

IRSTI 10.07.53
UDC 321.011
JEL K39

<https://doi.org/10.46914/2959-4197-2025-1-1-13-21>

MOMYSHEVA F.S.,*¹

c.l.s., associate professor.

*e-mail: f.momysheva@turan-edu.kz

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4053-0690

SUMBAROVA M.V.,²

d.l.s., associate professor.

e-mail: sumbarova.marina@inbox.lv

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0731-1982

ZHANGABULOVA ZH.M.,³

MSc in foreign regional studies,

senior lecturer.

e-mail: zhangabulova09@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2731-2920

KULIBEK A.B.,⁴

m.l.s., senior lecturer.

e-mail: begalykyzy.ak@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-5234-2688

¹Turan University,

Almaty, Kazakhstan

²Baltic International Academy,

Riga, Latvia

³Karaganda University of Kazpotreboyz,

Karaganda, Kazakhstan

⁴ESIL University,

Astana, Kazakhstan

GLOBALIZATION AS A FACTOR OF SOVEREIGNTY TRANSFORMATION: OPPORTUNITIES, RISKS, AND LEGAL CONSEQUENCES

Abstract

This article is dedicated to the study of the multifaceted process of globalization, analyzing key concepts that shape the understanding of this complex phenomenon. The relationship between globalization and sovereignty is a central issue. Various theoretical approaches are considered, ranging from liberal theories that emphasize economic integration and interdependence to critical perspectives that highlight increasing inequality and the erosion of national borders. The impact of globalization on political, economic, and cultural spheres is examined, along with its consequences for nation-states and their ability to control internal processes. The authors focus on how to balance engagement in global economic and political processes with the protection of national sovereignty. The interconnection between these two aspects is explored. This article aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the main concepts of globalization and their impact on state sovereignty, identifying both opportunities and risks associated with this process and contributing to a deeper understanding of contemporary global politics.

Key words: globalization, alter-globalization, state sovereignty, internationalization, Westernization, regionalization, integration.

Introduction

The term “globalization” was first introduced by the American marketing scholar Theodore Levitt, after which it became firmly established not only in the language of entrepreneurs but also gained

widespread use across various fields. Levitt's main idea is that, in the long run, "global" companies will dominate rather than transnational ones. Their strategy should focus on product standardization and cost optimization rather than adapting to consumer preferences in individual local markets. In other words, the future belongs to those who strive for unification and cost reduction rather than catering to the specific demands of each region. Unlike transnational corporations, global corporations perceive the world as a single market rather than a collection of separate territories [1].

However, in the decades since the term "globalization" began to be widely used in the fields of state and law, its definition has remained ambiguous. As evident from publications in recent years, both in the West and the East [2], the concept remains blurred. Debates about what globalization is, its nature, and its ultimate goals – initiated when researchers first began to analyze this phenomenon – have not only persisted but have also deepened and expanded. The intensity of these discussions arises from the irreconcilable differences in perspectives on globalization, expressed by various scholars. Many of them, when addressing the social consequences of globalization and the changes it brings to social structures, struggle to maintain an objective assessment. There is also a broad spectrum of opinions on how globalization interacts with other social processes, its short-term and long-term prospects, and its impact on nations and peoples.

One thing is undeniable: global processes are reshaping national sovereignty, reducing its scope and altering its very essence. The emergence of international organizations, the universalization of legal norms, the formation of intergovernmental alliances, the rise of supranational institutions, the dominance of global currencies, and the marginalization of certain ethnic languages – all of these reflect the rapid transformation of sovereignty in its various forms.

The future remains uncertain. To what extent are national sovereignty and deepening globalization compatible – or perhaps even antagonistic? This question requires thorough analysis and forecasting of potential development scenarios.

Materials and methods

The study is based on scientific articles, including those from peer-reviewed journals, as well as monographs by leading researchers in the fields of law, economics, sociology, and political science. Particular attention was given to empirical studies that analyze specific aspects of globalization.

