

Scientific Approaches to Socio-Economic Development of Territories

Abdullaev Farkhod Ozodovich

Researcher of Urgench State University,
Kharezm,
Uzbekistan

Abstract. In this paper has been studied the methodology of regional development. Based on the literature review, the essence, role, significance, prospects, and features of inclusive growth for the formation of regional development systems at the local and global levels are determined.

Keywords: Regionalism, old regionalism, new regionalism, comparative regionalism, interregionalism, transregionalism, regionalization, region.

1. INTRODUCTION

The leading trends in modern world development are two processes - globalization and regionalization, which until the beginning of the XXI century. were evaluated by researchers as opposite phenomena. The conjugation of the global and regional levels of world political practice has always been one of the most controversial points in the theory of international relations. Most researchers either focused exclusively on global world political processes (globalism), virtually ignoring regional specifics, or focused their attention on the study of a specific region (regionalism), resulting in an underestimation of the global systemic context.

In our opinion, today the importance and necessity of new theoretical approaches for the study of a holistic picture of the world, where both global and regional aspects would receive equal attention, is obvious.

Today, globalization and regionalization are becoming mutually dependent processes. Moreover, regionalization is increasingly seen as part of global processes. As a result, today in practice we have a variety of integration forms: from regional organizations to interregional and transregional ties, which are formed taking into account the regional and global contexts.

In addition, there is an overlapping membership of a large number of states in various regional structures, the addition of formal interstate interactions at the regional level with expanding sustainable informal and "private" ties due to the activity of business and civil structures in the formation of regional blocks of various levels, as well as the activation of direct relations between interstate unions in different regions. All together it is a complex "multi-level structure" that has gradually taken shape in the process of evolution of regionalism: from the "old" regionalism to the "new" and, finally, to "comparative" regionalism (comparative regionalism), the formation of the problem field of which is at the stage of its formation and causes active discussions in foreign and Russian scientific literature.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Subject of study of international relations, globalization, region development issues were studied by Adler E. [6], Greve P., Aniche E. [7], Beeson M., Lee-Brown T. [9], Biermannam, R. , Koops J.A.[11], Börzel T.A.[12,13], Risse T., Coe B.N.[14], Cusack A.K.[15], Fawcett L.[19], Haas E.[21,22], Hanggi H. [23], Roloff R., Ruland J., Hettne B., Söderbaum F.[45], Katzenstein P.J., Galicia [27], Keohane R.O.[28], Krapohl S. [29], Kubicek P.[30] , Libman A.[34], Obydenkova A., Loewen H., Zorob A., Makarychev A.S.[36], Martynova E.S.[37], Mearsheimer J.[38], Mikhaylenko E.[39], Mikhaylenko V., Panke D.[40], Stapel S., Rüländ J.[41], Schulz M.[40], Öjendal J., Selleslags J.[43], Ruiz, J.B., Fedoseeva S., Shcheglov E., Bogdan N .and others.

Based on the analysis of modern economic literature, reviews, reports prepared by international experts for international organizations, the study of statistical data, the essence, role, significance, prospects, and features of inclusive growth for the formation of national and regional innovation systems in countries are determined.

3. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Theories of regionalism steadily entered the scientific circulation in the late 1980s. and, as noted by F. de Lombardi, F. Soderbaum, L. van Langenhove and F. Burt, elements of comparative studies were already present at the initial

stage of the debate about the nature of early regionalism [17]. These approaches have occupied their own niche in the theories of international relations and have become independent of the classical integration approaches. If at the end of the last century, experts only began to form theoretical clusters of regional approaches, trying to identify and define the concept of "regionalism", then today we can argue that the conceptual understanding of approaches to regionalism and regionalization finds expression in the comprehensive approach of "comparative" regionalism. Nevertheless, this term has not yet been fixed in the Russian scientific lexicon, which is due, on the one hand, to the difficulties of translation traditional for international studies, and on the other hand, to the incompleteness of the process of forming the problem field of the new discipline.

