



Published by the decision of the Scientific Council
of Khachatur Abovian
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic
named after Academician Georg Brutian



W I S D O M

3(19), 2021



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources
Citation Index service*

YEREVAN – 2021

THE ISOLATIONIST PATHOLOGY OF SOVEREIGNISM (Three Historical Cases for Analysis)

Abstract

The article examines the isolationist pathology of sovereignty in the loss of subjective capacity in the changing political reality. The article aims to study the isolationist policy of sovereignty, the consequences of which are considered a pathology of the countries' social organism. The study was carried out in the analytical strategy of searching for the measure of sovereignty and its pathology, in the search for the general, special and singular in specific historical cases of isolationism of states.

The authors found out that sovereignty differs in quality, the degree of implementation in achieving the integrity of society and government, solving the problem of superiority, equality and inequality of states, their influence and efficiency. States, depending on the degree of sovereignty, are classified into 1) rogue countries, 2) colonial countries, 3) countries under external control, 4) regional leaders and 5) superpowers. States differ according to the measure of sovereignty: 1) with developed sovereignty, 2) developing sovereignty, 3) with destroyed sovereignty and statehood; 4) with undeveloped sovereignty and statehood; 5) with chaotic sovereignty. Scientific intelligence has made it possible to actualize the issue of the predictive study of the isolationist policy consequences at all levels of political reality in order to make appropriate strategic decisions.

Keywords: sovereignty, sovereignty, pathology of sovereignty, isolationism, self-isolation, isolationist policy.

Introduction

Modern global threats such as international terrorism, pandemic, and the possibility of hybrid wars with their spectrum of confrontation from environmental, economic, medical, humanitarian, cultural, political, technological and military active actions have determined the turn of states from systems of global security and interaction to defending only their interests up to isolationism. Isolationist policy, as the main manifestation of neo-feudalism, has its own consequences, the study of the patterns of which is actualized for public policy and business, especially during a period of excitement and panic, when

an existential crisis, a crisis of existence forms a new norm of protecting one's own and discrimination or fighting someone else's, under the pretext of struggle with global danger.

The search for alternatives to the isolationist policy of sovereignty, which loses measure in delimiting the blockade of ties and relations with other states and forms new social traumas in international relations and calls into question the formation of a global subject – humanity, with the formation of new global thinking – praised as a noosphere by T. de Chardin (Sharden, 2007, pp. 291-295, 365) and V. Vernadsky (2004, pp. 273, 277) is actualizing our topic.

The specific historical limitations of events

often call into question the use of analogies with the modern, “unique” event basis of politics, in addition to issues of universality, the identification of those patterns that allow taking into account the results of the activities of the previous generation and not repeating the mistakes of the past, otherwise history “really never teaches anything”.

Previously unexplored aspects of the problem. Sovereignism, as a political direction, differs significantly from the scientific substantiation of the sovereignism of the state, as its independence and ability to act, since sovereignism often uses isolationism to one degree or another, as frustration and escape from solving global problems, from reality and capacity. The pathological tendencies of the isolationist policy of sovereignism are at the centre of the study of our article. In the literature, isolationist politics is largely considered in the history of politics or the history of geopolitics. However, the modern processes of lockdown and self-isolation require consideration of the current situation specifics, taking into account the universal isolationist patterns in causal relationships, in order to understand the possibility of making state and international decisions.

Research novelty. In our article, for the first time on the concrete historical cases of self-isolation, international isolation of another state and the global chain reaction of isolation under the threat of global danger, we search for the regularity and pathology of the strategy of isolationism. A novelty is the true statement of the problem of isolationist policy as the main one in the conceptualization of sovereignism and the “better” of one’s interests over universal values and rights.

The research object is the isolationist policy of sovereignism. The research subject is the historical events of the isolationism policy, demonstrating the social pathology of relations both within countries and at the international level.

The purpose of the article is to study the isolationist policy of sovereignism, the consequences of which are considered a pathology of the coun-

tries’ social organism.

Presentation of the Main Material

The study of sovereignism, as the superiority of the interests of one’s own national state in denying universal norms and rights, denying supranational and interethnic subjects, has its number of subject questions that determine the context of the study and require resolution.

