

RELEVANT TENDENCIES OF MULTIPOLAR WORLD ORDER FORMATION

Dr. Grebnev Ruslan Dmitrievich¹

Abstract: This research examines the fundamental tendencies and dynamics of the multipolar world order formation in the context of contemporary global transformations. The study focuses on the transition period of international relations system reset (2020-2030), characterized by accelerated globalization processes and the emergence of a new international relations architecture.

The paper explores the shift from traditional geopolitical balance-based systems to a geoeconomically determined multipolar order. It investigates the complex nature of the emerging international relations system, emphasizing the role of geoeconomic parity as a multidimensional phenomenon influencing global stability.

The research analyzes the evolutionary nature of globalization processes and their impact on the formation of a polycentric international relations system. Special attention is paid to the differentiation between global governance and global regulation concepts, their applicability in various globalization theories, and their relevance to the multipolar world order.

The study examines the Digital Age's influence on globalization processes, highlighting how accelerated information processing affects international relations dynamics. It explores the transformation of geopolitical paradigms and the emergence of new centers of power in the evolving international landscape.

The research identifies key features of multipolar world formation, including geopolitical reconfiguration, geoeconomic development acceleration, and the shift from state competition to mutually beneficial cooperation. It analyzes the balance of power dynamics and its role in stabilizing the international relations system.

The paper investigates the principles of global regulation in a multipolar world, emphasizing decentralization tendencies, regionalization processes, and the distribution of responsibilities among centers of power. It explores the cluster principle, relativism, legitimacy, and network organization as foundational elements of the new global regulation system.

The study concludes that the formation of a multipolar world order requires the establishment of a decentralized global regulation system reflecting the new balance of power and contributing to international relations stabilization. It emphasizes the necessity of consensus-building among geopolitical influence centers for successful transition to a multipolar international order.

The research contributes to understanding the complex processes shaping the contemporary international landscape and provides insights into the future development of global governance structures in a multipolar world.

Keywords: multipolar world order, geopolitical balance, geoeconomic parity, global governance, decentralization of global regulation.

¹ Deputy Dean for International Affairs, Faculty of Global Studies, Lomonosov Moscow State University.

INTRODUCTION

The reset of the international relations system in 2020-2030 is characterized by the acceleration of the dynamics of the globalization of political processes. The new emerging system of international relations is distinguished by the complex nature of its foundations. Unlike the system of international relations that is going down in history, based on the geopolitical balance of power, the stability of the future system of international relations aimed at global sustainable development depends on geoeconomic parity in the world, ensured by a number of actors in the globalization of political processes. At the same time, geoeconomic parity in the world itself appears to be a multidimensional and multi-aspect phenomenon, the modeling of which, in particular, requires taking into account the processes of overcoming technological, demographic and energy imbalances in the world.

Is the reset of the international relations system a controlled process or only partially controlled? Is the formation of a multipolar world an evolutionary or revolutionary global process? Only history can confirm the truth of the answers-assumptions to the questions posed. However, in any case, the desire for certainty in social relations inherent in human nature predetermines the development of a regulatory system capable of stabilizing the international relations system.

In the context of the functional approach, a polycentric system of international relations, the centers of which are states that possess military power, international competitiveness, a high degree of sovereignty, socio-cultural unity, historical memory and other signs of geopolitical subjectivity, does not allow predicting scenarios for stabilizing the system of international relations. As history shows, a number of classical political theories are untenable when applied to a polycentric system of international relations. For example, in the presence of geopolitical subjectivity, understood as the ability of a state to extend political influence to foreign states, as well as to counteract external regulation and any forms of expansion¹, a sanctions policy directed against such states does not lead to their capitulation, but in many ways contributes to the consolidation of society and the development of international relations with states that are bearers of a related type of collective identity.

The institutional approach, on the contrary, allows modeling a structure consisting of structures with different functional orientations, which in their

¹ Grebnev R.D. (2003). Geopoliticheskaya sub'yektnost' i geopoliticheskaya identichnost'. Postsovetkiye issledovaniya [Geopolitical Subjectivity and Geopolitical Identity. Post-Soviet Studies]. T. 6. № 1. pp. 10-19.

entirety are capable of complementing and stabilizing the polycentric system of international relations. Such a structure, on the one hand, is determined by the functional aspect of the system of international relations, and on the other hand, is capable of performing the functions of the control part of a complex system. Taking into account the evolutionary nature of globalization¹ [Ilyin et al. 2009], it is obvious that modeling a future institutional structure that promotes the stabilization of the system of international relations presupposes a study of the tendencies of the UN reorganization and global political processes that arise in overcoming the objective limits of the powers and functions of the world organization.

