

# Actualization of Western Hegemonic Concepts and Ways of Their Implementation: on the Issue of the Policy of “Double Standards” of Western Countries

Vladislav I. Gasumyanov✉

National Research Institute for Communications Development, Moscow, Russia, [institut@nicrus.ru](mailto:institut@nicrus.ru)

**Abstract.** The article analyzes historical examples of the XX–XXI centuries, showing inconsistent, contradictory foreign policy of “double standards” of Western countries. The sources of such a policy are: a) the dominance of their own economic and geopolitical interests over the interests of small and medium-sized countries of less economically developed societies; b) reproducing colonial thinking and concepts of hegemonism, which currently determine the political decisions of Western countries; c) attempts to return the world to a unipolar model, putting in economic and military-political dependence on other countries. The example of the “US National Security Strategy” shows how these policies are manifested and consolidated in state strategic documents.

**Keywords:** «double standards», foreign policy, geopolitics, hegemonism, unipolar model, security

**For citation:** Gasumyanov V.I. Actualization of Western Hegemonic Concepts and Ways of Their Implementation: on the Issue of the Policy of “Double Standards” of Western Countries. *Russia & World: Scientific Dialogue*. 2022; 4(6): 20-32, [https://doi.org/10.53658/RW2022-2-4\(6\)-20-32](https://doi.org/10.53658/RW2022-2-4(6)-20-32)

## Introduction

Russia’s special military operation in Ukraine (hereinafter referred to as the SVO), in fact, became the trigger for many processes and phenomena that exposed the technologies and principles of the countries of the “collective West”, which had been disguised for a long time. The countries of the “collective West” deliberately ousted the events of past years from the historical memory of the world community, masked their impartial actions on the territories of other countries, and deliberately forgot historical facts that testify to a tough and cynical policy towards others.

The “correction” of the image of the countries of the “collective West” was due to the use of advantages in the global information space, ignoring UN resolutions, due to deliberate domestic political destabilization, “correction” of history, the implementation of programs and projects of “humanitarian influence”, and the consolidation of the economic dependence of other countries. As a result, a profitable vision and a “corrected” image of Western countries were introduced into the mass consciousness. The natural factor of generational change, when many eyewitnesses of unflattering actions passed away, made it possible to “clear” the image of the facts of annexations, genocides, and the use of the principle “all means are good to achieve our interests.”

The real motive of these countries has always been the benefit of elites and interested lobbyists, for whom they sacrificed not only the lives of the inhabitants of other countries, but also the well-being of their own inhabitants. Tough politics and predatory competition did not stop until the desired territory fell into the orbit of their geopolitical and economic influence.

The development of the situation around the SVO, which allowed the world to see the technologies and principles of the West, raised doubts in the world community about the sincerity of these countries. This is confirmed by the UN vote on November 5, 2022, according to which the majority of countries (105) supported, and the third committee of the UN General Assembly adopted the Russian draft resolution on combating the glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to the escalation of modern forms of racism. Against were 52 countries of the “collective West” and their dependent states.

This article analyzes historical facts showing the practice of “double standards” in assessing domestic and foreign political events and phenomena. Historical facts make us think and question the moral and ethical positions of countries that offer themselves to the world as guarantors of peace and stability.

## Materials and Methods

The study used archival documents placed in the public domain, research materials by Russian and foreign authors, statistical data, referendum materials, the history of wars and periods of destabilization. The approaches developed within the framework of Western theories of hegemonism (C.Kindleberger, R.G.Gilpin, S.D.Krasner, R.O.Keohane, J.Modelski and others) are analyzed (1; 9; 13; 12; 10) , the theory of vital interests (J.K.Galbraith, P.F.Drucker, L.Thurow, D.P. Goldman, Fukuyama) (8; 5; 3; 11; 7), the concept of attempts to return Pax Americana.

## Results

Thanks to the support of the USSR and its position regarding the liberation of peoples from colonial dependence, the countries of the “collective West” were very reluctant but forced to give up their colonies only 50–70 years ago. But “colonial thinking”, reinforced by the idea of cultural superiority and the economic resources of the metropolises, proved to be very tenacious. It is this type of thinking that underlies the modern politics of Western countries. 20th and 21st centuries are replete with examples of ignoring international decisions, the results of the people’s will, power seizures, if this is beneficial to Western countries. The referendum mechanism has been turned by the countries of the “collective West” into a means of solving their geopolitical and economic problems. Let’s give some examples.