Let us outline this row:

- I. The first issue to be resolved is the problem of sovereign and sovereignty. We consider the sovereign in the context of the one whose will is carried out by the state as the country’s central institution and power. The state as the central institution of power, in theory, should serve the society, its integrity in solving the problems of survival, management and development. History also demonstrates another idea that K. Marx (1957) formulated in class theory: the state fulfils the will of the ruling class (p. 72). This statement can be clarified in the extension, as the use of not only the class dimension, but also the consideration of the fulfilment of the ruling elite’s will, the oligarchy (with the venality of the politician and the state); political clique; transnational corporations, etc., as well as politicians and statesmen of the comprador type, who are called upon to carry out the people’s will, but fulfil the will of other countries, international forces or those or other power configurations, etc.

In the digitalized information world, not just a political “behind the scenes” appears, but “shadow configurations” in reputation wars, discrediting and hating. Noteworthy is the fact of the possibility of blocking D. Trump on Twitter, at that time, the current President of the United States. In other words, there is a sovereign, but simulative, since this sovereign does not have sovereignty but has a sovereign, and this is not a people. In this case, there is a shift in the issue of the interests of the nation and the state, as an institu-

tion of society's integrity, to the sovereignty of the "behind the scenes", those forces whose will and interests are carried out by the state in practice, in reality. The definition of this paradigm coordinate provides a definite basis for the following reflections.

II. The next is the question of superiority, which is certainly related to the first question but has its own meaning. This issue presupposes a solution to the issue of equality and inequality. Superiority always presupposes inequality, and the important thing is the decision about what kind of inequality is being discussed. If the question is about equality of opportunity and equality before the law, as an institution of justice, as a universal value, this is one solution to the issue. However, this decision does not mean equality of people in the ability, readiness and implementation of education, achievement and effectiveness, since there are also natural predispositions to a particular area, and a person's choice of the degree of his capacity, refusal of laziness, improvement of his will and activity, everything that is hidden in the maxim of understanding the subject.

This is true for states as well. That is why countries (as states, and not just as territorial certainty) are considered in the classification of influence / non-influence in the international arena: rogue countries, colonial countries, countries under external control with formally fixed sovereignism, regional leaders influencing the countries of a particular region, and superpowers that are subjects at the planetary level. This classification is determined at least by the problem of sovereignty, the level of power, controllability (inside and outside), influence in the world (on other countries or from other countries).

It is these criteria that determine the possibilities for superiority. A powerless state, without powerful internal creative forces, the ability for a holistic effort to develop its own life and subjectivity, manifested in different spheres of life, can

only be an outcast, colonial or under external control, or a state without statehood and sovereignty. Such states without sovereignty are represented by the criminal states of Southeast Asia and by some African states, for example, Somalia, tribal states of ongoing military conflicts. In this dimension, states can be considered in the classification of the measure of sovereignty:

1. With destroyed sovereignty and statehood.
2. With undeveloped sovereignty and statehood.
3. With chaotic sovereignty, with a leapfrog of sovereigns changing each other, vectors of development that are sometimes unable to even formulate state interests, or these interests are so corpuscular by groups and tribes that integrity in this state is impossible, not to mention their realization, and so more superiority.

How is the superiority of the interests of one's national state possible? This question assumes a multiplication in the integrity of several components:

- power according to A. Toffler (2003), with which we agree, in the mutual strengthening of the power of force (military and political), knowledge (science and education), wealth (economic and cultural component) (pp. 33-43);
- organization and management, in the power of the state (the interests of the integrity of society and its development); civil society (in individual interests in a mass meaning); business (production and reproduction of economic welfare interests);
- in the volitional dimension of the use of hard, soft and smart power in the conceptual meaning of Joseph Nye (2014, pp. 18, 59, 152-154).

The first two questions reflect the research in the meaning of "ours and others" interests, and universal interests, protection and assertion of one's own (and often universal) as the best and superior, in the meaning of the effectiveness, attractiveness and influence of the state.

III. The previous question is related to the

strength of the assertion of superiority, which in itself is often viewed in a negative connotation of inequality and has a discriminatory basis: if there is an excellent one, then there must be “poor”, flawed, inferior.