In the theory of globalistics, there are several main approaches to the concept of global governance, usually identified with global regulation. At the same time, the content of scientific discussions using various methodologies sometimes substantiates opposite conclusions about the applicability of the terms “global governance” and “global regulation”². In the context of the stated topic, global governance is understood as an imperative, targeted impact on the system of international relations through the development and implementation of global policy, rule-making in the field of international relations, as well as monitoring compliance with these norms, which implies responsibility for their non-compliance.

In contrast to the concept of global governance, global regulation is understood in the context of a dispositive approach, implying relative flexibility of the system of international relations, equality of subjects of international relations and the absence of global powers. Thus, global governance is more consistent with the method of prescribing the proper organization of the system of international relations, and global regulation is more consistent with the method of permission within the framework of generally recognized principles of certainty of international relations. The concept of global regulation is more conducive to leveling out fundamental civilizational contradictions, which corresponds to the ideas of true globalization³.

¹ Il'in, I. V., Ursul, A. D. (2009), *Evolyutsionnaya globalistika (kontseptsiya evolyutsii global'nykh protsessov)* [Evolutionary globalistics (the concept of the evolution of global processes)]. Moscow: MSU press.

² Smakotina, N. L., Yegorenkova, M. A. (2021), *Global'noye upravleniye ili global'noye regulirovaniye? Sotsial'no-gumanitarnyye znaniya* [Global management or global regulation? Social and humanitarian knowledge]. №4. pp. 118-130.

³ Chumakov, A. N. (2020), *Philosophy of Globalization*. p. 63. Moscow: Moscow University Press.

Both concepts (global governance and global regulation) are applicable, but to different theories of globalization of political processes. The more complex the subject composition of international relations, the diversity of which is provided by structures of global, regional, inter- and trans-regional significance, the more differentiated is global regulation. Global regulation is related to the concept of a fair multipolar world order, and global governance is related to the concept of a global state. In the current state of globalization of political processes, the term “global governance” is also appropriate in the context of the US globalization project.

The Digital Age and globalization

The notion of the Digital Age is inextricably linked with globalization. Owing to the achievements of digital world, never has information been so transparent in global history. The Digital age, also known as the Age of Information, is primarily connected with the acceleration of information processing. The structured information as one of the expressions of energy understood in the context of Information theory, contributes to the evolution of globalization processes as “any change in the quantity of structural information content or, better to say, information content should be attributed to material systems development processes¹”.

Any “progressive development in nature goes from lower to higher, from less perfect to more perfect; there occurs a consistent accumulation, a growth in the quality of information in the evolution of matter. Alongside, progressive development of material systems results in new information properties, in particular, meaning and value²”. The speed of information processing causes the acceleration of global evolution, which, in response, may explain rapid world development, the emergence of AI technology, the appearance of new forms of international relations, such as information wars of cognitive operations.

Evolutionary Globalistics considers globalization of political processes within the theory of complex systems, i.e. in inextricable connection to other globalization aspects condition and complement each other. In particular, multipolar world order formation as a relevant global political process is seen as objective and evolutionary, indelibly related to the change in the model of world order, globalization and Digital Age.

¹ Il'in, I.V., Ursul, A.D., Ursul, T.A. (2012), *Global'nyj e'volyucionizm: Idei, problemy, gipotezy* [Global evolutionism: ideas, problems, hypotheses]. P. 81. Moscow: Moscow University Press.

² Ursul, A.D. (1971), *Informaciya. Metodologicheskie aspekty* [Information. Methodological Aspects]. p.20. Moscow: Nauka.

The change in world order and transition from geopolitical Topics to global agenda

The Digital Age changed the understanding of quality space that had remained almost unchanged since the time of Aristotle's works. New digital and information patterns of quality space have had impact on the development of geopolitical Topics that unfolds the foundations of geopolitical approach, the latter largely defining the formation of foreign policy doctrine of powerful states.

Globalization, in turn, shaped the formation of the global political system, intensified the interconnection of foreign policy actions among various political actors. States switched to an active use of the potential of international organizations and interstate institutions in regulating and coordinating international relations. In the XX century, international organizations acquired exceptional functions in global regulation.