For example, a number of researchers explain the need for the emergence of the term "comparative regionalism" by studying the processes of regionalization outside Europe [4,5] or by comparing these models with European practice [47]. Other researchers under comparative regionalism mean a tilt towards social constructivism in the study of regions [6,7,8,9,10]. At the same time, in general, the work of these researchers is aimed at a new reading of the concept of "region" and is an attempt to create a new direction in the study of the regional level of development in the context of global processes of our time.

The purpose of this article is to determine the theoretical foundations of the study of the modern generation of regionalism, its problematic field and the difficulties in its study. Despite the theoretical development of modern theories of regionalism by foreign researchers [1,2,3 45, 47].

One of the first Russian works on "comparative integration" was the monograph by A.A. Baikov, published in 2012 [8], in which the author proposed his own version of the toolkit for a comparative analysis of regional versions of integration interaction.

The theoretical foundations of the regionalization of modern international relations, the nature of the refraction of global political and economic patterns in the regional segments of the world - macro-regions and global regions, the prospects for the development of the regional world order are devoted to the works of A.D. Voskresensky [2012; 2019; *The Regional World Order...* 2019].

The works of E.B. Mikhailenko [39] and S.K. Pestsova. The problem of interregionalism, transregionalism and the global region is being actively developed by Russian researchers D.A. Kuznetsov [31], M.L. Lagutina [32] and others. These works present one of the first in Russian political studies a comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon of transregionalism, new forms of regionalism, the concept of a "global region", which is a new approach to studying the process of formation of regional structures in the era of globalization.

The authors of this article offer their own vision of the process of evolution of the theories of regionalism and believe that modern regionalism as a new direction of research includes not only comparative studies (from region to region), but also studies of the process of regionalization and region-building, the formation of regional orders and subsystems, the study of their global context, which allows you to reach a new research level.

The formation of regional studies has gone through a long evolution. Researchers identify several stages in the development of regional studies. So, for example, F. Soderbaum proposes to divide all regional studies into early (early), recent (recent) and comparative (comparative) debates [45]. Following his logic, let us designate the evolution of scientific approaches within the framework of regional studies.

F. Soderbaum refers to early research studies that are traditionally included in the cluster of European studies: the theory of federalism, functionalism [21], neofunctionalism [22], interdependence theory [28]. L. van Langenhove and A.-K. Costea this period is called economic regionalism, which includes the evolution from the creation of a free trade area, then transformed into a customs union, a common market and, finally, an economic union [17]. In scientific literature, this period was also called "old" regionalism [45]. In accordance with this approach, the key category of regional studies - "region" - is understood as a group of neighboring countries, representing a separate economic and geographical area, or close in national composition and culture, or of the same type in terms of socio-political system, a region of the world. Thus, the "old" regionalism was formed in the bipolar context of the Cold War, when the formation of the region took place exclusively "from above", with the leading role of states.

Recent debates include the approaches of the "new" regionalism that was developed in the late 1980s. [24, 25, 47]. According to M. Schulz and I. Ojendal, it is fundamentally important to change approaches to understanding what a region is and how regionalization develops [42]. Thus, unlike the "old" regionalism, which was mainly imposed from the outside by the leading powers (hegemonic regionalism), the "new" is a spontaneous process directed "from below" and "from within" the regional space. In addition, according to researchers, the "new" regionalism is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, in contrast to the "old" one, which had clear specific goals and objectives (creation of a free trade zone or an alliance to ensure regional security).

In parallel with the theories of the “new” regionalism, studies of the “world of regions” were developed [26, 4, 5]. A distinctive feature of the theoretical approach was the rejection of the Eurocentric model of building a region. P. Katzenstein argued that considering Asian models of integration through the prism of European integration can be misleading. The fundamental differences between the two types of regionalism lie, first of all, in different historical trajectories and a different architecture of integration [26].

It is in the approaches of theorists of the "world of regions" that the term "comparative" regionalism or "comparative" integration began to appear [8]. Often under the term "comparative" regionalism in the late 1990s. implied a "non-European" model of integration.

The convergence of the ideas of the two schools - the "new regionalism" and the approaches of the "world of regions" - gave impetus to the start of the third stage in the study of regional processes. This stage of theoretical research (comparative debate), according to F. Soderbaum, includes the parallel development of research on regionalism in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas in the first decade of the 21st century. [45]. Researchers studying different regions of the world faced the problem of criteria for comparative analysis [16].