This third question, unlike the previous one, is related to denial:

- firstly, universal norms and rights, meaning above all, human rights and sustainable human development in the meaning of the concept of the Nobel laureate Amartya Sena and Mahbub ul Haq (more details in (Lepskyi, 2015, p. 15)), since the universal concerns all humanity and the specific manifestation of human protection and his rights (life, freedom, freedom of speech, rights of a citizen, the right on health, safety, a decent life, etc.);
- secondly, supranational and international subjects – denial presupposes their lack of influence and powerlessness in the face of the national state, the lack of coherence of their will in upholding universal human and human rights from the international level to the state level, the lack of coherence of international law, civil solidarity at the meso-level and specific people and reference groups at the micro-level.

In this case, the question is not only in relation to the macrolevel – the state and international relations, international actors, but also the relation of the mega-level, humanity, its integrity (with the possible prospect of space exploration and the development of interplanetary communities), but also the preservation of the universal as humanity and the noosphere, and alike problems in practical activities: meso-level – organizations, institutions, large social groups and communities in upholding and harmonizing the interests of universality (humankind and humanity) and integrity (country, state) in horizontal solidarity of people from different countries in the meso-level cut; micro-level – the universality of the individual and his reference contact definiteness (the institution of family, education, community, work, everyday life, etc.). These para-

digmatic coordinates can be a diagnosis of how disunited the universal and the holistic in the concrete at the mega-, macro-, meso- and micro-levels.

Sovereignism, as a field for solving paradigmatic certainty in these issues, is unstable in a possible loss of measure, and therefore sliding into pathology in the following questions:

1. Statehood and sovereignty.
2. Strong-willed, power and managerial foundations.
3. Integrity of development as a unity of micro-, meso-, macro-, mega-levels, the unity of the universal (common to all humanity), special (public with the central institution of the state).
4. Excellence (not as protection and realization of existence, survival, effective management and optimal development), but as national arrogance or discrimination of man, humanism and humanity.

After a paradigmatic consideration of sovereignism and the measure that determines its norm and pathology, let us move on to the study of specific historical models of isolationism, events that have become prototypes of the dynamics and mechanisms of international relations of pathological sovereignism.

In our opinion, such extreme forms of sovereignism, such as the superiority of the interests of their national states in denying universal norms and rights, supranational and international subjects, were the events of state isolation from the position “from us”, “from them” and “multi-level hybridity”.

The first historical event – as isolationism “from them” – is Japan’s isolationism from 1640 for the next 265 years.

The second historical event – isolationism “from us” – is the continental blockade of Napoleonic France against Great Britain and subsequent events of the early XIX century.

Third – “multilevel hybridity” – modern events of the COVID-19 pandemic in the end of 2019-2021.

Case 1. Japan's isolationism since 1640.

To describe this case, the works of K. Kirkwood (1988), L. Vasiliev (2017), E. Gadzhieva (2006), V. Kozhevnikov (2018) are valuable. The background to this event begins with the Battle of Sekigahara in 1603, after the victory in which Shogun Ieyasu Tokugawa came to power. He unified Japan, and his reign determined the subsequent changes. Japan's isolationism is often associated with the island's geopolitical position. Let us dwell on the characteristics of this event. Power in Japan was essentially divided into 3 centres. Two of them were of a political nature and were overt. This is the capital of Emperor Kyoto, with the palaces of 77 monarchs, where art and monastic education of the elite were concentrated. The second centre is the city of Edo (modern Tokyo) – the military headquarters of the commander-in-chief – the Tokugawa shogun. It was the capital of the government. The emperor reigned but did not rule. The shogun ruled but did not reign. Furthermore, the trade and economic centre is the city of Osaka. From physics, namely from the “Poincaré principle”, it is known: if there are three centres of attraction, then it is possible to foresee the development of events only by constantly accompanying the process or by imposing (in social development) its own control system, which was done by the Tokugawa dynasty. Initially, several restrictions were introduced, primarily of a military nature. For example, the length of the swords for the clans, which from the very beginning supported the Tokugawa (the maximum length and the ability to fence, shifting the sword from one hand to the other), differed significantly for the clans who later swore allegiance to Tokugawa, feeling its military strength (swords were shorter and formal exercises with a sword included many restrictions) and especially a large number of restrictions applied to clans that fought against the Tokugawa. It is no coincidence that Miyamoto Musashi – a great Japanese samurai who belonged to the losing clan in the battle of Sekigahara – was a ronin and a wandering swordsman

for a long time, according to the legend, Musashi's main duel took place with a master from the ruling clan. Musashi fenced with a stump of an oar, or rather a sword cut out of it, in order to circumvent the prohibitions on the length of the sword.

