

ПОЛІТОЛОГІЯ

UDC 321.01:321.4:342.25:351.91:343.352

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/apfs.v052.2024.33>*N. A. Babarykina*ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6167-3693>*PhD, Associate Professor,**Associate Professor at the Department of Political Technologies,
Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman*THE IMPACT OF THE DECENTRALIZATION PROCESS
ON THE INTERNAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE STATE

Introduction. In the conditions of modern state governance, the principle of internal sovereignty remains one of the key foundations of power organization, defining its boundaries and mechanisms of implementation. The essence of this principle lies in the supremacy of the state in resolving internal affairs, its independence from external influences in the sphere of domestic politics, and its ability to maintain law and order within its own territory.

At the same time, due to globalization processes and the growing role of international organizations, the concept of internal sovereignty undergoes significant transformation, making it particularly relevant for scientific comprehension. The significance of internal sovereignty is enhanced in times of political crises when the state faces the issue of preserving unity and control over its own territory. In this context, the system of power organization plays a special role, particularly the issue of decentralization, which can simultaneously serve as a tool for strengthening sovereignty or threaten its erosion. Decentralization contributes to more effective management, strengthening the role of local self-government, but in certain cases can create preconditions for internal division of the state. Therefore, the balance between centralized governance and delegation of powers to local levels is critical for preserving internal sovereignty.

In addition, the development of democratic institutions and expansion of civic participation in the political process also affect the concept of internal sovereignty. The state is no longer a monopolist in exercising power, as social movements, civic initiatives, and new forms of political communication change traditional notions about relations between power and people. In such conditions, there is a need to review classical models of internal sovereignty that were based on exclusive dominance of the state as a single decision-making center. Apart from internal challenges,

state's internal sovereignty faces external threats such as interference in domestic politics, economic dependence or informational influences. In today's world no state can exist in isolation, which forces governments to seek compromises between maintaining their own autonomy and the need for interaction with international actors. Therefore, the issue of internal sovereignty arises not only as a legal category, but also as a flexible mechanism that ensures the stability of state governance.

Thus, the aim of the article is to define the role of internal sovereignty as a principle of power organization in the state in connection with the modern process of decentralization in the context of contemporary challenges.

State of scientific development of the problem.

Modern scientific research on internal sovereignty as a principle of power organization in the state demonstrates the multidimensionality of this concept and its close connection with political, legal and socio-economic processes. The starting point in studying the problem is the classical understanding of sovereignty, initiated by J. Bodin [1; 18], who defined it as the indivisible and absolute power of the state. Lately this concept underwent changes, in particular thanks to the ideas of popular sovereignty, which highlighted the need for legitimizing power through people's will [22; 4].

In modern conditions, the internal sovereignty of the state is considered through the prism of constitutional order and the principle of rule of law. Domestic researchers, including Z. Kuznetsova [14] and T. Bevz [2], analyze the issues of formal and real sovereignty, emphasizing that the presence of democratic institutions does not yet guarantee full realization of popular sovereignty. In Ukraine, for example, mechanisms of democracy often face challenges related to political instability, corruption and the influence of oligarchic groups on state governance [24]. One of the key challenges to the realization of internal sovereignty in democratic states is cor-

ruption, which significantly undermines both the legitimacy of power and the effectiveness of state governance. In countries with unstable political systems, a high level of corruption can lead to the delegitimization of central authority and strengthen the influence of informal political and economic groups. This, in turn, complicates the implementation of the principle of popular sovereignty, as decisions are made not in the interests of citizens but for the benefit of narrow elites.

A separate aspect of research concerns the interconnection between internal sovereignty and decentralization processes. On one hand, decentralization can serve as a tool to increase the efficiency of state governance and bring power closer to citizens, as noted by N. Gorlo [10]. On the other hand, excessive expansion of regional powers without proper control from central authorities can cause erosion of sovereignty and pose threats to territorial integrity.