Often, the EU was the criterion for comparison, so many regional projects outside the EU began to be identified as unsuccessful projects [30,46]. Therefore, F. Soderbaum, A. Acharya and others propose to reconsider approaches to comparative regionalism, to develop criteria for analyzing the regions of the world, avoiding using Europe as a "mirror".

For the next ten years, we see a flourishing of comparative research, known as conceptual pluralism [De Lombaerde, Söderbaum, Van Langenhove, Baert 2010].

In the early 2000s the term "comparative regionalism" began to be used by Western researchers to characterize a new stage in the development of regionalism, which they assess as a complex, eclectic phenomenon [17]. F. Soderbaum in his works devoted to the rethinking of regionalism [45] notes a number of conditions for the formation and development of a new generation of regionalism:

- 1) the role of the global context, the emergence of the BRICS countries and other new (emerging) powers, representing the so-called Global South or "the rest of the world" ("the Rest");
- 2) definition of regional governance as part of a multi-level system of global governance;
- 3) the role of non-state actors in the formation of new forms of regionalism.
- 4) Gradually, a new direction of research began to take shape.

Taking into account the pluralism and diversity of modern regionalism, at the theoretical level, researchers continue to face a number of conceptual problems. The works of F. de Lombardi, F. Soderbaum, L. van Langenhove and F. Burt [16], A. Acharya [4] are devoted to this, where the authors identify three main problems of the theory of comparative regionalism: conceptual (the problem of terminology), theoretical and methodology problem.

For comparative regionalism, a conceptual problem is relevant - the problem of defining such key concepts as "region", "regional integration", "regionalism" and "regionalization".

As for the theoretical problem, according to foreign researchers [16], comparative regionalism can provide an opportunity for the convergence of various theoretical approaches to the study of regional cooperation.

Given the diversity of approaches and the continuation of theoretical research, A. Acharya asks the question: can we come to an agreement that some specific theories and concepts will become the basis for comparative regionalism [4]? Or should we leave the field of comparative regionalism to the competition and rivalry of theorists? At the same time, researchers note the problem of the dominance of the theory and practice of European integration in many studies, and therefore insist that within the framework of comparative regionalism, more attention should be paid to theories, concepts and ideas developed outside of Europe. Developing the theories of comparative regionalism, should we follow the method of induction rather than deduction, that is, instead of taking some general approaches for studying regions as a basis (as in the case of the EU), focus on studying the characteristics of each region in order to search for common and distinctive features?

The EU has become a model and model for verifying various theoretical approaches, including theories of regionalism. However, the modern world is so complex, heterogeneous, and diverse that one-size approach cannot be used. The EU has a very developed model of regionalism, however, modern regions offer more and more tools for the study of regionalisms.

Finally, we turn to the problem of methodology. F. de Lombardi, F. Soderbaum, L. van Langenhove and F. Burt note two widely used methodological approaches to the study of regions: the first is the study of one specific case, taking into account the historical factor in the development of regional relations in this particular region (using qualitative research methods), the second is the study of a set of different cases in order to identify their common

characteristics (using quantitative methods). The second approach is most effective in studying the economic aspects of regional cooperation [16].

Nevertheless, each of the presented approaches has its drawbacks, therefore, according to representatives of comparative regionalism, a combination of both approaches is preferable when conducting a comparative analysis of regional ties.

Another methodological problem is related to the criteria for the effectiveness of regionalism and the need to evaluate the activities of regional institutions, namely: how to determine that a particular region has taken place or a certain type of regionalism has become a reality, and is the presence of a regional organization proof of the viability of regionalism?

Regional institutions are a natural object of study of regionalism, since it is regional institutions that can make it possible to fix the status quo at a certain stage of regional construction. Integration associations initiate inter-regional, trans-regional and inter-regional relations. However, regionalization can take place both within existing institutions and outside them, including the territories of states and

zones at the intersection of several regional institutions. Therefore, it is difficult to identify a certain set of criteria for identifying regionalism.