In multipolar world formation process the geopolitical paradigm was shifted by the doctrines of political globalistics, in particular, the concept of superpower was displaced by the notion of the centre of power, id est, a state possessing exceptional subjectiveness in international relations. By subjectiveness we understand an ability to expand political influence and to act as a guarantor of world order. The language of world politics was enriched with such terms as a pole of a multipolar world, a world and regional superpower, a regional subsystem of international relations and other, with all the notions being proper to the terminology of global studies¹.

The assessment of possible development scenarios for the system of international relations given in the text below is based on the practical consequences of the existence of different approaches to understanding foreign policy. One of these approaches is based on the understanding of politics in general as an activity aimed at gaining power, strengthening it and maintaining it. Based on a purely pragmatic approach to defining policy, the foreign policy of a state can be understood as an activity aimed at establishing the political influence of one state over another or others. In connection with this, on the other hand, there is an objective need to protect all aspects of state sovereignty: political, economic, cultural and other aspects corresponding to the types of possible expansion carried out by another state.

The above approach to interpreting foreign policy is not universal and is not applicable to states that carry out foreign policy activities on the principles of equality, mutual benefit and common interests, which will be discussed below. However, such an approach correlates with the geopolitical approach

¹ Rossi, Ino (2020), *Challenges of Globalization and Prospects for an Inter-civilizational World Order*, p. 1126. Cham: Springer.

to conceptualizing the US foreign policy course in the 20th century and its implementation up to the present time.

A characteristic feature of the geopolitical approach to the design of US foreign policy is the factor of military superiority of the United States over the states in relation to which attempts are being made to establish political influence. At the same time, the factor of US military superiority is used to form the economic and trade dependence of foreign states on the US, which can reasonably be called new colonialism. Neocolonialism is a new form of colonialism, which has inherited not so much its political concepts as its ideological and cultural ones, which are somehow understood in the context of “superiority and dominance”, “oppression and exploitation”, “violence and domination”, carried out on the principles of “inseparability of metropolises and colonies”¹.

Multipolar world formation is characterized by the geopolitical reconfiguration of the world and by the acceleration of the geo-economic foundations of international relations system’s development that contribute to international cooperation to a larger extent than geopolitical foundations. This once again confirms the evolutionary character of global processes as the transition from states’ competition to mutually advantageous cooperation contributes to the formation of planetary civilization. The concept of multipolarity meets the demand of traditional societies for the resolution of fundamental contradictions that arose as a result of previous stages of globalization of political processes. However, multipolarity as an ideological superstructure of globalization of political processes cannot be realized without a system of global regulation of international relations. Clarification of the foundations of the geopolitical approach and development of the theory of multipolarity are called upon to facilitate the conceptualization of international relations between states interested in the formation of a multipolar world.

What is a multipolar world?

With the intensification of globalization processes, the concept of “a pole” acquires a fundamental meaning for the theoretical understanding of the dynamics of the modern world order. The etymological analysis of the term “a

¹ Mirzekhanov, V.S. (2023), Fenomen kolonializma v mirovoy istorii: temy i tendentsii noveyshey istoriografii. Elektronnyy nauchno-obrazovatel’nyy zhurnal “Istoriya” [The Phenomenon of Colonialism in World History: Themes and Trends of Modern Historiography. Electronic Scientific and Educational Journal “History”], T. 14, № S23.

pole” dates back to Ancient Greek and Latin linguistic tradition where the term implies the geosphere’s axis of rotation terminal point.

In the sociological discourse, the notion of “a pole” is transformed in a key determinant that enables structural organization and functional stability of the global social system. Methodological approach to the analysis of the global society structure suggests the use of a comprehensive system of indicators that includes measuring force potential in military, economic and political spheres. It is precisely through the lens of these fundamental measurements that it becomes possible to objectively understand the architectonics of the modern world order and to define the hierarchy of global actors.

When studying the architectonics of a multipolar world it is relevant to classify the poles according to the following major directions:

- economic poles are centers of economic power concentration that are defined by a high level of productive potential, developed infrastructure and a significant impact on global economic processes;
- political poles are subjects of international relations that greatly influence the formation of the global political agenda and that take crucial decisions in international politics;
- military poles are states that have substantial military resources and potential that determine their role in ensuring global and regional security.

The methodological framework for the classification is based upon a system of specific indicators characteristic of each type of poles. The parameters mentioned function as objective criteria that allow for states’ categorization depending on their role and influence in a certain sphere of international relations. The theoretical importance of the typology proposed lies in the possibility to conduct a multifactor analysis of the global world order, which contributes to a more profound understanding of the instruments of modern system of international relations functioning and a better identification of a place of certain states in this paradigm.