The shogun and his power are controlled by partial or complete expropriation of property, resettlement to another area, the division into daimyo categories: the highest daimyo group was called gosanke (御三家 – “three noble houses”) – families related to the Tokugawa house (Kin, Mito, Owari); the second group – fudai daimyo (譜代大名) – vassals, those clans that supported the shogun in the battle of Sekigahara; the third – tozama daimyo (外様大名) – those who were opponents in this battle and hostile to the Tokugawa house in its struggle for central power.

To the latter, the institution of the hostage was applied, the rule “one year to live in their possessions, the other in Edo”, they were assigned a monitoring service metsuke (目付) – “attached eye”.

Under Hideyoshi, the structure of the population was defined as “shi – no – ko – syo” (士农工商) – “samurai – peasants – artisans – merchants”, in general, the class was called “simin”. The highest layer was the samurai (侍). However, it was the townspeople (町人 – chōnin), i.e. merchants and artisans, who later played a crucial role in overthrowing the power of the samurai and restoring the centrism of the emperor's power after the isolationist policy, as an economic force – the power of wealth.

Therefore, the emergence of a fourth, alternative centre of power could have become Japanese Christians' Christian religion, putting the Japanese government in front of a serious threat of returning to civil strife and fragmentation. The formation of an aristocratic and samurai centralized culture, education, through the formation of other strata, was reduced to strengthening the system, first of all, in the consolidation of class

conventions and knowledge of the laws of the Tokugawa, as the reproduction of social and political governance.

The English researcher of this era Kirkwood (1988), refers to the Japanese scholar Hasegawa Nyozeikan on this issue: “Although the Tokugawa government strongly promoted the creation of an orthodox government school system and mobilized an army of scholars to spread the knowledge brought by monks to Japan from Song China, it was complete indifference. His only merit was the publication in the middle of the Tokugawa period of a decree according to which *terakoya* (寺子屋) was ordered to instil knowledge of the laws in ordinary people. The best *terakoya* teachers were honored with awards. The purpose of the decree was to bring *terakoya* schools in line with the norms of the Tokugawa regime, and the government never bothered about creating schools for the people. Government schools ... were designed to educate representatives of the ruling class” (p. 47).

In his *History of Japanese Education*, Hugh L. Keenleyside notes: “The existence of temple schools was not only allowed, but even encouraged, and the daimyo of all major principalities, imitating their great predecessor, founded schools in which their own children and the sons of other samurai studied. An active and fruitful competition began between different schools, and talented students received awards for their academic success, which were previously given for military prowess. Several years later, after the final victory at the Battle of Sekigahara in 1600, Ieyasu, on the advice of the famous Confucian scholar Hayashi Razan, founded a school in Kyoto, over which he personally controlled, and put Fujiwara Seika at its head”. All daimyos followed the shogun’s example (Kirkwood, 1988, p. 48). Education was seen as the most important process of forming the stability of the state and society.

Isolation not only gave rise to a confrontation between the ruling and popular culture but also predetermined further creative forces precisely in

the urban folk culture, with the regulation and decline of creativity in the elite military culture, which was reoriented to suppress uprisings, policing and border protection.

The stability of the political system and its stagnation determined, on the one hand, peace and centralization, but, on the other hand, a significant lag behind world development.

Many Japanese scholars admit that the isolation policy has negatively affected the cultural development of Japan. Thus, Nitobe Inazo openly condemns its disastrous consequences: Japan’s falling into hibernation until the middle of the XIX century; ignorance of world events, apart from faint echoes from Dutch merchants, (about the Thirty Years War, the English Civil War, the Restoration, the Brilliant Revolution, the reign of the great monarchs Peter I or Charles XII, Catherine II or Frederick the Great, about the partition of Poland, about the American War for independence, about the French Revolution, about Napoleon); no exchange of ideas with others and no appearance of foreign designs; diminishing the theme of original works; not a single major philosophical system was created, and the best minds were busy commenting on the classics; “the authorities were afraid of any original ideas or bold statements”, “they looked at inventions and discoveries with caution, suspicion, and hindered them in every possible way”; “cruel convention reigned in everything” (Kirkwood, 1988, p. 82).