Various research methods were employed at both theoretical and empirical levels. Theoretical analysis included an examination of key globalization concepts proposed by different schools of thought, such as liberalism, Marxism, and constructivism. Empirical analysis focused on assessing the impact of globalization on various aspects of the global economy and society. This combined approach made it possible to present a balanced and well-argued view of the phenomenon of globalization.

The use of systemic scientific research methods allowed for a comprehensive examination of the object and subject of the study, considering their development and interactions with other phenomena. Based on this framework, an attempt was made to identify specific patterns and trends in the evolution of state sovereignty under the conditions of globalization.

In academic discourse, sovereignty and globalization are often presented as mutually exclusive forces. The study of these concepts has attracted the attention of many researchers.

The question of state sovereignty has long captivated scholars. Certain elements of the sovereignty doctrine have been reflected in the works of renowned Kazakhstani and global political and legal thinkers. Their writings analyze key aspects related to independence and the supremacy of state power. These ideas have developed over centuries and continue to influence modern interpretations of sovereignty. The study of these thinkers – Aristotle, Jean Bodin, Alexander Hamilton, Hegel, V.M. Hessen, Thomas Hobbes, Hugo Grotius, N.N. Alekseev, Hans Kelsen, among others – provides deeper insights into the evolution of the concept of sovereignty and its significance for international law and political theory.

A comprehensive analysis of the concept of sovereignty and state structure has been provided in the works of Kazakhstani and Russian scholars, including S.A. Avakyan, M.T. Baymakhanov, M.V. Baglay, S.Z. Zimanov, V.A. Kim, A.K. Kotov, O.E. Kutafin, E.L. Kuzmin, B.M. Lazarev, I.D. Levin, V.S. Nersesyants, S.S. Sartaev, G.S. Sapargaliyev, V.E. Chirkin, V.S. Shevtsov, and others.

Globalization, manifested in the increasing interconnectedness of states, has become the subject of intense debates regarding the transformation of national sovereignty among contemporary Western scholars, including Kenneth Waltz, Roland Robertson, David Held, and others [3]. Some researchers argue that globalization leads to the erosion of sovereignty, as transnational corporations and international organizations exert growing influence over domestic policies. Others, however, contend that globalization does not necessarily undermine sovereignty but rather transforms it. States adapt to new conditions, reinterpreting their roles and functions.

In our view, it is premature to claim that the various aspects of globalization have been fully conceptualized in academic discourse. Foundational domestic studies on the impact of globalization on the state-legal sphere remain limited in number.

Furthermore, despite the existence of numerous publications, monographs, and dissertations, the issue of sovereignty's transformation in the era of globalization remains insufficiently explored.

Results and discussion

The concept of revolutionary globalism (hyper-globalism) has its primary supporters among politicians and business leaders. It is widely recognized as a successful model of societal development based on the Western paradigm and envisions the future of globalization as a fundamental restructuring of human activity. These ideas are rooted in neoliberal theory and practice, where globalization is seen as a specific form of internationalization of economic, political, and cultural life, focused on accelerated economic integration on a global scale. This approach maximizes the use of scientific and technological advancements and free market mechanisms, often disregarding national entities, social structures, cultural and civilizational factors, and ecological imperatives. According to this perspective, free competition and market dynamics will naturally ensure the most rational and efficient distribution of resources and capital, ultimately leading to the formation of a global economic, legal, and political space and establishing a new world economic order [4].

Evolutionary globalists (transformationists), on the other hand, consider the modern form of globalization historically unprecedented, incomparable to any previous world order. They emphasize the gradual adaptation of states and societies to an interdependent and unstable world, with its inevitable social and political transformations. They argue that globalization is a powerful, world-transforming force, responsible for societal evolution and the reshaping of global order. Supporters of this approach view globalization as a long-term, contradictory process, subject to various shifts and changes, and believe that attempting to predict the future global structure is misguided. They associate globalization with new global stratification, where some countries steadily establish themselves at the core of world development, while others become hopelessly marginalized. Although sovereign states will retain control over their territories, the influence of international organizations will expand alongside national sovereignty [4].