In 2013, a referendum was held in the Falkland Islands, in which 99.3% of the inhabitants voted in favor of the status of a British Overseas Territory.<sup>1</sup> These results were beneficial to Great Britain and, of course, recognized by her. She actively referred to the right of peoples to self-determination enshrined in the UN Charter. In the situation with Crimea and other territories, the UK does not recognize this right, just as it does not recognize the results of the will, for example, of the population of Gibraltar, who did not want to leave the EU. Without going into details of the history of the Gibraltar issue, we note that in 2016 the UK ignored the opinion of the inhabitants of Gibraltar, 96% of which voted in the 2016 referendum on the UK’s exit from the EU to remain in the EU<sup>2</sup>. At the same time, when in 1967 the people of Gibraltar voted against the transition to Spanish sovereignty, the UK recognized the results of their will.

The example of the French colony of the Comoros (Greater Comoros (Ngazidja), Moheli (Mwali) and Anjouan (Ndzvani)) shows how France can ignore UN resolutions if they are contrary to its own interests. In 1974, a referendum for independence was held in the Comoros, one of the islands voted to become part of France, and three islands voted to become an independent state. France did not consider the overall vote, but the results for the islands<sup>3</sup>. Thus, three islands formed an independent state, and one went to France. In 1975, the independent state of the Comoros became a member of the UN. The new nation was defined as including the entire archipelago, that is, together with Fr.Mayotte. The UN General Assembly adopted a series of resolutions entitled “Question of the Comorian island of Mayotte”<sup>4</sup>, according to which Mayotte belongs to the Comoros

1 The results of the referendum: The Falkland Islands will remain British. RIA-Novosti News Agency: official website. Available from: <https://ria.ru/20130312/926804756.html>

2 Residents of Gibraltar voted to keep Britain in the EU. RIA-Novosti News Agency: official website. Available from: <https://ria.ru/20160624/1450559058.html>.

3 Union of the Comoros and Mayotte. Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs of the French Republic: official website. Available from: <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/ru/dvustoronnie-otnosheniya/afrika/la-france-dans-la-region-sud-ouest-de-l-ocean-indien/article/l-union-des-comores-et-mayotte>

4 The question of the Comorian island of Mayotte: UN General Assembly Resolution No. A/RES of 10/26/1985/43/14. United Nations: official website. Available from: <https://www.un.org/ru/ga/43/docs/43res.shtml>

in accordance with the principle that the territorial integrity of the colonial territories must be preserved after independence. But France in 1976 vetoed these resolutions, did not recognize the decision of the UN General Assembly in 1979 that Mayotte is part of the Republic of the Comoros, arguing its “acquisition” of the inhabitants on this island by the results of a referendum. To consolidate its position, France held a new referendum in 2009 and, guided by the positive results of the referendum, made Mayotte its overseas department<sup>5</sup>.

Officially, this happened in 2014, before the nationwide referendum in Crimea, the results of which France did not recognize. As well as the results of the popular vote in the DPR, LPR, Zaporozhye and Kherson regions, they did not recognize it, supporting the destruction of the inhabitants of these territories by the Ukrainian army.

In order to search for oil, France annexed the island of Bank du Geyser, the right to which is disputed by Madagascar with independence (15:78). Also, Madagascar disputes many nearby islands around, which remained subordinate to France (Bassas-da-India, Europa Island, Gloriose). There is also Tromelin Island, which is disputed by Mauritius. In 2010, they signed a peace treaty for the common use of the island.

The inhabitants of the island of Corsica, captured about two centuries ago, are still trying to gain their independence. However, the local independence movement was recognized by France as terrorist. Trying to talk about its independence and Brittany, in which since 1963 the Popular Front for the Liberation of Brittany has been operating (6).

The geopolitical and geo-economic interests of the Western countries have always been the dominant of their policy both towards their neighbors and towards their former colonies. Even an uninhabited rock Rockall in the Atlantic Ocean was annexed by Great Britain for the sake of exploration and rich fishing. The capture mechanism was simple: in 1955, several military officers landed on the island together with a scientist, hoisted a flag and, on behalf of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, declared the island British, forbidding the passage of foreign ships within a 50-mile zone around the rock (14:627–647). In 1972, the UK declared the island an administrative part of the Harris region of Scotland<sup>6</sup>. In 1982, in response to an international agreement that determined that a person could not survive on this territory, and, accordingly, the UK did not have rights to the continental shelf, the UK landed a survival specialist on the island, who spent 40 days there. As a result, it was concluded that if the rock is habitable, then the waters around it must be British. Despite this, the British right to the continental shelf around Rockall was not recognized. However, the attempts of Ireland, Denmark (Faroe Islands) and Iceland to challenge the state ownership of the island and surrounding waters with the help of international UN institutions remain unsuccessful (4:78–93). The UK ignores these decisions.

