); thirdly, the World War 1939–1945. (in

modern interpretation, it is increasingly referred to as World War III). This is followed by the Fourth (1946–1991) «Cold» War. The fifth («hybrid» with the potential for global deployment) can be called the Russian-Ukrainian war (February 2022).

Let's start the analysis with the Napoleonic permanent World War I (1796–1815), in which at least 3 million people had died. Born in the crucible of the French Revolution, this war engulfed almost the entire European subcontinent, Egypt and Syria, captured part of Russia, affected the United States, aimed at India, while simultaneously implementing a continental blockade against Great Britain, together with a «battle of the fleets» in the adjacent waters.

Already at an early stage of this protracted war, one key problem began to emerge clearly — the problem of the relationship between world war and world revolution. Starting with a local event — a mass popular uprising against Louis XVI, the French Revolution soon discovered in itself a talent for the «worldwide emancipation» from the «power of monarchs and aristocrats.» This was facilitated by the long work of the French «encyclopedists» who saw in the «Enlightenment» a kind of «mental revolution» — the beginning of the emancipation of the whole world from backwardness, ignorance, and primitivism. Napoleon picked up on this idea, ushering in the era of personal «revolutionary imperialism.»

27-year-old General Bonaparte, commander of the famous Italy campaign, proclaimed:

«Let those who raised the daggers of civil war over France tremble; the hour of vengeance has come. But let the nations be calm. We are friends of all peoples... The free French people, respected by the whole world, will bring worthy peace to Europe...» (Manfred, 1989, p. 131).

Thus the Napoleonic «world war» became a revolutionary factor in the old feudal system's destruction on the European continent. The Napoleonic Civil Code and the abolition of the old tribal nobility opened a wide path for large-scale socio-economic changes. and mobilization of «civil society.» Bonaparte's creed: «through the destruction of the old European feudal system, to the new European world.» The space of Enlightenment and civil liberties was carried out wherever his troops passed. The global nature of Bonaparte's foreign policy ambitions was also indicated by his Eurasian project «from Paris to the Urals and Calcutta,» which since then and to this day has been taken up, by various political leaders up to the XXIst century inclusive. However, the real European process did not go according to Bonaparte's plan. His world-system project collapsed. The Napoleonic strategy of «continental blockade» (economic strangulation of England as the center of the 19th century world-economy) ended in failure. Defeated and deposed Napoleon died under the British supervision on the deserted island of St. Helena. The British-centric system was established throughout the world, and the pound sterling became the main world currency.

Why did it happen? To answer this question, we will try to trace the algorithm of the main events caused by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. So:

a) the result of the French Revolution is a Bonapartist («revolutionary» in origin) world war;

b) in the course of the Napoleonic World War, the old feudal system was broken down, bourgeois social relations and bourgeois legislation developed rapidly;

c) English commercial pragmatism comes into decisive conflict with the political idealism of Bonaparte;

d) bourgeois Britain assumes the role of the old feudal Europe «restoration wars» hegemon, using them in its own business interests;

e) as a result, after the final victory over Napoleon, was established a transitional world order, in which the old European feudal monarchism «lets in» a new economic content, Anglo-Saxon in origin and bourgeois essentially;

f) Britain, which successfully combines monarchism and bourgeoisism, becomes exactly the subject that turned out to be the most «acceptable» in post-war Europe.

This is why British capitalism is taking over the European and world market practically without resistance.

Thus, taking advantage of the Old Europe restoration wars (1812–1815) in response to the daring geopolitical challenge of the «revolutionary emperor,» Britain found itself on the «top of the mountain.» Moreover, her triumph turned out to be that «crown of the French Revolution» which even in the worst dream could not come to Robespierre or Bonaparte. The Napoleonic dream of a brilliant «Empire of Enlightenment» turned into the triumph of a vulgar «Empire of Profit».

A kind of historical «three-stage transmission» worked:

a) the French national revolution spilled over into a World war,

b) the World war produced pan-European revolutionary changes, and

c) the European revolutionary changes, in turn, cleared the way for Britain to establish a liberal-bourgeois (essentially Anglo-Saxon) world order.