Today, globalization has become the overarching backdrop and context for all social processes, including economic, political, and socio-cultural developments. But what exactly is globalization?

In academic circles, there is no universally accepted definition of the term "globalism". Different perspectives exist on this phenomenon. Some researchers interpret globalism as a positive process aimed at bringing humanity closer together and fostering integration. They argue that globalism contributes to the formation of a unified global community.

At the same time, another part of the scientific community takes a critical stance on globalism. They view it as a deliberate spread of Western values, norms, and behavioral models across the world, which they consider a form of Western-centric dominance.

There is no single agreed-upon definition of this concept. In the broadest sense, globalization can be defined as a trend toward convergence, interaction, and interdependence among states on a global scale. However, within different research paradigms, the concept of globalization is interpreted in varied ways, altering its role, mechanisms, and objectives depending on the context.

The term "globalization" generally encompasses diverse processes such as internationalization, Westernization, integration, unification, and several others. These processes give rise to various challenges. Political unification and integration processes often face resistance from nation-states

and governments that are unwilling to “trade” national sovereignty for the perceived “benefits” of globalization.

The process of Westernization and the socio-cultural transformations occurring in non-Western societies, particularly in the Middle East, provoke opposition. Similarly, transnationalization encounters resistance from countries dissatisfied with the position assigned to them within the global economic system.

The content and role of globalization in the modern world are interpreted differently by researchers. One scientific perspective views globalization as a new form of modernization of the global economy, marking a new phase in the internationalization of economic systems. This phase results from shifts in the global economy driven by the scientific and technological revolution, which is propelling humanity into a new technological era shaped by the latest advancements in science and technology [5].

Another significant aspect of globalization processes is reflected in the concept of globalism as unipolar globalization, also known as neoliberal globalization. The primary goal of this form of globalization is to create a borderless world for goods and capital, establishing a single global market where transnational corporations (TNCs) play a dominant role. Globalism thus becomes the ideology of these TNCs, and they, in turn, become its main agents.

The political order is restructured into a neoliberal framework, where new rules grant TNCs advantages over traditional state actors. These corporations, by shaping and enforcing new market rules, secure their dominance.

By freeing themselves from state regulations and national borders, TNCs aim to establish a global market based on neoliberal principles. The key processes driving this form of globalization are transnationalization and Westernization [4].

The concept of globalization can take on different meanings depending on the goals and ideological context of the research. Various research paradigms interpret the nature of globalization differently.

At its core, globalization represents the spread of Western socio-political and cultural models, alongside the expansion of economic ties between nations. This process involves the transfer of Western values and institutions to other regions while simultaneously deepening international economic integration. Thus, globalization can be seen as a dual process, combining Westernization and the transnationalization of economic relations.

According to Immanuel Wallerstein’s World-Systems Theory, the economic structure of modern capitalism is based on a global system rather than a national one. The world system consists of an economically and politically dominant core and a dependent periphery. The core develops as an industrial production system, while the periphery supplies raw materials at prices determined by the core [6].

V.L. Inozemtsev, a Russian analyst of globalization processes, examined political globalization as the gradual erosion of national sovereignty. He attributed this phenomenon to the increasing instability and loss of governance in certain states, as well as the integration of human rights principles into the international legal system.

As a result, according to Inozemtsev, a phenomenon of “limited sovereignty” emerges as a direct consequence of political globalization. He emphasized that globalization is not an inevitable or uncontested process – a state can isolate itself from global flows, but such a strategy would lead to negative consequences for that country while having little impact on the rest of the world [7].

The post-industrial aspect discussed by Inozemtsev refers to the developed Western nations, led by the United States.

In our view, modern globalization is primarily globalism. The essence of globalism can be defined as hyperstructuralization at all levels of social relations – in economy, politics, governance, and culture – which, according to the renowned Hungarian scholar Miklós Simai, “under conditions of liberalization, is practically beyond the control of national legislation” [8].