<sup>5</sup> Union of the Comoros and Mayotte. Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs of the French Republic: official website. Available from: <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/ru/dvustoronnie-otnosheniya/afrika/la-france-dans-la-region-sud-ouest-de-l-ocean-indien/article/l-union-des-comores-et-mayotte>

<sup>6</sup> Island of Rockall Act 1972. UK Statute Law Database: official website. Available from: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1972/2>

The countries of the “collective West” also practice military seizures. With the help of military forces, Spain in 2002 ousted the Moroccans from the island of Perejil<sup>7</sup>. Both countries claim their rights to the island. Since the island was not mentioned in the treaty granting Morocco independence from Spain, the Spaniards consider it theirs. Moroccans consider it historically their territory. In 2002, the one with the military advantage turned out to be right, namely Spain. Let us note an interesting point in the behavior of the Spanish colleagues – members of the European Union. At a time when most of the EU countries recognized the rights of Spain to Perejil, France and Portugal only regretted what had happened and did not talk about the rights of Spain<sup>8</sup>. Ownership of the island allows Spain to maintain its presence in North Africa, where France has a foothold. In turn, the League of Arab States (except for Algeria, historically associated with France) supported the right of Morocco to Fr. Perehill<sup>9</sup>.

Since 1982, Morocco has laid claim to the city of Melilla as an integral part of its territory<sup>10</sup>. In turn, the Spanish government has never recognized these demands, excluding the very possibility of any discussion of the status of its semi-enclaves in Morocco, blackmailing that it will not start discussion until it returns the rights to Gibraltar. According to the position of Spain, it belongs to her under the Treaty of Utrecht, despite the results of referendums of residents who wished to remain with Great Britain.

All these examples show that the countries of the “collective West” cannot be an example and a guarantor of stability and security. The United States cannot fulfill this role either. As soon as the US gained independence, a period of continental annexation began. And if the Republic of Vermont was annexed peacefully (1791), and Louisiana (French Louisiana) was bought from France (1803), then West Florida was annexed, despite the protests of Spain, under the guise that these lands are part of the purchased Louisiana. The annexation of Texas (1845), the occupation during the Mexican-American War, and the annexation of the territory of New Mexico (1846) are indicators of the priority of the principle “who is stronger is right”. Since 1898, the United States has been known for its overseas expansion and capture of colonies in the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea (2).

Numerous war crimes characterize the period of the American occupation of Iraq. The most publicized murder was in Mahmudiya (five American soldiers killed a family of 4, and also committed violent acts against a 14-year-old girl)<sup>11</sup>, massacre in Mukaradib

7 Jordán, Javier. The confrontation between Spain and Morocco over the islet of Perejil. A Reinterpretation from the Countering Hybrid Threats Perspective. Global Strategy – Universidad de Granada (in Spanish). Available from: <https://global-strategy.org/the-confrontation-between-spain-and-morocco-over-the-islet-of-perejil-a-reinterpretation-from-the-countering-hybrid-threats-perspective/>

8 Ibid.

9 Secretary General of the League of Arab States Amr Moussa supports Morocco's claims to the island of Perejil in the Mediterranean Sea. RIA-Novosti News Agency: official website. Available from: <https://ria.ru/20020814/207329.html>

10 The Prime Minister of Morocco has put forward territorial claims to Spain. Kommersant News Agency: official website. Available from: <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/4626727>.

11 We have been silent about many crimes but we will not stand rape. The Guardian: official website. Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2006/oct/20/iraq-middleeast>

(more than 40 people who were celebrating a wedding were killed by American pilots)<sup>12</sup>, massacre in Haditha<sup>13</sup>. Only a small part of the accused American military personnel was brought to justice.