Nitobe acknowledges that ending the feuds and civil wars of the Ashikaga period brought the peace he desired but that the world lacked some inspiring signs of greatness. This is what *Rah Tokugawa* became.

“The ban on foreign contacts” began to operate only in 1640, under the third shogun Tokugawa Iemitsu. To counter the influence of Spanish and Portuguese Jesuit missionaries, Ieyasu expanded trade with British and Dutch Protestants. Nevertheless, in 1637-1638 in Shimabara, a major Christian insurrection took place, showing the authorities that Europe, with the help of

religion, can undermine the loyalty of citizens. Thus, Fenolloza notes, “in 1639, a policy of isolation began, in which not a single local resident could leave the country and not a single Japanese outside its borders could return to their homeland. All Dutch were concentrated on the island of Dashima, and they were allowed to send only one ship per year. The Chinese were also able to trade through a single port, Nagasaki. Both economically and spiritually, Japan has become an isolated island in the face of the developing world” (Kirkwood, 1988, p. 80).

Degradation, stagnation and petty topics of spiritual life, science, education have formed the world of low-speed development and created conditions for the Meiji bourgeois revolution since not only city dwellers entered the arena, but merchants who have achieved success in the field of economic development with the active development of crime (*yakuza* – ヤクザ), which opposed the Tokugawa military-police system, recruited the losing clans in the Battle of Sekigahara.

To summarize, defending one’s own interests, like fear and inability to cope with external threats, leads to an even greater, albeit slow, weakening, while it would seem that social changes are preserved. The end result of this situation was a revolution. The image of isolation “from them” is not only associated with an island hierarchical military state for the sake of overcoming the possibility of “turmoil”, which has frozen the creative energy of several generations for 265 years in regulation and formalization. This, in turn, led to the internal migration of creativity into folk, primarily into urban culture, the mystification of limited knowledge and criminalization, and later the urban bourgeois revolution in combining its legitimation with the imperial power, as well as in the processes of discrimination of military centrism of samurai and the “military headquarters” in Edo, with the creation and search for examples of the Western path of development and entry into international military relations, the return of maritime culture, especially the glorifica-

tion of the Japanese Navy after the Russian-Japanese war. Isolation was based on the decline of maritime transport and, therefore, romance, heroism, expansion, which was in another island state – Britain.

Certain parallels with the isolationism of the Iron Curtain of the Soviet Union should be noted. This analogy has predictive potential for considering several Arab countries and North Korea.

Case 2. “Continental blockade”.

The opposite is such a historical event as the “continental blockade at the beginning of the XIX century”. To describe this case, we relied on the work of Tarle V. (1958), Podmazo A. (n.d.), Zlotnikov M. (1966), Sirotkin V. (1969).

This event was preceded by the military, political and economic events in Europe. Let us briefly recall the main ones: after the revolution, the successful military general Bonaparte Napoleon came to power in France, who, due to successful European campaigns, brought a new economic and political resource to France plundered by revolutions. At this time, Napoleon’s young marshals could hardly resist only A. Suvorov in his famous Italian campaign, which had its own difficulties of a theatre of military operations, especially in the Alps.

The economic benefits of the Russian bayonets of the Suvorov miracle heroes in Italy were obtained not only by Austrian policy but also by British naval strategy and diplomacy of gaining benefits during peace negotiations. The Spanish partisans successfully opposed Napoleon, the Spanish campaign was each time less successful than the previous one.

At the same time, Napoleon successfully introduced an administrative and political reform and introduced the Civil Code – this, in many respects, is still the basis of civil law and one of the systems of territorial administration. Simultaneously, Napoleonic troops improved military techniques, strategy and tactics, primarily ground operations, starting from 1792, successfully con-

ducting military operations in various parts of Europe. No less important was the elimination of theft and embezzlement in the army and its supply.

Suvorov fought for his emperor, the last knight of Europe, Paul I, who not only received the masters of the Hospitallers, but himself became the Master of the Order of Malta after the capture of the island of Malta by Napoleon for his military expedition to Egypt in 1798. Our events unfold already during the reign of Alexander I, when Malta, in turn, was captured by the British in 1800 and did not return to the Knights of Malta, but used the island until 1964, before the final collapse of the British Empire.