The presence of intensive regionalization in the field of economy, security, culture, education, consensus building, etc. can be an important step towards building strong regional ties. Since regionalism is a project in the process of its creation [24], we can observe several different projects within the same territorial space.

Thus, it can be argued that comparative regionalism at this stage is not a mature theory from the classical point of view. Unlike the "new" regionalism, which grew out of the theory of modern political economy, globalization, constructivism and comparative regional studies, comparative regionalism began to be applied quite widely to various types of regional studies, which gave it an eclectic character.

At the same time, the emergence of a new area of research on modern regionalism is due to qualitative transformations in world political practice at all levels: local, regional and global. The diversity of existing modern regionalisms in practice requires the modern research community to develop some unified approaches to their study. The goal of comparative regionalism is precisely to develop a comprehensive theoretical and methodological approach to the study of various options for regional cooperation.

4. FEATURES AND TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN REGIONALISM

Regional studies are developing more and more actively, approaches and principles to the study of modern regions are changing. The number of scientific papers devoted to different variants of regionalism is huge, however, we will try to find answers to the questions posed and identify theoretical trends in modern studies of regions.

Conceptually, the supporters of comparative regionalism agreed that the "region" is a multi-valued concept ("container-concept") and its definition depends on the specific research problem [32,45]. If, within the framework of early regionalism, the region was considered mainly as a space located between the national and local levels within a single state (micro-regions), then in modern studies we are talking about the emergence of the region to the macro-regional level. In addition, representatives of neo-functionalism, institutionalism and especially transnationalism note that regions have ceased to have an exclusively state-centric nature, non-state actors and interest groups are actively involved in regional cooperation today [1, 45, 16, 17].

In Russian regional studies, there is also a gradual departure from the geographically local understanding of the concept of "region" that dominates in Soviet science. Thus, a number of Russian researchers define "region" in their works as a multidimensional concept, the study of which requires an interdisciplinary integrated approach [44, 36], introduce such terms as "macro-region" and "global region" into political science discourse [32].

It can be summarized that today "region" is one of the most difficult to define concepts in modern political and international studies, a "super term" [44] that has undergone a certain meaningful evolution: from intrastate structural units to an actor in world politics. As a result, within the framework of comparative regionalism, due to its pluralistic nature, two main approaches to the definition of the concept of "region" have been established: most studies are still focused on understanding the "region" as an interstate form of cooperation [18, 19], but the trend of recent years to the so-called "soft", or informal, regionalism, which implies the activity of non-state actors (business and civil society) in regional cooperation [1,45].

Regional studies include various theoretical schools: from the classical approaches of functionalism and neorealism to cognitivist and post-structuralist approaches. It should be noted that positivist approaches are important in studies of regions. The emergence of regional institutions cannot be analyzed without reference to the theories of neo-

functionalism, just as it is impossible to ignore the theories of neo-realism that explain the role of regional powers or emerging powers and their influence on regional dynamics. It is difficult to argue with J. Mearsheimer that institutions basically reflect the distribution of power in the world [38]. However, an increasingly complex, “multiplex” world [5] requires a more targeted approach to regional studies.

L. Fawcett offers three options for building regionalism, based on the use of the EU experience.

The first option, the orthodox one, involves building regional and interregional relations based on the flagship experience of the EU.

The second option is revisionist, which calls into question the experience of the EU and emphasizes the role of other actors and models for building regions.

The third option, post-revisionist, is a synthesis of the two previous options, namely the recognition of the role of the EU as a model of integration, its influence and role in the formation of regions outside Europe, as well as the recognition that the EU is one of the many variants of regionalism [18, 19].

From our point of view, all three options for research are relevant, since different regions use different options for building regionalism: from building regionalism through training, using the practice of the EU, to revisionist regionalism.

So-called "overlapping regionalism" today is found not only in Eurasia, but also in Africa and Asia. It is also common in North and South America and Europe. In addition, more than 60 currently active regional organizations have overlap with each other both within the framework of membership and by area of activity. Therefore, it is important to explore how modern regional institutions can interact and resolve conflicts of interest. A new research field is being formed to study the origin, nature and main processes of interaction between organizations in global processes (inter-organizational relations).