The withdrawal of US troops from Iraq began in 2010, by December 2011, the bulk of the US army units had left the country, which led to a renewed increase in violence<sup>14</sup>. Thus, the United States and its allies have occupied the territory of a sovereign state for 9 years. This time is characterized by the radicalization of Islamist groups, the growth of the terrorist threat, numerous war crimes by each of the parties to the conflict, and a large number of casualties among the non-military population. The death toll of Iraqis as a result of the US invasion is most commonly estimated to be between 150,000 and 250,000, a large proportion of which are civilians. As a result of the military operation in Iraq, Saddam Hussein's regime was overthrown, and an interim government was formed, which had to find a way out of all the existing contradictions. The coalition forces did not receive an international mandate to conduct the operation, and UN Secretary General Kofi Annan in September 2004 explicitly stated that from the point of view of international law, this invasion is illegal<sup>15</sup>.

The US recognition of the Golan Heights as part of Israel is also highly controversial. On December 14, 1981, the Israeli Knesset ratified the Golan Heights Law, according to which the Golan Heights belonged to Israel<sup>16</sup>. The law was signed by the President, Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior of Israel and entered into force on the day of signing. The law was condemned internationally: On December 17, 1981, UN Security Council Resolution No. 497 was adopted, according to which Israel's decision to establish its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights is null and void and has no international legal force<sup>17</sup>. However, in December 2017, US President D. Trump decided to recognize the Golan Heights as part of Israel. According to the President of the US Council on Foreign Affairs Richard N. Haass, this step increases the likelihood of instability in the region and destroys the image of the United States as an "honest mediator" in resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict<sup>18</sup>.

12 US-Hubschrauber greifen Hochzeitsfeier an – Dutzende Tote. Der Spiegel: offizielle Webseite. Available from: <https://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/irak-us-hubschrauber-greifen-hochzeitsfeier-an-dutzende-tote-a-300701.html>

13 What happened at Haditha? BBC News: official website. Available from: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/5033648.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/5033648.stm)

14 As bombs hit Baghdad, Iraq says about 69, 263 people killed between 2004 and 2011. Alarabiya news: official website. Available from: <https://english.alarabiya.net/articles/2012/02/29/197696>

15 Excerpts: Annan interview. BBC News: official website. Available from: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/3661640.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3661640.stm)

16 The Law on the Golan Heights of 12/14/1981. Ministry of Justice of the State of Israel: official website. Available from: [https://www.gov.il/he/Departments/DynamicCollectors/list-leg-000?DCRI\\_UrlName=list-leg-121&skip=0](https://www.gov.il/he/Departments/DynamicCollectors/list-leg-000?DCRI_UrlName=list-leg-121&skip=0)

17 Resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981. UN Security Council Resolutions: official website. Available from: <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/ru/content/resolutions-adopted-security-council-1981>

18 Haass R.N. Present at the Disruption. How Trump Unmade U.S. Foreign Policy. Foreign Affairs: official website. Available from: [https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-08-11/present-disruption?utm\\_medium=newsletters&utm\\_source=fatoday&utm\\_campaign=Present%20at%20the%20Disruption&utm\\_content=20200811&utm\\_term=FA%20Today%20-%20112017](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-08-11/present-disruption?utm_medium=newsletters&utm_source=fatoday&utm_campaign=Present%20at%20the%20Disruption&utm_content=20200811&utm_term=FA%20Today%20-%20112017)

The presence of the United States is not aimed at the socio-economic and social development of these countries and the achievement of the common good, but at the formation of dependence on the United States. One recent example of this is Afghanistan. During the years of presence in the country, stable institutions of opposition to the Taliban, declared democratic institutions, economic institutions and a model of social welfare have not been formed, but a significant economic dependence on the United States and international institutions controlled by the United States has been formed.

The inconsistency, selectivity and inventiveness of interpretations of the results of referendums, UN resolutions, the causes and results of forceful intervention in the affairs of other countries once again confirm the desire of the “collective West” to keep the world order slipping from the hands. It is unlikely that they will be able to maintain their former relations with the former colonies and countries, which, in their view, are still the “third world”, to which they can dictate their own rules and conditions. But attempts to do so continue. In the new US National Security Strategy of October 12, 2022<sup>19</sup> The United States distributes the roles:

A more integrated Middle East that empowers our allies and partners will advance regional peace and prosperity, while reducing the resource demands the region makes on the United States over the long term. In Africa, the dynamism, innovation, and demographic growth of the region render it central to addressing complex global problems. The Western Hemisphere directly impacts the United States more than any other region so we will continue to revive and deepen our partnerships there to advance economic resilience, democratic stability, and citizen security<sup>20</sup>.