As you know, most of all in Italy through Naples – the kingdom of the two Sicilies – “drank blood” to Napoleon Nelson, who ensured the naval superiority of the British at sea, especially after the Battle of Trafalgar on October 21, 1805.

The British Industrial Revolution, supremacy at sea and sea trade, the need to expand the market for a growing industry and the receipt of cheap raw materials determined the actions of Britain. The closest sales market, of course, was France, which was going through times of turmoil and instability after the revolution before the arrival of Napoleon. Of course, the sales market was in the colonial countries and other European powers. One of the first bans on importing British manufactured goods was adopted in 1793 by the Committee of Public Safety, which allowed import only from friendly countries. The British banned direct shipments from unfriendly countries, although they legalized “smuggling” through neutral countries in 1798. Such confrontation in the economic war between France and England was successfully used by American ships, which became intermediaries between the economies of opponents.

The next step was the decree of King George III of Great Britain on May 16, 1806, which blocked all ports in Europe, all banks and rivers from the Elbe to Brest. All ships automatically became a legitimate British prize. British mari-

time law opposed French continental law. In response, Napoleon, citing a violation of international law, signed the Berlin Decree on the Continental Blockade on November 21, 1806, since he controlled the European territories almost completely after the victory over the Prussian troops. The British were declared adversaries, and their goods were expropriated or confiscated. Britain responded by forcing the merchants of the neutral countries to pay duties in the ports of England. Napoleon’s response was the Milesian Decrees of 1807, which issued an ultimatum to all ships that obeyed British decrees as the enemy. The situation escalated further after October 18, 1810, as British goods were now to be burned.

Napoleon blocked the economy of Britain’s maritime economy, but, as some historians write, this allowed the development of the domestic industry of other countries, for example, Russia, on the other hand, the countries connected with Britain by supplies, and later by neutral shipping, lost significant income and suffered losses.

The country’s superiority in industrial development and maritime transportation determined the wars to overcome trade barriers, ultimately the economic rationale for the defeat of Napoleon, who was against the rapprochement of Russia with England, the victorious Patriotic War of 1812 and the full tension of the forces of British military power, diplomacy and economy against Napoleon a decisive role in the loss of the continental empire and the personal loss of Napoleon at Waterloo. Isolationism, designed to create barriers for the adversary state, from an auxiliary means of economic war during the escalation of the conflict, led to a pan-European war and the concentration of the forces of opponents, their maximum tension, since it rallied the efficiency of trade and financial capital for confrontation, but already in the political and military sphere.

Case 3. COVID-19 pandemic.

The third event that determined the hybrid isolation of countries was the COVID-19 pan-

dem, which brought new meanings to the isolation and geopolitical struggle and solidarity of countries. The previous events were Brexit – the exit from the European Union of Great Britain with the need to develop the European sales market and sovereignty outside the EU; development and expansion of Chinese goods in the formation of the “new silk road” project; the economic blockade of Russia after the annexation of Crimea, military conflicts in Syria, in the Donbas; economic war between the United States and China; aggravation in the North Korean conflict with the United States; crisis within NATO.

As a manifestation event of the global threat to human life, the coronavirus pandemic has determined a number of consequences for the social organisms of various countries. More details can be found in the study of one of the authors, M. Lepskyi (2020). We note only a few of them. First, “self-isolation” (determined by anti-pandemic measures, which already raises the question of the meaning of the prefix “self”), an increase in physical and social distance identified fear and disunity in people’s reference contacts, which creates the basis for micro-isolationist tendencies. Secondly, online social contacts have become the process of compensating for offline contacts, and more broadly, media contacts, since the processes of communication and communication with the help of intermediaries – devices that use Wi-Fi, the Internet and various programs of binary and multichannel, audio and video communication. Third, the lockdown, the isolation of the work of public places, determined the collapse of small and medium-sized businesses, all commercial structures associated with flights and passenger delivery, mass events, services, etc. Fourthly, the situation, on the one hand, increased solidarity with doctors, police officers, rescuers, on the other hand, demonstrated an unwillingness to cope with a medical crisis without scaling it into a general economic, social, political, affected the morale and psychological state, first of all, doctors. Fifthly, the impoverishment of people, mass layoffs, and the rise in

unemployment determined the unwillingness to create a new economic system without dire consequences for society. Sixth, the latter trend led to the criminalization of society, since the investors in the way out of the crisis were often criminal structures or people were forced to break the law, in the USA this also determined the riots under the pretext of protests over the death of a black detainee. Seventh, government events were often imitative to the main geopolitical players, which demonstrated the low management culture of political elites and government officials and a fascination with the power to regulate the market through the “lockdown” scheme.