The issue of internal sovereignty is also closely related to information space, especially in the context of hybrid wars. V. Vorotynsky [7] emphasizes the need to protect information sovereignty as an integral part of state security. He highlights that modern conflicts are fought not only on the battlefield but also in media space, where control over information flows becomes a decisive factor for political stability of the state.

In an international context, the problem of internal sovereignty is studied through the influence of globalization processes that change classical notions about state power. S. Semchyshyn [20], H. Mashura [16] and N. Melnyk [17] consider debates between realists who emphasize preservation of states as main actors in international relations and neoliberals who assert that national governments increasingly cede power to international institutions. This poses a challenge for states to maintain sovereignty in conditions of international interdependence.

Overall, modern research confirms that internal sovereignty remains a fundamental principle of power organization in a state, but its realization depends on the effectiveness of state institutions, level of democratic development, information security and ability to adapt to global challenges. It is not a fixed category, but constantly transforms according to political, social and economic changes.

Main material. 1. The essence of state sovereignty.

Analysis of the historical development of the concept of state sovereignty shows that understanding of sovereignty changed depending on who was its bearer. If in J. Bodin and T. Hobbes the bearer of state sovereignty was a monarch endowed with unlimited power and rights, then with the process of forming national states and developing democratic ideals, an alternative source of power became the people.

State power began to be considered as an absolute category, state sovereignty had to rely on the sovereignty of the people as its source and legitimizing factor. Therefore, the people became the new source of sovereign power [5], [1]. The concept of sovereignty emerged gradually, based on political-legal thought and practice of state-political development of different countries of the world and continues to exist today.

Currently, there is no unanimity among modern researchers regarding the essence of sovereignty and its role in political practice. In literature, a wide range of concepts are used – personal sovereignty, economic sovereignty, ethnic, popular, parliamentary, territorial, distributed sovereignty, etc. In our opinion, these terms characterize only different aspects of sovereignty, defining its internal content. In legal literature, only the existence of state sovereignty, the sovereignty of the nation or people is recognized, and legal significance is given only to state sovereignty.

The concept of state sovereignty is inextricably linked with democracy, legal social statehood. Under the conditions of affirming the principle of the rule of law, based on ideals of justice, real protection of human rights, when one's freedom is a condition for everyone's freedom, popular rule is possible. The current stage of human development makes it impossible for direct exercise of power by the people, which necessitates its delegation to the state. In a democratic society, the state transforms into a representative form of expression and organization of the will and interests of the people.

In modern democratic society, people use various channels to exercise power through tools of direct democracy – elections, referendums, recall of deputies, spontaneous mass protests. In everyday life, the power of the people, on behalf of the people, is primarily realized as state power, through state bodies, local self-government bodies, directly through elections or indirectly through other bodies created by the people [3, p. 309].

The adoption and recognition of a specific power structure is one of the aspects of internal sovereignty. Internal sovereignty is a political-legal property of state power, which means its supremacy and completeness within the country and the monopoly right to legislate and govern. Internal sovereignty represents a special type of power relations in the state, internal powers of state structures and their ability to effectively influence the population. The key component of internal sovereignty is the legitimacy of power.

The signs of internal sovereignty are [1]:

1. Supremacy – there can be no other powers competing with the state within its territory; only the state can make its commands obligatory for all.

2. Independence – any illegal interference by other subjects of the political system in the state's activities is prohibited; the state has enough resources to perform its tasks and functions.

3. Completeness – state power extends to all spheres of social life without exception; the state has the right to decide on any matters of public interest, without exception.

4. Indivisibility – state power is integral, unified; only powers are distributed among state bodies and branches of power for more effective resolution of social issues.

The concept of popular sovereignty, which reflects the balance between absolute state power and civil society, is substantively included in the composition of internal sovereignty. The form of resolving this balance has become the recognition of the right of the entire population of the state to be the sole source of state power. In such a case, state sovereignty can be considered as derived from popular sovereignty. Both concepts are interrelated, as it is impossible for a nation to fully realize sovereignty without a state.