Hyperstructuralization implies the displacement of traditional forms of control and governance over capital and information flows. Within the system of global influence, these processes intertwine with various models of dominance by some states over others. These include: “English” colonial models, based on direct military violence and political governance, “American” neocolonial models, based on indirect economic control and political pressure. Both serve as tools for sociocultural transformation

toward neoliberalism. Globalization does not lead to economic homogeneity or political equality among countries engaged in global interactions. On the contrary, it exacerbates inequality, thereby generating conflicts at different levels and in various spheres.

Supporters of alter-globalization, contrary to popular belief, do not propose real alternatives to globalization; rather, their actions demonstrate the absence of viable alternatives. The idea of an alternative to freedom of migration and consumer choice is largely illusory. Corporations naturally seek jurisdictions with a favorable investment climate. Citizens justifiably reject inefficient social security systems, opting for more advanced models. Ignoring humanitarian crises caused by authoritarian regimes is unacceptable, even under the pretext of sovereignty, contradicting the principles of “humanitarian intervention”. Thus, we argue that globalization, as a process of global community integration, is irreversible.

Another major conflict arises from the transnationalization of the economy, which is closely tied to the formation of a “global” economy.

Some view the creation of a “global” market as an attempt by the United States to monopolize the world economy through elite manipulation. Success in internationalization depends on a country’s position in the global economy: the biggest winners will be industrially developed countries – the core of the capitalist world – as they can reduce production costs by expanding their high-tech industries. Meanwhile, high-tech sectors in less developed countries will shrink. Labor-intensive and environmentally harmful industries will be relocated to semi-peripheral and peripheral developing nations.

In academic studies on globalization, East Asian countries – such as Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore – are often cited as successful examples of adaptation to globalization [5]. Under these conditions, state sovereignty is transformed into a negotiable asset, capable of generating economic advantages. This phenomenon stimulates regionalization as an integral part of globalization. As Naisbitt noted, globalization has a destabilizing effect on national sovereignty, impacting a wide range of political functions. In response, states strengthen cooperation and form regional political-economic alliances, which, to some extent, limit globalization [9]. This paradox, known as “Naisbitt’s paradox” [10], suggests that the expansion of global economic integration simultaneously strengthens individual actors. While nations seek to preserve their independence, they are also interested in forming economic unions to gain economic benefits. Examples of such integration blocs include BRICS, SCO, and EAEU.

Conclusion

Despite differences in wording, scholars agree that the process of globalization is a phenomenon of global significance, affecting the interests of individuals, society, and humanity as a whole.

It is reasonable to consider globalization in the context of modern scientific and technological innovations and advanced technologies. However, statements that reduce globalization to social production, the creation of a unified global financial and information space, or the abolition of territoriality appear to be debatable. Similarly, defining globalization solely through a political lens or subjective activity seems insufficiently justified.

The political aspect is undoubtedly important, but it does not fully encompass the diversity of globalization processes and is subject to situational changes. We believe that a comprehensive approach to studying the term “globalization” is necessary – one that considers the interrelationship of technological, economic, political, and sociocultural factors shaping the global space.

The main perspectives for analyzing globalization include economic, cultural, state-political, legal, sociological, and environmental approaches. It seems reasonable to consider globalization as the culmination of internationalization. This process can be regarded as a culmination because globalization accumulates and intensifies international ties, elevating them to a qualitatively new level. While internationalization implies interaction between individual national economies, globalization leads to the formation of a global economy characterized by transnational corporations and global supply chains.

Thus, globalization is a logical continuation and the highest stage of internationalization, marking the transition to a more integrated and interconnected world.

We believe that in the era of global interconnections, state and national sovereignty retain their key role as a fundamental legal concept that reflects changes in the system of modern states and international organizations. Sovereignty is an inherent characteristic of a state, rather than its governing apparatus, and therefore, the distinction between these concepts is of fundamental importance.

For a comprehensive analysis of the processes weakening state sovereignty, it is proposed to classify destabilizing factors by integrating these concepts into the theoretical framework of state and law. Globalization drives the transformation of existing risks and the emergence of new challenges and threats that impact sovereignty.