Further wars were initiated (or «privatized»), mainly by Britain in accordance with its geo-economical and geopolitical interests. These include the «Opium Wars» of the 1840s in China, the «Crimean War» (1853–1856) in Russia, the Russian wars in Central Asia (1853–1895), the Russo-Turkish war (1877–1878), the Anglo-Burke war (1899–1902), etc. The exception was only the Franco-Prussian war (1870–1871), which manifested the rise of a new, self-sufficient and competitive, center of force — Prussia (the nucleus of the future II Reich).

The First World (or «The Great») war broke out on July 28, 1914, almost a hundred years after the Napoleonic World War. She became the second (after the wars of 1810–1815) the most powerful trigger of global changes. The English-centric world, which at that time had the United States as a «younger partner» reached the peak of its power. After the victory in the «Great War» (November 1918), Britain began to rule the lands that extended all the azimuth with a total area of 31,878,965 kmI. This is about 22 % of the earth. The total population of the empire by that time was about 480 million people (approximately 1/4 of the then humanity). This, in particular, explains

the key communicative role of the English language as the most common language around the world.

By 1919, German militarism seemed completely destroyed. Japan was bogged down in Chinese problems. Four powerful empires fell down: German, Austro-Hungarian, Russian and Ottoman. France, a member of the Entente, bloodless after the severe war, became British dependent. Another British ally (Russia), which fell under the revolution and the Civil War blows, not only became the successor of the promised victory benefits but lost a lot of its own property. Under the control of the Anglo-centric world system, became about 86 % of the population of the planet. In those years, Britain was at the top of success and did not see any serious competitors on the horizon. However, there was one thing, that overshadowed this horizon. We are talking about awakening from many isolationist slipping years of global power of the United States. In the Anglo-Saxon global duet, in addition to the traditional performer No.1 (Britain), the voice of performer No.2 (USA) began to sound more confidently and loudly.

In addition, in the interval between the First World («The Great») and the Second World War (in fact «The Third»), were found factors that did not fit into the Great Britain geopolitical imagination. In the three countries (Russia, Italy and Germany), occurred three (each in its own way) revolutions. And were marked three points of growth, due to not so much socio-economical but socio-psychological and politico-cultural factors. Three sources of world-system anxiety arose. There were a) Russian communism, b) Italian fascism and c) German Nazism. All three had a totalitarian structure. All three denied the old bourgeois world order. All three resolutely condemned the «rotten» liberal democracy. All three had the intention to build their own special world order in accordance with their original world-system project.

The first (Russian) revolution of 1917 passed two stages (February and November) reaching in November the highest (Jacobin) radicalization. By the beginning of World War II, the Bolsheviks with the help of a powerful political, cultural and social propaganda, when using totally organized repressive technologies, managed to discipline the people and mobilize their creative energy for scientific, technical and military modernization. This was especially clearly manifested during the period of the «Stalin's five-year-terms» (1928–1932; 1933–1937).

The second is the Italian (fascist) revolution (1922–1924), although in a much smaller range, managed to mobilize the masses for a political coup and social modernization. The famous Ukrainian, Russian and European Philosopher N. Berdyaev noted that «Italian fascism has on its basis the myth of the state as the highest value and the supreme creature...» (Berdyaev, 1991).

The third (Nazi) revolution (Germany, 1933) led to the dominance of the nationalism as a total ideology and policy. The principle of the Germans racial superiority was put at the forefront, and the state was put at the service of this principle. In his book «Mein Kampf», Hitler directly states:

«... it is not the state that is the main prerequisite for the emergence of a higher breed person, but the race. This property of the race is eternal. Only

appropriate external conditions are needed for that it can practically manifest itself» (Gitler, 2012, p. 307).

Hence — the main setting of the Nazi ideology (unlike the Italian fascists) — the creation of a pure and strong race, capable to uncontested world domination, and the transformation of the state into its instrument.