The emergence of the practice of transregional and interregional relations [23] and the development of theoretical research in this field require comparative studies of modern interregional relations.

Scientists note the following features of modern interregional relations.

Firstly, the emergence of “competing”, rival regionalism, the emergence of regional blocs, within which interregional cooperation began to be used as a tool for dominating a region in a foreign regional group.

Secondly, complex interregionalism began to take shape: interregional "concerts" of powers appear within Europe, East Asia and North America.

Thirdly, regional powers, growing powers that use their tools for regional construction, have begun to play a more active role among regional actors. The existing gap between the dream of rising powers of a global role in the world and their legitimization in the regional space leads to conflict forms of interaction between regional powers and their neighbors in the region and with other regions. Many BRICS members face problems with their regional neighbors due to unresolved territorial disputes, disparities in status or economic position, and suspicions of hegemony.

Fourthly, the number of regional blocs, institutions, agreements at the bilateral and multilateral levels is multiplying, which can lead to an institutional overstrain of modern global governance.

Undoubtedly, such new phenomena as BRICS, MIKTA (Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey, Australia), the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Chinese “One Belt, One Road” initiative, the Russian “Greater Eurasian Space” initiative and others are difficult to study within the framework of classical theories of integration and the concept of an international region.

It is interesting to note that active theoretical developments are being carried out in this area within the framework of the Russian school of regional studies. In particular, Russian researchers propose approaches that make it possible to consider BRICS as a regional project of a new type: for example, the authors of this article define BRICS as an example of “alternative regionalism” [39] or “global region” [32]. In their research, YES. Kuznetsov defines BRICS and MIKTA as one of the types of international transregionalism - "transregional forums", and the initiatives "One Belt, One Road", the Trans-Pacific Partnership and others - as an example of "network transregionalism" [31, 33].

The work of V.I. Yurtaeva, Rogov. One of the important theoretical directions of modern regionalism can be the study of the relationship between regionalism at the macrolevel and regionalization (microlevel).

Simultaneously with the formation of mega-processes, the construction of macro-regions, there is fragmentation and regionalization within each region. Subnational regions (microregions) and supranational regions (macroregions) practically do not intersect in research fields. They are studied by various academic communities. Microregionalism is usually analyzed in the context of issues of federalism, separatism, and transregional cooperation. The links between microregionalism and macroregionalism are not just underestimated from an "empirical" point of view. The coexistence of microregionalism and macroregionalism, and above all their complex relationship, is poorly explained

by traditional theories that dominate modern international relations [45, 16]. The growth in the number of micro-regions appearing in various forms, such as subnational and/or cross-border, formal or informal, economic, political, administrative, cultural, etc. regions, becomes obvious and requires the formation of a separate research field within the framework of modern regionalism.

Fedoseeva Svetlana Sergeevna, Shcheglov Evgeny Vyacheslavovich, Balandin Evgeny Dmitrievich. studied the patterns of spatial and sectoral development of the subjects of the Volga Federal District in terms of the volume of investment in fixed assets. Based on the results of the study, conclusions were drawn about the need for further study of the structure of the distribution of investments in fixed assets, as a tool to overcome regional disproportions in spatial and sectoral development. The results of the study can be in demand in the implementation of scenario forecasting of the spatial and sectoral development of Russian regions and a comprehensive assessment of the impact of investment factors on the economic growth rates of the country's subjects.[48]

Bogdan N.I., Svetlana Warkhurst considered the theoretical problems of inclusive growth and its relevance for solving modern problems of regional socio-economic development. It is proved that the tasks of developing national and regional innovation systems are related to the problems of inclusive innovation and the development of learning potential. The features of the regional innovative development of Belarus are determined, the current directions of innovation policy in the regions of Belarus are considered, the possibilities and prospects for inclusive innovations in Belarus are identified.[49]