The key factors undermining the sovereignty of modern states include: the formation of alternative “centers of power” alongside the traditional system of sovereign states; the expansion of transnational corporations (TNCs); the destructive activities of states in political and economic spheres, including the use of “color revolution” technologies and private military companies; the spread of nihilistic ideology aimed at rejecting the concept of sovereignty; the use of the “humanitarian intervention” doctrine to violate international law; changes in migration dynamics; separatist aspirations of political forces in various regions; and the intensification of terrorist activities.

Globalization processes and the urgency of overcoming global challenges necessitate the involvement of states in various organizations and alliances with different legal natures, stimulating greater integration and interdependence among countries. Under these conditions, while the state loses its monopoly, it retains a key role in the development of the global system, delegating certain sovereign rights and functions – but not sovereignty itself. This delegation is driven by objective circumstances and aimed at protecting and advancing national interests.

We believe that such a transformation of sovereignty does not constitute its erosion but rather represents an adaptation to the new realities of the global order, where cooperation and interdependence become essential conditions for ensuring security and prosperity.

REFERENCES

- 1 Levitt T. The Globalization of markets // Harvard Business Review. 1983. URL: <https://hbr.org/1983/05/the-globalization-of-markets> (accessed: 03.03.2025)
- 2 Токаев Т.К. Казахстан в условиях глобализации // Вестник РУДН. Серия: Международные отношения. 2009. № 3. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kazakhstan-v-usloviyah-globalizatsii> (дата обращения: 15.03.2025)
- 3 Held D. Global transformations: politics, economics and culture. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1991. URL: <https://philpapers.org/rec/HELGTP>
- 4 Баранов Н.С. Глобализация как ведущая тенденция мирового развития. URL: <http://www.nicbar.ru/politology/study/kurs-rossiya-v-globalnoj-politike/lektsiya-1-globalizatsiya-kak-vedushchaya-tendentsiya-mirovogo-razvitiya?ysclid=m8am2t0kl7334161598> (дата обращения: 11.03.2025)
- 5 Селищева Т.А., Вэйди Ч., Потапенко А.В., Ананьев А.А. Евразийская экономика и идея многополярного мира в контексте глобализации и регионализации // ПСЭ. – 2016. – № 1(57). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/evraziyskaya-ekonomika-i-ideya-mnogopolyarnogo-mira-v-kontekste-globalizatsii-i-regionalizatsii> (дата обращения: 13.03.2025)
- 6 Новиков К.Е. Мир-системная теория И. Валлерстайна: анализ идейных истоков спорных суждений о российской истории // Социологический журнал. – 2015. – № 2. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/mir-sistemnaya-teoriya-i-vallerstai-na-analiz-idei-nyh-istokov-spornyh-suzhdenii-o-rossii-skoj-istorii> (дата обращения: 14.03.2025)
- 7 Иноземцев В.Л. Современная глобализация и ее восприятие в мире // Век глобализации. – 2008. – № 1. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sovremennaya-globalizatsiya-i-ee-vospriyatie-v-mire> (дата обращения: 15.03.2025)
- 8 Шимаи М. Глобализация как источник конкуренции, конфликтов и возможностей // Проблемы теории и практики управления. – М., 1999. – № 1.

9 Могильный Н.К., Мизинцева Н.Ф. Однополярное экономическое пространство как результат процесса глобализации // Управление экономическими системами. URL: <http://uecs.ru/makroekonomika/item/4294-2017-02-21-07-41-53>.

10 Naisbitt J. Global paradox: the bigger the world economy, the more powerful its smallest players. N.Y.: Morrow, 1994. 304 p. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/97-01-001-naysbitt-dzh-globalnyy-paradokshem-krupnee-mirovaya-ekonomika-tem-moschnee-ee-samyemelkie-uchastniki-naisbitt-j-global-paradox> (accessed: 16.03.2025).

REFERENCES

1 Levitt T. (1983) The Globalization of markets // Harvard Business Review. URL: <https://hbr.org/1983/05/the-globalization-of-markets> (accessed: 03.03.2025). (In English).