This is what German Nazism (racism) was fundamentally different from Italian fascism. If Mussolini put forward a totalitarian state as a system-forming principle, capable of rallying all citizens into a single whole, regardless of their nationality and religion, but Hitler put forward a race as a system-forming core that uses the power of the state apparatus to suppress, subjugate or eliminate all racially alien peoples. If Mussolini strove for an «integrator state», then Hitler strove for a «separator state» that rigidly separated the «clean» from the «unclean». At the same time, both ideologies were the initiators of the totalitarian repressive practices. This united them.

Unlike German Nazism and Italian fascism, the Soviet socialist «state of workers and peasants» did not seek to assert the dominance of one race (nation) over all the others, nor did it seek to «compress» all classes into a single cluster «a la Mussolini». Its goal was to «liberate the whole world from the exploiting classes» and reorganize it on egalitarian principles, taken from a Christian context and reinforced by the slogans of the French Revolution: «Liberty, Fraternity, Equality».

In accordance with the concept of the Bolshevik's leader V. Lenin, one of the main strategic tasks of the proletarian dictatorship state should be the movement towards a classless society. He emphasized: «For the complete destruction of classes, it is necessary not only to overthrow the exploiters, landowners and capitalists, not only to abolish their property, it is also necessary to abolish all private ownership of the production means, it is necessary to destroy both the difference between town and village, so as the difference between people of physical and mental labor. This is a very long task. To make it, is needed a huge step forward in the development of productive forces, it is necessary to overcome the resistance... of the numerous remnants of small-scale production, it is necessary to overcome the enormous force of habit and inertness associated with these remnants» (Lenin, 1967, p. 15). It is quite understandable that with such a total denial of all social differences, there is hardly place for emphasize racial and national inequality.

If the German world order looked like a hierarchical pyramid of peoples and races, on top of which is the «great German nation» (as the standard of the «Aryan race»), then the Leninist world order looked like a global («horizontal») co-optation of the peoples of the world into a common Soviet Union based on national and cultural equality. For this reason, the communist-type totalitarianism looked more socially attractive than the other two totalitarianisms (Italian and German). It is quite likely that this very circumstance, in addition to a number of others, played a role in the unification of the USSR with liberal allies (the United States and Britain) to defeat fascism. It is possible that the Soviet national-racial egalitarianism was more or less understandable to the liberal world, which also spoke of the

formal equality of peoples. Perhaps this explains the assumption by the West (for a certain time) of the socialist world-system headed by the USSR.

Returning to the Second World War, we note that by its beginning (September 1, 1939) had formed two distinct anti-liberal clusters, which could really threaten the existence of the dominant world-system with its Anglo-Saxon core. These are German Nazism (with Italian fascism and Japanese militarism) and Soviet communism (combined with the flaring up revolutionary movement in China and the combat cell system of the Comintern).

In this situation, there was only one way out for Britain — to clash two anti-systems, that had matured by the beginning of the world war, against each other, supporting one of them to destroy the other (while preparing to eliminate the survivor). Let us recall Churchill's position in relation to the warring USSR and Germany: «For 400 years, England's foreign policy was to confront the strongest, most aggressive, most influential power on the continent... We have always... united with less powerful powers, created a coalition with them and in this way they defeated and frustrated the plans of the continental military tyrant, whoever he was, whatever country he was at the head of...» (Huntington, 2003).

The defeat of the German Nazis and their satellites in World War II (1939–1945) led not only to the liquidation of one of the opponents of liberal democracy but also to the «development» by the Americans of the British colonial legacy. And Britain itself has turned (to use the terminology of the writer Orwell) into «airstrip number 2» for the United States. After Breton Woods, the dollar becomes the world currency. West Germany, defeated, humiliated, and denazified, was integrated into the American-centric world. East Germany becomes part of the Soviet anti-system. And the whole of Western Europe, reanimated with the Marshall Plan help, was turning into an additional (in relation to the United States) center of world politics. The American-British world-system with a built-in Western European cluster was starting to gradually eliminate the USSR as the core of the anti-system. At the same time, the USSR follows the course of the world capitalist system destruction and the USA as its core. Everyone remembers the well-known N. S. Khrushchev exclamation at the session of the UN General Assembly: «We will bury you!»