Simchenko N.A., Anisimova N. studied the assessment of the development of the system of labor relations using fractal theory. Their work provides an overview of theoretical and methodological approaches to assessing the formation and development of complex systems in domestic and foreign literature, reveals their advantages and problem areas of research. Based on the need to take into account the diversity of data and different levels of hierarchy, as well as the discrepancy between traditional linear models and the real behavior of institutional participants in the labor market, the possibility of using fractal theory in assessing the development of the labor relations system is substantiated. A structural and logical scheme of a fractal approach to the study of the system of labor relations has been formed, which includes three areas: an intersectoral balance of the training system and the regional labor market, a methodology for assessing digital labor, and a model for assessing the value of the educational potential of a region. Approbation of the formed particular algorithms of the fractal approach at the regional level of administration of the Republic of Crimea was carried out, separate results of the assessment of the development of the labor relations system were presented, conclusions were formulated about the prospects of using the fractal theory in the study of the development of complex socio-economic systems. [50]

Yurak V.V., Ignatieva M.N., Polyanskaya I.G. identified a number of basic trends and phenomena in the development of the theory of evaluation in the economics of environmental management. The axiological (subjective) value is approaching the objective value of natural goods by integrating an increasing number of value factors into the assessment.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Modern regionalism is a multidimensional, eclectic approach to the study of various forms of regional ties, taking into account not only the regional, but also the global context, the formation of the theoretical and conceptual foundations of which has not yet been completed. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the changing nature of international and regional relations requires new approaches to the study of regional, interregional and transregional relations. As a result of the process of its evolution, in our opinion, regionalism today has become an umbrella approach that combines different theoretical schools and comparative methodology.

The evolution of the theoretical approaches of regionalism demonstrates the need to search for new methods and approaches to the study of modern regional processes. When conducting comparative studies, it is important to go beyond the “false universalism” inherent in the selective understanding of regionalism through the prism of the EU. In particular, comparative regionalism has accumulated a sufficiently large potential to develop suitable tools for the analysis of modern regional cases.

Positivist studies at the present stage are just as necessary as cognitive approaches to understanding what a region, regionalization and regionalism is. Within the framework of new approaches to regionalism, it is possible to develop research in all areas: from the economic-geographical approach to the constructivist analysis of the regional cohesion of a particular region.

The "constellation" of theories of regionalism should create the possibility of including new areas of research into research niches: comparative interregional studies, comparative studies of interintegration relationships, comparative