The balance of power and the stabilization of the system of international relation in a multipolar world

As the history of XX century shows the balance of power precedes the formation of the system of international relations global regulation and the world order. The world order after WWI and WWII was forming this way. The balance of power is the expression of the consent of the world powers on issues of global regulation system organization and on the foundations of the world

order. While the balance of power is maintained, the system of global relations remains stable. If the global regulation system does not respond to the alterations in the configuration of the global relations system, e.g. a new center of power formation, the global regulation starts to stagnate and, eventually, there emerges a crisis. This is the pattern of international relations system destabilization, and currently we evidence such a pattern.

The pretexts for the consent of world powers on fundamental issues of the world order are formed long before the appearance of the international political and legal act that finalizes balance of power formation. In fact, the balance of power requires the conditional equality of parameters of might of world powers, i.e., states having complex superiority in military, political, economic spheres at international level. Such states are characterized by their ability to exercise control over global political processes through significant dominance in the international stratification system. Consequently, the balance of power implies the harmonization of interests and goals of world powers' external politics.

The center of power in modern international relations is characterized by the integration of all aspects of might- the economic, political and military ones. This, in turn, allows considering a world power as the key element of the global political system able to identify international relations development vector and to form world political agenda. Thus, a world power is a complex phenomenon of modern international politics marked by complex superiority in various fields and by the ability to exert influence over global political processes, while the balance of power is a complex system of political will and world powers subjectivity harmonization.

International relations global regulation and the world order

International relations global regulation is proposed to understand as a tool of external political influence of centers of power and as a based on universally accepted norms activity of world politics institutions aimed at forming and maintaining the world order.

The proposed definition of international relations global regulation enables us to conclude that centers of power play pivotal role in forming regulation system and the very system contributes to the realization of their respective national interests. "The transition from the theory of hegemonic stability to the concept of the collective governance of the world order" maybe considered as "a

factor reflecting national priorities¹". Thus, current Bretton Woods institutions framework that are positioned as the basis of neoliberal globalization is virtually a tool for protecting US national interests that maybe withstood only from the economic power perspective²".

While the record of real power distribution in world politics is a fundamental principle of international relations global regulation system formation, still, it is not the only one. Such principles also include respect for sovereign states' national interests and inclusiveness. Record of subjectivity of sovereign states supposes creating relevant representation system in world politics institutions. The balance of goals of world politics and of sovereign states' national interests contributes to the legitimacy of global regulation. Under conditions of "transit from one globalization model to another,...transition from a monocentric world to the polycentric one, with several centers of power and many poles of economic, political and military might"³ stakeholder involvement in global regulation aims at considering diverse positions on issues of world politics.

Responsibility distribution among centers of power depending on their respective areas of influence

International relations global regulation system formation in a multipolar world has characteristic features. The key one is responsibility distribution among centers of power depending on their respective areas of influence. When modeling world development that envisages new centers of power forming and preserving global regulation with one center of responsibility, Russian scientists

¹ Baburina, O.N. (2011), *Perehod ot teorii gegemonistskoj stabil'nosti k koncepcii kollektivnogo upravleniya mirovym e'konomicheskim poryadkom kak faktor otrazheniya nacional'nyx prioritetoj. Nacional'nye interesy: priority i bezopasnost'* [Shift from the theory of hegemonic stability to the concept of collective governance of global economic interests as a factor in the resolution of national priorities. National interests: priorities and security], №9, pp. 71-88.

² Baburina, O.N. (2021) *Problemy obespecheniya nacional'noj bezopasnosti Rossijskoj Federacii v usloviyax Bretton-Vudskoj sistemy global'nogo upravleniya. Vklad transporta v nacional'nuyu e'konomicheskuyu bezopasnost'* [Problems of ensuring national security of the Russian Federation under the Bretton Woods system of global governance. Contribution of transport to national economic security]. *Trudy VI Mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoj konferencii* [Proceedings of the VI International Scientific and Practical Conference], p. 21. Moscow: FGAOU VO MIIT.

³ Leonova, O.G. (2024), *Deglobalizaciya versus globalizaciya. Vek globalizacii* [Deglobalization versus globalization. The Age of Globalization]. №9, p. 10.

forecast global “political stagnation with all the negative features preserved: increased instability,...turbulence, the gap between the North and the South, etc. With diminishing US leadership, there appears a rupture of global governance and global responsibility for the status quo in the world, which can possible lead to a chaos”¹.