From the Fulton W. Churchill speech (March 1945), the «Cold» (Fourth) World War begins. 45 years later it ends with the collapse of the USSR and the destruction of the entire European part of the World Socialist System. There remains a group of eastern countries with a socialist orientation without a core uniting them (China, Vietnam, North Korea). Socialist Cuba is becoming an abandoned island in the Atlantic Ocean. At the same time, China of the Deng Xiaoping era was temporarily developing in a «built-in» (into the American trade partnership system) mode, covertly using this situation for large-scale socio-economic modernization and launching a counter-offense.

Since the beginning of the XX century 90s, after the collapse of the USSR, the ancient 500-year-old capitalist world-system receives a surge of fresh strength, rises to a new level, and, thanks to its global leader (USA), modifies

its structure. Four levels of the Global Leader «escort» are being formed, — the «inner circle» (Britain, Western European countries, and Japan), the «middle circle» (countries admitted to the EU and NATO), the «far circle» (dependent countries seeking the favor of the United States) and, finally, «outcasts» (those who, for one reason or another, «have lost the Boss high trust»). In addition, in the zone of the American-centric world-system constant monitoring, there is one more circle — the «circle of existential threats», fraught with the emergence and development of an alternative world-system, able to overturn the current one. Today, it is primarily China, conducted with Russia, which is striving to concentrate around a multi-vectored set of non-Western countries.

It should be noted that since the end of the XXth century, the activity of states belonging to this group has been increasing. Even S. Huntington emphasized: «The balance of influence between civilizations is shifting. The relative influence of the West is declining. The economic, political, and military power of Asian civilizations is growing. The demographic explosion of Islamic countries has destabilizing consequences both for the Muslim states themselves and for their neighbors. Non-Western civilizations reaffirm the value of their cultures» (Huntington, 2003, p. 15).

It is in this set of states belonging to non-Western civilizations, which are still less consolidated than the Western world, «center of attraction» is gradually crystallizing. We are talking about the Chinese-Russian geoeconomical and geopolitical alliance, which seeks to acquire the status of a new world-system core. All this inevitably leads the world to the mutual tension increase (up to an extreme degree of antagonism) between the two world-system cores — existing American-centric and rising Chinese-centric.

Once upon a time, the Soviet-Chinese alliance did not take place due to the desire of the USSR in the 60s to dominate and impose its political and economic system on China. Ultimately, this ended in a bloody clash on Damansky Island in March 1969. At present, a modernized China is in the status of a leading party and is behaving strategically very competently, strengthening its «field of attraction.»

Unlike post-Soviet Russia, which lost a significant part of its territories and resources and abandoned its former ideological attitudes, China has managed to maintain its territorial integrity and, most importantly, its strategic ideology. While post-Yeltsin Russia was looking for new ideological meanings for its further existence, communist China (with all its tactical maneuvers and assumptions) confidently continued to follow the strategic course chosen once and forever. Here, perhaps, the centuries-old Chinese «culture of Tao» — the culture and philosophy of the Way as the sense of human existence.

However, for all the existing differences in ideologies of both countries, modern China and Russia agree that the established Anglo-Saxon world-system model is becoming a «suffocating factor» and an obvious existential threat to them. There are also reasons to believe that both states agreed that the destruction of the existing world order is possible only by force. Something similar happened in the formation history of the Western world-

system itself. There is ample evidence that the history of the West is the history of many large and small wars, and four of them were the World wars (as discussed above).

The East in the XXst century, in fact, turned out to be in this trend. The original intention of the 24.02.22. «Hybrid» war was reduced to a sudden and rapid change of the power balance in the Western European bridgehead in favor of Russia, followed by a change of the power balance in the zone of Southeast Asia in favor of China. Such a blow from two strategic flanks (East European and Taiwan), apparently, was intended to achieve a sharp reduction in the Anglo-Saxon influence on Eurasia, and, in fact, on Africa. In this case, the Chinese «Belt and Road» strategy will receive full military and political support, which, in the end, may lead to a sharp existing world order reformatting.