2 Tokaev T.K. (2009) Kazakhstan v usloviyah globalizatsii // Vestnik RUDN. Seriya: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. No. 3. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kazakhstan-v-usloviyah-globalizatsii> (data obrashheniya: 15.03.2025). (In Russian).

3 Held D. (1991) Global transformations: politics, economics and culture. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. URL: <https://philpapers.org/rec/HELGTP>. (In English).

4 Baranov N.S. Globalizatsiya kak vedushhaya tendentsiya mirovogo razvitiya. URL: <http://www.nicbar.ru/politology/study/kurs-rossiya-v-globalnoj-politike/lektsiya-1-globalizatsiya-kak-vedushchaya-tendentsiya-mirovogo-razvitiya?ysclid=m8am2t0kl7334161598> (data obrashheniya: 11.03.2025). (In Russian).

5 Selishheva T.A., Vjejdi Ch., Potapenko A.V., Anan'ev A.A. (2016) Evrazijskaya jekonomika i ideja mnogopoljarnogo mira v kontekste globalizatsii i regionalizatsii // PSJe. No. 1(57). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/evrazijskaya-ekonomika-i-ideya-mnogopoljarnogo-mira-v-kontekste-globalizatsii-i-regionalizatsii> (data obrashheniya: 13.03.2025). (In Russian).

6 Novikov K.E. (2015) Mir-sistemnaya teoriya I. Vallerstaĭna: analiz idejnyh istokov spornyh suzhenij o rossijskoj istorii // Sociologicheskij zhurnal. No. 2. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/mir-sistemnaya-teoriya-i-vallerstai-na-analiz-idei-nyh-istokov-spornyh-suzhdenii-o-rossii-skoi-istorii> (data obrashheniya: 14.03.2025). (In Russian).

7 Inozemcev V.L. (2008) Sovremennaya globalizatsiya i ee vosprijatie v mire // Vek globalizatsii. No. 1. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sovremennaya-globalizatsiya-i-ee-vosprijatie-v-mire> (data obrashheniya: 15.03.2025). (In Russian).

8 Shimai M. (1999) Globalizatsiya kak istochnik konkurencii, konfliktov i vozmozhnostej // Problemy teorii i praktiki upravleniya. M., No. 1. (In Russian).

9 Mogil'nyj N.K., Mizinceva N.F. Odopoljarnoe jekonomicheskoe prostranstvo kak rezul'tat processa globalizatsii // Upravlenie jekonomicheskimi sistemami. URL: <http://uecs.ru/makroekonomika/item/4294-2017-02-21-07-41-53>. (In Russian).

10 Naisbitt J. (1994) Global paradox: the bigger the world economy, the more powerful its smallest players. N.Y.: Morrow, 304 p. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/97-01-001-naysbitt-dzh-globalnyy-paradokshem-krupnee-mirovaya-ekonomika-tem-moschnee-ee-samyemelkie-uchastniki-naisbitt-j-global-paradox> (accessed: 16.03.2025). (In English).

МОМЫШЕВА Ф.С.,*¹

З.Ф.К., қауымдастырылған профессор.

*e-mail: f.momysheva@turan-edu.kz

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4053-0690

СУМБАРОВА М.В.²

З.Ф.Д., қауымдастырылған профессор.

e-mail: sumbarova.marina@inbox.lv

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0731-1982

ЖАНГАБУЛОВА Ж.М.,³

шетелдік аймақтану

саласындағы магистрі,

аға оқытушы.

e-mail: zhangabulova09@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2731-2920

ҚҰЛИБЕК А.Б.,⁴

З.Ф.М., аға оқытушы.

e-mail: begalykyzy.ak@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-5234-2688