At the G7 summit in Italy in 2017, the issue of world powers’ responsibility for maintaining world order was raised: “it is high time we thought to what extent the countries - leaders of the global world can take responsibility for the unexpected and painful problems caused by globalization; and whether they are able to come up with relevant global governance of the challenges and to bring our civilization to the path of sustainable development as stipulated in 2030 Agenda”². The question seems to be only partially justified as responsibility distribution, in our opinion, precedes world order formation.

When analyzing responsibility redistribution among centers of power in world politics it is justified to state that the cluster principle is one of the fundamental principles of global regulation in a multipolar world. The cluster principle implies formation, by the centers of power, of formal and non-formal institutions in international relations and in world politics that form, in their integral unity, the global regulation system.

Political processes regionalization

Political processes regionalization is the second, but no less important feature of international relations global regulation system formation in a multipolar world. “New governance regimes requires that local subjects and politicians adapt their strategies based on the spatial approach”³, thus, not enabling rather not impeding the natural course of integration processes grounded in the contiguity of nations’ collective identity. “The development of bottom-up integration creates the basis for a broader and more inclusive framework of cooperation. The countries with coinciding geopolitical interests, similar goals

¹ Leonova, O.G. (2024), *Global’nye politicheskie vyzovy sovremennosti. Vek globalizacii* [Global political challenges of our time. The age of globalization]. №3, p. 69.

² Il’in, I.V., Leonova, O.G. (2017), *Globalizaciya, integraciya i ustojchivoe razvitie. Mezhdunarodnyj Forum G7. E’konomika i upravlenie: problemy, resheniya* [Globalization, Integration and Sustainable Development. International Forum G7. Economics and Management: Problems, Solutions]. №9, p.69.

³ Edited by Khadija Darmame, Eric Ross (2024), *Local Governance and Development in Africa and the Middle. Local and Urban Governance*. Cham: Springer.

and common values may use unilateralism to bypass multilateral institutions of global governance that are in crisis"¹.

In the absence of a global alternative to the US geopolitical project, the stage of active regionalization of international relations began at the end of the 20th - beginning of the 21st century. Implementing a policy aimed at strengthening their sovereignty, this trend was led by states - regional leaders and powers. Over the course of 15 years, MERCOSUR, SCO, EAEU, and the African Union were organized. A distinctive feature of the regional entities created as a result of regional processes is the emphasis on mutually beneficial economic cooperation and virtually unexpressed political integration and military alliance. At this stage, the first sign of the formation of a new global alternative to the US geopolitical project appears.

Speaking of Russia's expertise, one may state that the development of post-soviet regional international relations regulation system to a greater extent contributes to the implementation of the national interests of the Russian Federation and of the states sharing civilizational community with it. Regional integration excludes the unwanted prospect of external regulation and elevates the status of post-soviet republics from key transit areas to independent collective actor of global politics that enables participation in forming world development agenda. The systematization of Russia's regional politics alongside SCO and ASEAN may influence the architecture of the Great Eurasian partnership, which, in turn, is a model process of a multipolar world formation. Russia's external political interests in regional dimension may be implemented through further institutionalization of regional international relations regulation system via reforming CIS, CSTO, EAEU, as well as creating a specialized institution of CIS in humanitarian cooperation.

Function distribution among world organizations and other international organizations, interstate associations and integration unions

Current polarization of international relations emerging as a result of states' commitment to either old or new, yet forming, world order alongside the increasing role of interstate associations and international organizations, including regional ones, on which the states acquiring power are basing - these factors predetermine global regulation function distribution. As shows the expertise of the BRICS and

¹ Il'in, I.V., Leonova, O.G. (2023), Formiruyushchiesya tendencii global'nyx politicheskix processov. Vestnik MGU, Seriya 27. Globalistika i geopolitika [Emerging trends in global political processes. Moscow State University Bulletin, Series 27. Globalistics and Geopolitics]. №3, p. 16.

the SCO, successfully fulfilling certain global regulation functions outside the UN, function distribution among world organizations, interstate associations and integration unions is a tangible and efficient measure of an effective international relations coordination.

“While risking looking naïve, it is still noteworthy that there are two schools of thought regarding interconnection between international relations and power extension. One school supposes that international organizations are conservative institutions aimed to put on hold current power configurations, while the other argues that they must pluralize power”¹. Of course, the above-mentioned quote considers distribution of “power” understood as a regulation function among states. Nevertheless, this principle is applicable to world organizations that are able to secure status quo of various international organizations and interstate associations.