However, things didn't go according to plan. This war began to turn into a «black hole», into which almost the entire global community began to be drawn gradually. The fact of the decisive rallying of more than 40 Western states to provide comprehensive military assistance to Ukraine to achieve a decisive victory over Russia speaks volumes. The Anglo-Saxon core entered into a decisive struggle against the attempts of the emerging Sino-centric world-system core to change the world order in its favor. This, in particular, explains the alignment of two military-political blocs (NATO and AUUKUS) along with certain strategic directions. One (NATO) aims to destroy the Russian flank. The other (AUUKUS) targets China. At the same time, the China-Russian alliance has its own macro-regional and functional specialization. The Eastern European land zone of Eurasia (mainly Ukraine) has become the vector of Russia's offensive efforts. The coastal zone of Southeast Asia (primarily Taiwan and the Solomon Islands) has become the vector of China's priority efforts. In functional terms, economically limited Russia resorts to using its «untwisted» military potential, and economically powerful China, based on the Russian military campaign monitoring, is developing a combined, multi-way strategy for advancing in the Southeast direction. One thing is clear: both Russia and China see their bond not just as a situational alliance, but as a deep cooperation, designed for a long historical game, the main prize of which will be a new world order.

On analyzing the experience of the Russian «special operation», China cannot but register the Kremlin's strategic blunders. It is striking that Moscow underestimates the power and combat readiness of the Ukrainian armed forces, the extent to which the Ukrainian political system has «growth» into the organism of Ukrainian society. The extent of the «reagent potential» of the West in its response to the Russian challenge was also underestimated.

The second significant mistake is seen in the vagueness of the «special operation» motivational aspect. Once, Napoleon justified his invasion of Europe (and then Russia) by the need to «carry the ideals of the French Revolution», to liberate Europe from «rotten monarchical regimes.» Hitler inspired the German people with their «sacred right» to conquer the living space and establish world domination «by the right of a strong race.» Stalin

called on the peoples of the USSR to unite in order to rid the world of the «brown plague» and bring to the humankind «social liberation and equality».

In the «special operation», everything was initially reduced to «denazification», «demilitarization» and the achievement of the Ukrainian «neutral status». Subsequently, this slogan was replaced by the more specific slogan «liberation from Nazi terror the citizens of Donetsk and Luhansk regions» Such vagueness of the motivational base is not accidental. It is due to the uncertainty of the ideological positioning of Russia after the USSR collapse. If the Soviet Union positioned itself as the «vanguard of all progressive mankind», waging the uncompromising struggle against the «reactionary capitalist world», then post-Soviet Russia for a long time sought to position itself as «part of the civilized West», albeit with some «Russian specifics». Over time, the emphasis on «Russian specifics» began to intensify, without changing, however, the main message: «Basically, we are the same as you.» This explains the paradoxical circumstance that in the official rhetoric of the Kremlin leadership, even in the most acute conflict situations, the West did not hear definitions such as «enemies», «competitors.» Invariably sounded only one word — «partners».

It is this unstable Russian ideological positioning, that negatively affected the Russian «special operation» motivation in Ukraine. However, the logic of the brutal war, the very fact of the unanimous and acutely hostile rallying of the West against Russia, forces Russian society (even apart from the actions of the political elite) to reconsider its basic ideological positions. Russia is forced to realize its incompatibility with the Western system of values. Gorbachev's «new thinking» turned out to be a fake. There is a return (for the umpteenth time!) from «Western romanticism» to the logic of «hard historical reality».

Today, the Russian leadership is faced with the need to carry out an internal «conservative revolution». Its main elements can be (as problems deepen) firstly, the purge of the command armed forces staff (on charges of incompetence, negligence and corruption), the transfer of army and the military-industrial complex to the wartime regime and permanent combat readiness; secondly, the tightening of control over «big business» up to the nationalization of certain sectors of the economy; thirdly, the development of the «strong people's social state» ideology (rather in the style of Russian populism than communist Bolshevism); fourthly, the reorganization of higher and secondary education in the «Soviet school» traditions, fourthly, the decisive opposition of the «true values» philosophy to «Western decadence», the «cleansing» of Russian society as a whole and young people, in particular, from «internal decadence», education in the youth qualities of diligence, responsibility, strong-willed skills and physical endurance (like the «Ready for Labor and Defense» movement in the early USSR); fifthly, the tightening of internal ideological and political censorship, the desire to turn Russia into a «single ideological and political cluster» embraced by the idea of «people's patriotism».