¹Тұран университеті,

Алматы қ., Қазақстан

²Балтық халықаралық академиясы,

Рига қ., Латвия

³Қазтұтынуодағы Қарағанды университеті,

Қарағанды қ., Қазақстан

⁴Есіл университеті,

Астана қ., Қазақстан

ЖАҢАҢДАНУ ЕГЕМЕНДІКТІҢ ӨЗГЕРУШІ ФАКТОРЫ РЕТІНДЕ: ЖАҢА МҮМКІНДІКТЕР, ТӘУЕКЕЛДЕР ЖӘНЕ ҚҰҚЫҚТЫҚ САЛДАРЫ

Андатпа

Мақала жаһандану үдерісінің көпқырлылығын зерттеуге арналған, осы күрделі құбылысты түсінуге негіз болатын негізгі тұжырымдамаларға талдау жасалады. Жаһандану мен егемендік арасындағы өзара байланыс мәселесі басты назарда тұр. Экономикалық интеграция мен өзара тәуелділікті баса көрсететін либералдық теориялардан бастап, теңсіздіктің күшеюі мен ұлттық шекаралардың бұлыңғырлануына назар аударатын сындарлы көзқарастарға дейінгі әртүрлі теориялық тәсілдер қарастырылады. Жаһанданудың саяси, экономикалық және мәдени салаларға әсері талданады, ұлттық мемлекеттерге және олардың ішкі үдерістерді бақылау қабілетіне тигізетін салдары зерттеледі. Авторлардың назарында жаһандық экономикалық және саяси үдерістерге қатысуды ұлттық егемендікті қорғаумен қалай үйлестіруге болатыны туралы мәселе тұр. Осы екі аспектінің өзара байланысы зерттеледі. Мақала жаһанданудың негізгі тұжырымдамалары мен олардың мемлекеттердің егемендігіне тигізетін әсеріне жан-жақты шолу жасауға бағытталған. Бұл үдеріспен байланысты мүмкіндіктер мен қауіп-қатерлер айқындалып, қазіргі әлемдік саясатты тереңірек түсінуге ықпал етеді.

Тірек сөздер: жаһандану, альтержаһандану, мемлекеттің егемендігі, интернационализация, батыстандыру, өңірлену, интеграция, құқықты әмбебаптандыру.

МОМЫШЕВА Ф.С.,*¹

к.ю.н., ассоциированный профессор.

*e-mail: f.momysheva@turana-edu.kz

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4053-0690

СУМБАРОВА М.В.²

д.ю.н., ассоциированный профессор.

e-mail: sumbarova.marina@inbox.lv

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0731-1982

ЖАНГАБУЛОВА Ж.М.,³

магистр в области зарубежного
регионоведения, ст. преподаватель.

e-mail: zhangabulova09@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2731-2920

ҚУЛИБЕК А.Б.,⁴

м.ю.н., старший преподаватель.

e-mail: begalykyzy.ak@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-5234-2688

¹Университет Туран,

г. Алматы, Казахстан

²Балтийская международная академия,

г. Рига, Латвия

³Карагандинский университет Казпотребсоюза,

г. Караганда, Казахстан

⁴Университет Есиль,

г. Астана, Казахстан

ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЯ КАК ФАКТОР ИЗМЕНЕНИЯ СУВЕРЕНИТЕТА: ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ, РИСКИ И ПРАВОВЫЕ ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ

Аннотация

Статья посвящена исследованию многогранного процесса глобализации, проводится анализ ключевых концепций, формирующих понимание этого сложного явления. Вопрос о взаимосвязи между глобализацией и суверенитетом является стержневым. Рассматриваются различные теоретические подходы, от либеральных теорий, подчеркивающих экономическую интеграцию и взаимозависимость, до критических перспектив, акцентирующих внимание на усилении неравенства и размывании национальных границ. Анализируется влияние глобализации на политическую, экономическую и культурную сферы, исследуются последствия для национальных государств и их способности контролировать внутренние процессы. В центре внимания авторов находится вопрос о том, как сочетать вовлеченность в глобальные экономические и политические процессы с защитой национального суверенитета. Изучается взаимосвязь между этими двумя аспектами. Статья стремится предоставить всесторонний обзор основных концепций глобализации и их влияния на суверенитет государств, выявляя как возможности, так и риски, связанные с этим процессом, и способствуя более глубокому пониманию современной мировой политики.

Ключевые слова: глобализация, альтерглобализм, суверенитет государства, интернационализация, вестернизация, регионализация, интеграция, универсализация права.