At the same time, measures against the pandemic with the isolation of social contacts hampered real solidarity, since mass events, including mass protests, were prohibited or significantly limited, which led to trends in violation of the law and the possibility of the arbitrariness of the politician in power. Moreover, with the closure of the borders of states and restrictions, conditions appeared for state isolation from other states, the illusion of a decrease in the importance of international relations in the globalized world was formed.

Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research

Thus, let us summarize the main conclusions of our work. The sovereign is seen as one whose will is carried out by the state as the country’s central institution and power. The sovereign can be real and illusory; internal (with a range of possible options for the people, politicum, clique, corporations, etc.) and external (by international institutions of global governance, colonialism and neo-colonialism, protectorate, comprador-type external governance, etc.); transparent, open management and “behind the scenes”, shadow configurations. Sovereignty reflects the compliance of the sovereign and the integrity of society in the interests of the nation and the state as the integrity of society and the actual government of

the state in practice, in reality.

Sovereignty reflects the solution to the problem of superiority, equality and inequality of states, their influence, effectiveness and efficiency. Hence the classification of countries in the international arena: rogue countries, colonial countries, countries under external control with formalized sovereigntism, regional leaders influencing the countries of a particular region, and superpowers, which are subjects at the planetary level. This classification is determined at least by the problem of sovereignty, the level of power, controllability (inside and outside), influence in the world (on other countries or from other countries). Non-sovereign states or states with limited sovereignty are considered in the classification formally legitimate, limitedly legitimate (tribalist, politically limited ruling cliques or oligarchy, etc.), incessant political and military conflicts. Based on the measure of sovereignty, states are considered in the classification with developed sovereignty, developing sovereignty, with destroyed sovereignty and statehood, with undeveloped sovereignty and statehood, with chaotic sovereignty.

Sovereignty as the superiority of one's national state in interaction with other states presupposes several components: power (according to A. Toffler), strength (military and political), knowledge (science and education), wealth (economic and cultural component); organization and management, in the power of the state; civil society; business (production and reproduction of economic welfare interests); in the volitional dimension of the use of hard, soft and smart power in the conceptual meaning of Joseph Nye.

Sovereignty with a negative connotation of superiority, as a denial of inferiority, weakness and inferiority, is associated with a discriminatory basis. Lack of sovereignty in this sense means the denial of universal norms and human rights and sustainable human development in the meaning of the concept of the Nobel laureate Amartya Sena and Mahbub ul Haq; lack of influence and powerlessness in the face of the na-

tional state, lack of will in upholding universal human and human rights from the international level to the state level, lack of connection of international law, civil solidarity at the meso-level and specific people and reference groups at the micro level. The pathology of sovereigntism is reflected in the loss of the measure of statehood and sovereignty; strong-willed, power and managerial foundations; the integrity of development as a unity of micro-, meso-, macro-, mega-levels, the unity of the universal, special (public with the central institution of the state); superiority (not as protection and realization of existence, survival, effective management and optimal development), but as national arrogance or discrimination against man, humanism and humanity.

From this position, we examined such extreme forms of sovereigntism as the superiority of the interests of their national states in the denial of universal norms and rights, supranational and international subjects, in the events of state isolation from the position "from us" – Japan's isolationism since 1640; "from them" – the continental blockade at the beginning of the XIX century; and the "tiered hybridity" of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Isolationism as an extreme form of sovereignty from the position "from us" determines the degradation and stagnation of internal forces leading to a revolution in the country. Isolationism "from them", designed to create barriers for the adversary state, from an auxiliary means of economic war during the escalation of the conflict led to a pan-European war and the concentration of enemy forces, their maximum tension, since it rallied the efficiency of trade and financial capital for confrontation, but already in the sphere of politics and the military sphere. The isolationism of the "multilevel hybridity" of the pandemic leads to new political splits, the destruction of international law and solidarity, to reboot of a new type of economy with a large segment of the technological revolution of the cognitive-information-digitalized type with the formation of a new subjectivity and influence on the sovereign-

ty of states.