It cannot be argued that all these tendencies will manifest themselves in full, but one thing is clear: the instinct of self-preservation will force Russia

to change internally, become more disciplined and tough, or perish. It is also obvious that the Russian-Ukrainian war is already beginning to change Russia from within. All these transformations are quite coherent with the political plans of modern China. There is a growing strategic connection in which China is taking on the role of a partner, who leads, and Russia — is a lead partner. To some extent, this is reminiscent of the United States and Europe's strategic «duet». But when looking at recent events related to Russia's apparent military failures, this «duet» becomes more and more problematic and undesirable for China.

There is an assumption that in the range between 2022 and 2025, the «corridor of opportunities» will open before the world, upon exiting which we will be able to find ourselves in one of the certain world-system contexts.

Let's outline the contours of the two main (diametrically opposed) options.

Option one (occidental): «Triumph of the West.»

a) The West uses the factor of «bogging down» Russia in the space of «hybrid war» for complete moral discrediting, economic exhaustion and total «abolition» of its inveterate geopolitical adversary, Russia, from the context of world civilization. Russia is «squeezed out», pushed out, and removed from the oxidative world — system space. In this situation, according to the head of the American analytical service «STRATFOR» D. Friedman: «... the country will fall apart... (as it already fell apart in 1917 and it happened again — in 1991) and soon... will collapse military power of Russia (Fridman, 2010, p. 162).

b) The West is intensifying the technologies developed since the time of Gorbachev's «perestroika» to use the mechanisms of democratic procedures for wide access to Russian domestic politics. The expected result is the political desovereignization of Russia and the reprogramming of «Russian identity.»

c) The American-centric world-system is «developing» post-Russian resources on the backdrop of political and economic «tying» a weakened (and possibly disintegrated) Russia, with a parallel strengthening of Ukraine's managerial functions in the Russian post-imperial space.

d) Attempts to disintegrate China as a core of a global counter-system. The expectation that (according to the forecasts of the same Friedman), «China... will not withstand the consequences of the economic downturn and will break up into separate regions, the borders of which are well known, and the central part will weaken and let go of the threads of rule... « (Fridman, 2010, p. 136). The United States assets in this outcome are more than obvious: a weakened and dependent Europe, a conquered Russian Heartland, a weakened China with an alarming prospect of disintegration. Restoration of monopolarity in the style of «Pax Americana».

Option two (oriental): «Triumph of the East.»

a) After the failure of the February «blitzkrieg», Russia begins to focus on internal mobilization resources (military-political, economic, social, value-ideological), moves to the economic autarky and the ideology of the imperial «reconquista.» Is awakening the very «Russian reflex», which at one time extremely worried Bismarck: «... the most favorable outcome of the war will never lead to the decomposition of the main force of Russia, which is based on

millions of Russians... These latter, even if they are divided by international treaties, so they quickly recombine with each other, like particles of a cut piece of mercury...» (Bismarck, 2019). In the near future, the ideology and practice of modernized Russian populism may intensify, along with the ideas of deoligarchization of Russian society. The question of the «social responsibility» of Big Business under the political power radical control will be put on the agenda. The ideas of «Russian-Christian neo-imperialism,» the historical revenge of Russia, the denunciation of the «historical untruth» of the West, and the assertion of the «spiritual power» of the East will take root in public opinion. «World-saving» in the style of F. Dostoevsky can become the basis of the Russian state ideology and the dominant cultural trend. On this basis, a system of new world order is being formed in close connection with the Chinese world-system project of the «Common Destiny Global World.» But reality says that with every day of the Russian-Ukrainian war, Russia is losing its chance more and more.