studies of the levels of regionalism, studies of international transregionalism, and others - everything that does not fit into the framework of classical integration theories.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Acharya, A. (2003). Democratization and the Prospects for Participatory Regionalism in Southeast Asia. *Third World Quarterly*, 24 (2), 375—390.
- [2]. Acharya, A. (2006). Europe and Asia: Reflections on a Tale of Two Regionalisms. In: Fort, B. & Webber, D. (Eds.). *Regional Integration in Europe and East Asia: Convergence or Divergence?* London and New York: Routledge. P. 312—321.
- [3]. Acharya, A. (2008). Regional Worlds in a Post-Hegemonic Era: Keynote Speech. 3rd GARNET Annual Conference, Bordeaux. 17—20 September. URL: <http://amitavacharyaacademic.blogspot.com/2008/10/regional-worlds-in-post-hegemonic-era.html> (accessed: 07.10. 2019).
- [4]. Acharya, A. (2012). Comparative Regionalism: A Field Whose Time has Come? *The International Spectator: Italian Journal of International Affairs*, 47 (1), 3—15.
- [5]. Acharya, A. (2014). *The End of the American World Order*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.
- [6]. Adler, E. & Greve, P. (2009). When Security Community Meets Balance of Power: Overlapping Regional Mechanisms of Security Governance. *Review of International Studies*, 35 (S1), 59—84. DOI: 10.1017/S0260210509008432
- [7]. Aniche, E. (2018). Pan-Africanism and Regionalism in Africa: The Journey so Far. SSRN. URL: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3098045> (accessed: 07.10. 2019).
- [8]. Baykov, A.A. (2012). Comparative Integration. Practice and Models of Integration in Foreign Europe and Pacific Asia. Moscow: Aspekt Press publ. (In Russian).
- [9]. Beeson, M. & Lee-Brown, T. (2016). The Future of Asian Regionalism: Not What It Used to Be. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, 4 (2), 195—206. DOI: 10.1002/app5.168.
- [10]. Beeson, M. & Stubbs, R. (Eds.). (2011). *Routledge Handbook of Asian Regionalism*. London: Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780203803608
- [11]. Biermann, R. & Koops, J.A. (Eds.). *The Palgrave Handbook of Inter-Organizational Relations in World Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/978-1-137-36039-7
- [12]. Börzel, T.A. & Risse, T. (Eds.). (2006). *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Regionalism*. Oxford University Press.
- [13]. Börzel, T.A. & Van Hüllen, V. (Eds.). (2015). *Governance Transfer by Regional Organizations. Patching Together a Global Script*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [14]. Coe, B.N. (2019). Sovereignty in the South Inclusive Regionalism in Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia. Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781108654821
- [15]. Cusack, A.K. (2019). Venezuela, ALBA, and the Limits of Postneoliberal Regionalism in Latin America and the Caribbean. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/978-1-349-95003-4
- [16]. De Lombaerde, P. (2010). How to 'Connect' Micro-regions with Macro-regions? A Note. *Perspectives on Federalism*, 2 (3), 1—9. URL: http://www.on-federalism.eu/attachments/080_download.pdf (accessed: 26.02.2020).
- [17]. De Lombaerde, P., Söderbaum, F., Van Langenhove, L. & Baert, F. (2010). The Problem of Comparison in Comparative Regionalism. *Review of International Studies*, 36 (3), 731—753. DOI: 10.1017/S0260210510000707
- [18]. Fawcett, L. (2004). Exploring Regional Domains: A Comparative History of Regionalism. *International Affairs*, 80 (3), 429—446. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2004.00391.x
- [19]. Fawcett, L. (2005). Regionalism in Historical Perspective. In: Farrell, M., Hettne, B. & Van Langenhove, L. (Eds.). *The Global Politics of Regionalism. Theory and Practice*. London: Pluto Press. P. 21—38.
- [20]. Fawcett, L. (2016). Regionalism by Emulation: Considerations across Time and Space. In: Telo, M., Fawcett, L. & Ponjaert, F. (Eds.). *Interregionalism and the European Union. Post-revisionist Approach to Europe's Place in a Changing World*. Abington: Routledge. P. 33—55.
- [21]. Haas, E. (1964). *Beyond the Nation-state: Functionalism and International Organization*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- [22]. Haas, E. (1975). *The Obsolescence of Regional Integration Theory*. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California.
- [23]. Hanggi, H., Roloff, R. & Ruland, J. (2006). Interregionalism: A New Phenomena in International Relations. In: Hanggi, H., Roloff, R. & Ruland, J. (Eds.). *Interregionalism and International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- [24]. Hettne, B. & Söderbaum, F. (2000). Theorising the Rise of Regionness. *New Political Economy*, 5 (3), 457—472. DOI: 10.1080/713687778
- [25]. Hettne, B. (2005). Beyond the "New Regionalism". *New Political Economy*, 10 (4), 543—571. DOI:10.1080/13563460500344484