However, we see how the countries of the Middle East are building their strategies. The United States suffered an obvious setback when it failed to agree with India and Venezuela to abandon the strategic partnership with Russia and when Saudi Arabia, in fact, refused the United States to increase the supply of Saudi oil to world markets above the quotas determined by OPEC+.

The United States believes that it “is in the midst of a strategic rivalry to shape the future international order” and believes that “the need for American leadership around the world is greater than ever”. However, they will «lead the world forward” only on the basis of their values and only with those who share US interests<sup>21</sup>. Countries that offer a multipolar and alternative view of the world pose “the most pressing strategic challenge” to the American vision of the world and are referred to in the Strategy as powers “that combine authoritarian governance with a revisionist foreign policy.” Threateningly sounds the statement that “countries around the world are once again

19 National Security Strategy of the United States of America. The White House: official website. Available from: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/8-November-Combined-PDF-for-Upload.pdf>

20 Там же.

21 Ibid. [...] “We will lead together with our allies and partners and in cooperation with all those who believe, as we do”.



convinced why you should never bet against the United States of America". Russia and China are declared the main opponents of the United States:

The People's Republic of China harbors the intention and, increasingly, the capacity to reshape the international order in favor of one that tilts the global playing field to its benefit [...] Russia and the P.R.C. pose different challenges. Russia poses an immediate threat to the free and open international system, recklessly flouting the basic laws of the international order today, as its brutal war of aggression against Ukraine has shown. China "is the only country with both the intent to reshape the international order and, increasingly, the economic, diplomatic, military and technological power to advance that objective"<sup>22</sup>.

The US believes that it will not be able to compete with major powers that offer a different vision of the world if it does not have a plan for cooperation with other countries. The US thinks in the paradigm of international competition, not in the paradigm of international cooperation, and considers it necessary to understand "how a more competitive world affects cooperation and how the need for cooperation affects competition. We need a strategy that not only deals with both (Russia and China – author's note), but also recognizes the relationship between them and adjusts accordingly." In fact, the new "US National Security Strategy" is the desire of the United States to return to the old concept of "Pax Americana" against the backdrop of the benefits that they receive in the conditions of SVO. Actually, the concepts and methods used are also old.

## Discussion

The examples considered are very indicative of the resuscitation of hegemonic theories, theories of vital interests and attempts to return American hegemony, including through the non-autonomy of decisions and dependence of the EU countries on the United States. The leaders of Western countries continue to be guided by theoretical models developed within the framework of the theory of hegemony.

From the point of view of these theories, the presence of Western countries in foreign regions and countries is justified by economic interests, but in the end it ends with political influence and military presence. It is declared that international economic stability is a common collective good, beneficial to all, as it allows everyone to develop, enrich themselves and avoid clashes. According to hegemonic theories, small and medium-sized countries have their own interests and the right to demand their implementation, but they do not play a significant role in the production of the international collective good. The contribution of small and medium-sized countries to this type of benefits is small and not significant, but they have great needs to realize their interests. From here the theorists of hegemonism explain the conflict potential of

---

22 Ibid.



relations. In their opinion, if there are only small and medium-sized state-economies in the world, then the common good (economic stability) will never be created. In this regard, the world needs a hegemon, a leader who will guide other countries to achieve the goals of the current system. This role was assumed by the United States (in fact, theories of hegemonism were developed mainly in the United States). It is explained to the world that the hegemonic state has the power to create the common good, and its motivation is connected with the desire to ensure/preserve its own security and prosperity. From these positions, it is believed that the efforts of the hegemon correspond to the national interests of most countries in the world. Hegemon is able to act autonomously and independently. Within the framework of this concept, the United States is trying to explain its claims to leadership.

The ideas of the neo-realists are very contradictory, according to which not all countries consider the hegemon a senior partner and, for example, the countries of the “third world” perceive leadership not as a common good, but as a phenomenon that they elect. Note that the United States constantly emphasizes its chosenness. And according to the theory of geo-economic monocentrism, the “periphery” and “semi-periphery” have limited funds for social policy, so people who do not have economic dignity prevail. In other words, it is impossible to be a leader and hegemon without dignity.