b) In the new China-centric world-system core, Russia will claim the role of a geopolitical «balancer» and «moderator» of the countries set, that adheres to the de-Westernized path of development. But at present day, things look different. Russia is increasingly turning into China's raw materials appendage, an increasingly dependent segment of Chinese world policy.

c) A gradual «re-switching» of Western European countries (trade, energy, investment, culture, and education) to the East will begin. Specialization of the «Eurasian tetragon» (China — Russia — India — Turkey) countries in the development of specialized segments of cooperation with the West.

d) Ultimately, the reorientation of the planet's population majority to the new Eurasian geo-economic center. The possibility of creating an analogue of the UN in the Eastern segment of the planet. Limitation of the Anglo-Saxon world activities by the zone of the Atlantic with a corresponding decrease in its status. The emergence of the phenomenon of «Anglo-Saxon peripherality». The gradual transition of Australia and Oceania into the orbit of China-centric Southeast Asia influence. Integration of Central Asia and the Middle East into a China-central world order. Increasing of non-Western countries totality, the level of cohesion. The turn of Western Europe towards the Eurasian integration process. But all of this is very problematic, given the difficult domestic political situation in China itself and the nature of his relations with India, and many other countries in the Pacific region also.

e) The global «conservative revolution» implementation on the basis of the historically established human society values. The onset of an era that modern intellectuals define as a «consciousness revolution» after «postmodernity» (Grof, Laslo & Rassel, 2004). However, today we are witnessing a global «wrestling» in which there is no guaranteed outcome and in which Ukraine, her spirit, her combat capability and her moral and political values play a key role.

However, the consolidation of the totality of Western countries in supporting Ukrainian resistance to the Russian invasion speaks about a significant resource of the West in upholding its principles and values.

Conclusion

Outlined here the two «polar» scenarios of the events possible development are far from exhausting the entire spectrum of the Russian-Ukrainian war global consequences. Most likely, the restructuring of the world order will follow some kind of «third», or even «fifth» or «eighteenth» path. Let us only pay attention to the fact that the ideal outcome from the dramatic «clash of civilizations» was drawn by S. Huntington at the end of the 20th century. He wrote: «A global war of civilizations can be avoided only when world leaders accept the multi-civilizational nature of global politics and begin cooperate to maintain it» (Huntington, 2003, p. 16).

However, the achievement of such an ideal state is possible, as the American political scientist believed, subject to three main conditions:

Condition one: «The survival of the West depends on whether Americans reaffirm their Western identification» [ibid] (i.e., abandon their global claims and return to their traditional Western segment).

Second condition: «... will the Westerners accept their civilization as unique, not as universal» [ibid] (that is, they will agree that Western civilization is no longer an imperative for the whole world, but just one of the equivalent civilizations).

Third condition: unification «... to preserve civilization against the challenges of non-Western societies» [ibid] (that is, the return of the West to its original civilizational borders, internal consolidation, appeal to its values and shrines).

The global world expects similar thoughtful and consistent actions from the East. It is quite clear that the transition to such a world order, especially in the conditions of a flaring up war, is very problematic and complicated. But there are chances if: a) politicians are seriously concerned about the fate of mankind and show the will to real agreements, b) if they show the courage to strictly observe these agreements, and c) if real politics prevails with a clear and fair observance of the interests, cultural preferences and traditions of all the world peoples without exception.

Today, it is obvious one thing — the Russian-Ukrainian war marked the Rubicon, on crossing which, the world has already begun to change dramatically and irreversibly. And the role of Ukraine, the heroism of its army, the creativity of its command, its growing resistance to the aggressor is becoming a decisive factor in the global bifurcation.

References [Список використаної літератури]

- Berdyayev, N. (1991). *New Middle Ages. Reflection on the fate of Russia and Europe*. Moscow: HDS-Press [in Russian]. [Бердяев Н. Новое средневековье. Размышление о судьбе России и Европы. М.: ХДС-Пресс, 1991. 82 с.].
- Bismarck, O. (2019). *Thoughts and memories*. M.: Folio [in Russian]. [Бисмарк О. Мысли и воспоминания. М.: Фолио, 2019. 576 с.].
- Fridman, D. (2010). *The Next 100 Years: A Forecast of the Events of the 21st Century*. Moscow: EKSMO [in Russian]. [Фридман Д. Следующие 100 лет: прогноз событий XXI века / пер с англ. М.: ЭКСМО, 2010. 336 с.].