References

- Gadzhieva, E. V. (2006). *Strana Voskhodyashhego solnca. Istoriya i kul'tura Yaponii* (Land of the rising sun. History and culture of Japan, in Russian). Rostov-na-Donu: Feniks.
- Kirkwood, K. P. (1988). *Renessans v Yaponii: Kul'turnyi obzor semnadsatogo stoletiya* (Renaissance in Japan: A cultural overview of the seventeenth century, in Russian). Moscow: Akademiya nauk SSSR.
- Kozhevnikov, V. V. (2018). "Sakoku" vo vneshnei politike Yaponii (politika samoizolyatsii) ("Sakoku" in Japanese foreign policy (policy of self-isolation), in Russian). *Trudy instituta istorii, arkhologii i etnografii DVO RAN* (Works of the Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography, FEB RAS, in Russian), 160-172.
- Lep'skyi, M. (2015). *Ideya "lyudskogo rozvitku" v konteksti vivchennya transformatsiy nih faz novatsiyi (biografichnyi metod rozvitku ideyi)* (Human development idea in the context of studying the transformational phases of innovation (biographical method of Idea, in Ukrainian). In M. A. Lep'skyi (Ed.), *Staliy rozvitok suspilstva: Zaporizkiy regionalniy dosvid* (Society sustainable development: Zaporizhia regional experience, in Ukrainian) (pp. 12-28). Zaporizhia: KSK-Allians.
- Lep'skyi, M. A. (2020). *Tendentsii i klyucheve izmeneniya v postpandemicheskoi situatsii v predmetnom pole social'nogo prognozirovaniya* (Trends and key changes in the post-pandemic situation in the subject field of social forecasting, in Russian). *Mezhdunarodnaya Konferentsiya "PALE-2020". 15-20.05.2020* (International Conference "PALE-2020"). Retrieved from <http://pale2020.euasu.org/tendenczii-i-klyucheve-izmeneniya-v-postpandemicheskoi-situatsii-v-predmetnom-pole-social'nogo-prognozirovaniya-prof-maksim-lep'skij/>
- Marx, K. (1957). *Besporyadki v Konstantinopole. - Stoloverchenie v Germanii. - Byudzhet* (Riots in Constantinople. - Cutting in Germany. - Budget, in Russian). In *Sochineniya K. Marxa i F. Engelsa: v 55 tomah* (Works of K. Marx and F. Engels: in 55 Volumes, in Russian) (Vol. 9, pp. 69-77). Moscow: Politizdat.
- Nye, D. J. (2014). *Budushchee vlasti* (The future of power, in Russian). Moscow: ACT.
- Podmazo, A. A. (n.d.). *Kontinental'naya blokada kak e'konomicheskaya prichina voyny 1812 goda* (Continental blockade as an economic cause of the war of 1812, in Russian). Retrieved from <http://www.museum.ru/1812/Library/Podmazo2/index.html>
- Sharden, P. T. (2007). *Fenomen cheloveka* (The human phenomenon, in Russian). Moscow: Direkt-Media.
- Sirotkin, V. G. (1969). *Kontinental'naya blokada i russkaya e'konomika* (Continental blockade and the Russian economy, in Russian). In *Voprosy voennoi istorii Rossii XVIII i pervoi poloviny XIX veka* (Issues of the military history of Russia in the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries, in Russian) (pp. 54-77). Moscow: Nauka.
- Tarle, E. V. (1958). *Sobranie sochinenij v 12 tomakh* (Collected works in 12 volumes, in Russian) (Vol. 3). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR.
- Toffler, E. (2003). *Metamorfozy vlasti* (Metamorphoses of power, in Russian). Moscow: OOO "Izdatel'stvo ACT".
- Vasiliev, L. S. (2017). *Istoriya Vostoka* (History

- of the East, in Russian) (Vol. 1). Moscow: Yurait.
- Vernadsky, V. I. (2004). *Biosfera i noosfera* (Biosphere and noosphere, in Russian). Moscow: Rol'f.
- Zlotnikov, M. F. (1966). *Kontinental'naya blokada i Rossiya* (Continental blockade and Russia, in Russian). Moscow; Leningrad: Nauka.