Hegemonic thinking largely explains the inconsistency of the positions of the “collective West” in relation to UN resolutions, the results of the will of citizens in different countries, etc., because, according to Western countries, they know better than others what needs to be done for the “common good” and explain this by their economic and political development, the economic and political dignity possessed by the citizens of their countries.

## Conclusion

The current international situation shows the attempts of the countries of the “collective West” to revive the hegemonic concepts of the twentieth century. Despite the changed reality, the economic and military-political growth of the non-Western poles of the world order, Western countries continue to view them as a “third world” that needs guidance and prompting. Using calls to achieve the world’s collective good, the West explains its advantage. The US explains why it should be the world hegemon. Without hiding their hegemonic claims and declaring enemies of all those who stand in the way of their dominance, the United States and Western countries use traditional methods of pressure and sanctions, which are already weakly working in the new realities.

The confidence of the international community in the policies of the countries of the “collective West” has been significantly undermined, and the insincerity of the intentions of the Western countries is becoming more and more obvious.

Increasingly, the former Western colonies, the countries of the Middle East, and Africa are recalling a history that was carefully retouched by Western ideologists in order to save the face of “Western democracy.” But an analysis of the relationship of Western countries with former colonies and economically underdeveloped countries shows that during the XX-XXI centuries the policy of the countries of the “collective West” discredited them as guarantors of peace and stability. This happened for reasons of “double standards” in the interpretation of the results of referendums in different countries due to the benefits of the West; for reasons of ignoring UN decisions, which led to a decrease in its role and status in conflict resolution; for reasons of forceful decisions in relation to other countries, due to the dominant interests of Western countries, which led to socio-economic and political crises in these countries; due to the growing instability in the countries where the “collective West” is present, especially the United States.

## References

1. Kindleberger Ch., Aliber R. Global financial crises. Manias, panics and crashes. St. Petersburg: Peter, 2010. (In Russian).
2. Prilutsky V.V. American-Mexican border conflicts in the 1870s-1910s // Bulletin of BSU. 2021;3 (49):139-147. (In Russian).
3. Thurow Lester C. The Future of Capitalism: How Today's Economic Forces Shape Tomorrow's World). Novosibirsk: Siberian Chronograph. 1999:430. (In Russian).
4. Symmons C. R. Ireland and the Rockall Dispute: An Analysis of Recent Developments. IBRU Boundary and Security Bulletin. 1998 Spring:78-93.
5. Drucker P. F. Post-capitalist society. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann. 1993:204.
6. Erwan Le Quilliec. Les Fronts de Libération de la Bretagne. Paris II-Assas. Mémoire de DEA de science politique. 1997.
7. Fukuyama F. America at the Crossroads. Democracy, Power and the Neoconservative Legacy. 2006, Yale University Press.
8. Galbraith J. K. The Culture of Contentment. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017.
9. Gilpin R. Global Political Economy – Understanding the International Economic Order. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
10. Globalization as Evolutionary Process: Modeling Global Change. Ed. by G.Modelski, T. Devezas, and W. R. Thompson. London: Routledge, 2008.
11. Goldman D. P. It's Not the End of the World, It's Just the End of You: The Great Extinction of the Nations. New York: RVP Publishers. 2011.
12. Keohane R. O. Understanding Multilateral Institutions in Easy and Hard Times. Annual Review of Political Science, 2020; 23:1-18.
13. Krasner S. D. Sovereignty: An Institutional Perspective. Comparative Political Studies, 1988; 21(1). DOI:10.1177/0010414088021001004
14. MacDonald F. The last outpost of Empire: Rockall and the Cold War. Journal of Historical Geography. 2006; 32:627-647.
15. Mohamed el-Amine Souef. Les grands défis de la politique étrangère des Comores, Les éditions De La Lune. 2009:132.

## About the author

Vladislav I. GASUMYANOV. DSc(Econ.). Director of the National Research Institute of Communications Development, Head of the Basic Department of Corporate Security, MGIMO of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Address: 22, p. 1, Korobeynikov lane, 119571, Moscow, Russian Federation, institut@nicrus.ru

## Contribution of the author

The author declares no conflicts of interests.

## Article info

Submitted: November 1, 2022. Approved after peer reviewing: November 10, 2022.  
Accepted for publication: November 21, 2022. Published: December 21, 2022.

The author has read and approved the final manuscript.

## Peer review info

«Russia & World: Scientific Dialogue» thanks the anonymous reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.