- [26]. Katzenstein, P.J. (1996). Regionalism in Comparative Perspective. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 31 (92), 123—159. Katzenstein, P.J. (2000). Regionalism and Asia. *New Political Economy*, 5 (3), 353—368.
- [27]. Katzenstein, P.J. (2005). *A World of Regions: Asia and Europe in the American Imperium*. Cornell University Press. Keating, M. (2001). Rethinking the Region: Culture, Institutions and Economic Development in Catalonia and Galicia. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 8 (3), 217—234. DOI: 10.1177/096977640100800304
- [28]. Keohane, R.O. & Nye, J.S. (1997). Interdependence in World Politics. In: Crane, G.T. & Amawi, A. (Eds.). *The Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy: A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- [29].Krapohl, S. & Van Huut, S. (2019). A Missed Opportunity for Regionalism: the Disparate Behavior of African Countries in the EPA-negotiations with the EU. *Journal of European Integration*, 1—19. DOI: 10.1080/07036337.2019.1666117
- [30].Kubicek, P. (2009). The Commonwealth of Independent States: An Example of Failed Regionalism? *Review of International Studies*, 35 (S1), 237—256.
- [31].Kuznetsov, D.A. (2016). Transregionalism: Problems of Terminology and Conceptualization. *Comparative Politics*, 7 (2), 14—25. DOI: 10.18611/2221-3279-2016-7-2(23)-14-25. (In Russian).
- [32].Lagutina, M.L. (2015). Global Region as a Unit of World Political System of the XXI century. *Comparative Politics*, 6 (2), 16—21. DOI: 10.18611/2221-3279-2015-6-2(19)-16-21. (In Russian).
- [33].Lebedeva, M.M. & Kuznetsov, D.A. (2019). Transregional Integration as a New Phenomenon of World Politics: Nature and Prospects. *Polis. Political Studies*, 5, 71—84. DOI: 10.17976/jpps/2019.05.06. (In Russian).
- [34].Libman, A. & Obydenkova, A. (2017). Why Is the 'Post-Soviet' Regionalism Post-Soviet? Historical Legacies and Regional Integration in Eurasia. MPRA Paper, 83506. URL: <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/83506>.
- [35].Loewen, H. & Zorob, A. (2018). Initiatives of Regional Integration in Asia in Comparative Perspective Concepts, Contents and Prospects. Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-024-1211-6
- [36].Makarychev, A.S. (1999). Western Frontiers of Russia: Problems of Security and Transnational Regionalism. Moscow: Moskovskiy tsentr Karnegi publ., 8, 1—19. (In Russian).
- [37].Martynova, E.S. (2012). Integration Processes in the Asia-Pacific Region: New Outlines of East Asian Regionalism. *International Organisations Research Journal*, 7 (4), 254—270 (in Russian).
- [38].Mearsheimer, J. (1994). The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security*, 4 19 (3), 5— 49.
- [39].Mikhaylenko, E. & Mikhaylenko, V. (2020). Eurasian Regionalism: Specifics, Problems and Prospects. In: Lagutina, M. (Eds.). *Regional Integration and Future Cooperation Initiatives in the Eurasian Economic Union*. IGI Global. P. 16—36.
- [40].Panke, D. & Stapel, S. (2018). Exploring Overlapping Regionalism. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 21 (3), 635—662. DOI: 10.1057/s41268-016-0081-x
- [41].Rüland, J. (2018). Coping with Crisis: Southeast Asian Regionalism and the Ideational Constraints of Reform. *Asia Europe Journal*, 16, 155—168. DOI: 10.1007/s10308-018-0503-z
- [42].Schulz, M., Söderbaum, F. & Öjendal, J. (2001). *Regionalization in a Globalizing World: A Comparative Perspective on Forms, Actors, and Processes*. New York: Zed Books Limited.
- [43].Selleslaghs, J., Ruiz, J.B. & De Lombaerde, P. (2020). Regionalism in Latin America: Eclectic, Multi-faceted and Multi-layered. In: Hosli, M. & Selleslaghs, J. (Eds.). *The Changing Global Order*. Springer. P. 223— 245. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-21603-0_12
- [44].Sergunin, A. & Gao, F. (2018). BRICS as the Subject of Study of International Relations Theory. *International Organisations Research Journal*, 13 (4), 55—73. DOI: 10.17323/19967845-2018-04-03
- [45].Söderbaum, F. & Taylor, I. (Eds.). (2007). *Micro-Regionalism in West Africa Evidence from Two Case Studies*. Discussion Paper 34. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrika institutet. P. 1—36.
- [46].Taylor, I. (2005). *NEPAD. Toward Africa's Development or Another False Start?* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- [47].Telo, M. (2007). *European Union and New Regionalism: Regional Actors and Global Governance in a Post-Hegemonic Era*. Cornwall: Ashgate Publishing. Van Langenhove, L. & Costea, A.-N. (2005). *The EU as a Global Actor and the Emergence of 'Third Generation'*.
- [48].<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/otsenka-vliyaniya-investitsionnogo-potentsiala-na-razvitie-prostranstvenno-otraslevoy-struktury-regiona>
- [49].<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/innovatsii-dlya-inklyuzivnogo-razvitiya-regionov-belarusi>
- [50].<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/otsenka-razvitiya-sistemy-trudovyyh-otnosheniy-s-primeneniem-fraktalnoy-teorii>