- Grof, S., Laszlo, E. & Russell, P. (2004). *The Revolution of Consciousness. Transatlantic dialogue*. М.: AST [in Russian]. [Гроф С., Ласло Э., Рассел П. Революция сознания. Трансатлантический диалог. М.: АСТ, 2004. 248 с.]
- Hitler, A. (2012). *My struggle*. Moscow: Vityaz [in Russian]. [Гитлер А. Моя борьба. М.: Витязь, 2012. 552 с.]
- Huntington, S. (2003). *The Clash of Civilizations?* М.: AST [in Russian]. [Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций. М.: АСТ, 2003, 604 с.]
- Lenin, V. I. (1967). *The Great Initiative / Complete Works*. Moscow: Politizdat [in Russian]. [Ленин В. И. Великий почин // Полное собрание сочинений. М.: Политиздат, 1967. Т. 39. 624 с.]
- Manfred, A. Z. (1989). *Napoleon Bonaparte*. М.: Thought [in Russian]. [Манфред А. З. Наполеон Бонапарт. М.: Мысль, 1989. 733 с.]
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). *The End of the World As We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-First Century*. М.: Logos [in Russian]. [Валлерстайн И. Конец знакомого мира: Социология XXI века / пер. с англ. под ред. В. И. Иноземцева. М.: Логос, 2004. 368 с.]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 13.06.2022

Попков В. В., Азаєв Д. А.

кафедра політології, ОНУ імені І. І. Мечникова
к.35, Французький бул., 24/26, м. Одеса, 65058, Україна

ВІЙНА ТА ДОЛЯ СВІТ-СИСТЕМИ. СУЧАСНА ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЯ ІММАНУЇЛА ВАЛЛЕРСТАЙНА

Резюме

Російсько-українська війна позначила Рубікон, перейшовши який, світ почав кардинально і незворотно змінюватися. Ця стаття є спробою осмислення російсько-української війни в контексті миросистемної методології І. Валлерстайна. Автори розглядають феномен війни та феномен революції як ключові фактори історичних змін. У статті реконструйовано зміни геополітичного балансу сил протягом довгих циклів історії, де світова війна та система договорів після неї розглядаються як відправні точки для нових циклічних поворотів. Автори розглядають глобальні зміни у миросистемному устрої, починаючи з періоду «наполеонівських воєн» та подальших глобальних воєн ХІХ–ХХІ ст. У статті наголошується на особливій ролі світових воєн в історії існуючої світосистеми. Російсько-українська війна бачиться як початок ламання існуючого світопорядку та встановлення миросистеми іншого типу. Автори відзначають, що ця війна має цілком чіткий геополітичний контекст, як будь-яка інша велика війна в історії людства. Цей контекст є глобальною геополітичною грою, що охопила практично всю світову спільноту. Вивчаючи теорію Валлерстайна, автори трактують цю гру як непримиренне протистояння панівній західній (англо-саксонській) світосистемі спробам східної (китаєцентричної) системи радикально загальмувати існуючий світопорядок. У світовій політології розглядаються спроби китайсько-російського геополітичного альянсу набути статусу нового ядра світосистеми. В результаті, на думку авторів, відбувається сильне зростання взаємної напруги між двома ядрами світової системи. Задаючись питаннями про те, чи згорить глобальний світ у вогні ядерної катастрофи, чи перейде людство в новий невідомий і тривожний світовий порядок, чи збереже світоустрій, що склався на початок ХХІ століття, свої основні характеристики, — автори визначають можливі сценарії та прогніти розвитку подій.

Ключові слова: світ-система, світовий порядок, війна, революція, Валлерстайн, оксидентальний, орієнтальний, Україна.