Basing upon the principles of function distribution among world organizations and other international organizations, interstate associations and integration unions, the system of international relations global regulation is formed by the following actors in the near future:

- International organizations (the UN, the WTO, the IMF and others);
- Interstate associations the BRICS, the G7, the G20 are platforms for coordinating and harmonizing foreign policy strategies, concepts and doctrines of major world politics actors;
- The SCO is an international organization whose activity is a role model for interregional and transregional cooperation regulation under multipolarity;

In order to act as a model example of inter- and trans-regional cooperation on the world stage, the SCO members will have to resolve the existing contradictions between China and India. According to the SCO Charter, the territorial dispute between India and China can be resolved exclusively by diplomatic measures in the order of conciliatory procedures by a third state. The role of mediator in resolving the territorial dispute between China and India can be played by Russia, which has experience in resolving similar issues with China. Taking into account the possible role that China, India and Russia will play in the emerging world order, mutual concessions by China and India, as well as the role of Russia in reconciling the disputing parties, seem inevitable. Regional and subregional unions of states, international organizations and interstate associations based

¹ Thomas G. Weiss, Rorden Wilkinson (2023), *International Organization and Global Governance*. Chapter 3: The Global South. New York, NY: Routledge.

upon the principles of the contiguity of concepts of society life political organization and collective identity;

- Representative forums, summits and conferences on regional frameworks;
- Sovereign states acting as guarantors of international order observance.

CONCLUSION

International relations global regulation decentralization

Multipolar world order establishment results from the formation of the system of decentralized international relations global regulation that reflects the new balance of power and contributes to stabilizing international relations system. Global regulation decentralization reflects foreign politics dominance level of key world politics actors, it contributes to the implementation of their respective interests, intensifies the role of regional regulation systems and promotes the development of interstate relations under multipolarity.

“Against the backdrop of worsening international relations it becomes more evident that it is impossible to govern the world global system even in one field (e.g. the economic one) from one center even it is very powerful. The world community represented by national states has always been and is a multipolar system where it is necessary to seek consensus on fundamental issues regarding the system’s governance. As a result, even the one who dominates in a particular moment history cannot rely on brutal force as a major means of dominance. It is possible in a short-term perspective but, eventually, a different approach is necessary, the one based on a combination of several tools where force coercion is balanced with soft power and they are applied considering relevant international, legal, political and economic system”¹.

Decentralization of international relations global regulation is a major tendency in forming a multipolar world order. Global regulation decentralization is a process contrary to centralization and it has the following characteristic features:

- responsibility distribution among new centers of power in accordance with areas of the political dominance;

¹ Chumakov, A.N. (2016). *Globalizaciya. Kontury celostnogo mira. 2-e izdanie, pererabotannoe i dopolnennoe*. Moscow: Obshchestvo s ogranichennoj otvetstvennost'yu "Prospekt" [Globalization. Outlines of a holistic world. 2nd edition, revised and supplemented. Moscow: Limited Liability Company "Prospekt"]; Ino Rossi (2020), *Challenges of Globalization and Prospects for an Inter-civilizational World Order*, pp. 410-411. Cham: Springer.

- regionalization of political processes;
- diversification world politics sources;
- function distribution among world organizations and other international organizations, interstate associations and integration unions;

Features of decentralization define the principles of international relations global regulation in a multipolar world:

- the cluster principle implies formation, by the centers of power, of formal and non-formal institutions in international relations and in world politics;
- the relativism principle that contributes to the implementation of peoples' right to preserve cultural identity understood as a source of political concepts;
- the legitimacy principle ensured by the democratic world order and by the unifying agenda;
- the principle of network organization that entails the diversity of forms of international organizations and interstate associations in their integral unity fulfilling the functions of international relations global regulation.

The totality of above-mentioned features and principles ensure the systemacity of decentralized international relations global regulation. The concept of multipolarity as an ideological superstructure of the globalization of political processes cannot be realized without the formation of a system of decentralized global regulation of international relations based on the consensus of the centers of geopolitical influence in the multipolar world. A qualitative transition to a decentralized model of global regulation of international relations becomes possible due to the formation of a global ideological attitude about the need to resolve the fundamental contradictions that arose as a result of the previous stages of the globalization of political processes¹.

¹ Dugin, A.G. (2015), *Teoriya mnogopolyarnogo Mira. Plyuriversum* [Theory of a Multipolar World]. Pluriversum. Moscow: Academic Project.