At the same time, a state that does not recognize in one way or another the sovereignty of its people, but not a certain social group or class, cannot prosper. All this somehow stemmed from the basic political and legal principles of classical liberalism: separation of an individual from society and the state, demarcation between the state and civil society, respect for minority rights, rule based on laws and minimal state intervention in the economy. The people are not exclusively an appointing body, whose function and right are exhausted by appointing deputies. On the contrary, electing deputies creates a strong legal link between them and their representatives – a normal political dependence of deputies on their voters.

The correspondence of legislative will of parliament to interests and needs of people is maintained by periodic renewal of parliament composition. The more democratic the state, the shorter the legislature. The constitution is a means of restraining parliament, in particular by recognizing the head of state's right to dissolve parliament prematurely.

The idea of popular sovereignty, which has been known to mankind since ancient times, gained its conceptual form in the second half of the XVIII – first half of the XIX century. For the first time, this idea appeared as a comprehensive theory in the work of J.-J. Rousseau "The Social Contract". The essence of it was that the inalienable natural right to power belongs to the people, who directly implement it on the basis of the common will of the majority. The key idea of J.-J. Rousseau's concept lies in interpreting popular sovereignty as the primary bearer of power. The doctrine of popular sovereignty is based on specific forms of organization and functioning of power

and issues of comparison between direct and representative democracy [1].

The main form of realization of popular sovereignty is self-government in a democratic society, that is, the representation of the interests of the people before the authorities and control over them. The essence of popular sovereignty as a fundamental principle of a democratic legal state is manifested through conscious collective will by expressing the interests and needs of each of its participants.

Thus, the analysis of the concept of state sovereignty demonstrates its evolution from the absolute power of the monarch, which was fundamental in the works of J. Bodin and T. Hobbes, to the concept of popular sovereignty, which was formed under the influence of democratic ideas of the XVIII–XIX centuries.

In modern understanding, state sovereignty is a combination of supremacy, independence, completeness and indivisibility of power within a certain territory. It provides the state with a monopoly right to pass laws, manage social processes and protect its independence. At the same time, internal state sovereignty cannot be considered separately from popular sovereignty, which identifies the people as the only source of power.

Thus, state sovereignty is derived from popular sovereignty, since the legitimacy of state power depends on its recognition and support by citizens. Popular sovereignty, in turn, is realized through mechanisms of democratic governance, including elections, referendums, representative institutions and civic activity. It is embodied both in direct and representative form, which allows combining direct expression of citizens' will with effective functioning of the state apparatus.

A key aspect of popular sovereignty is its connection with democratic legitimacy of power: the more citizens are involved in governance processes, the higher is the legitimacy of the state. Thus, modern states are forced to balance between centralized exercise of power and decentralization processes that give citizens more opportunities to influence government decisions. This confirms that effective functioning of state sovereignty is possible only if it is inseparably linked with popular sovereignty as a fundamental principle of democratic governance.

2. Decentralization as a context of modernity.

The process of implementing the principle of popular sovereignty in conditions of democratic transformation may face speculations from the authorities. This, in turn, carries the threat of political corruption, discrediting democratic values and delegitimizing power. After all, abuse of the principle of popular sovereignty is contrary to fundamental human rights and democracy. Popular sovereignty can receive the fullest realization in conditions of decentralization of power. The theory of participa-

tory democracy considers decentralization as a tool for strengthening political participation of citizens at the local level. Creating an effective mechanism for accountability of local self-government bodies to voters and the state and a mechanism for real influence of citizens on actions and decisions of local authorities is a guarantee of irreversibility of decentralization.

Decentralization is one of the forms of democracy development, which allows, while preserving the unity of the state and its institutions, to expand local self-government, activate the population to meet their own needs and interests, narrow the sphere of state influence on society, replacing this influence with mechanisms of self-regulation, self-government, and democracy [21, p. 23].

Decentralization of power is considered in the state-legal aspect as a model of organization and process of power functioning at the national, sub-regional and basic levels and is objectified through the implementation of the principle of popular sovereignty. In a broad sense, decentralization is often defined as a regrouping of competence volumes and redistribution of power among local and central levels of public authority with a focus on the local level in terms of implementing predefined and guaranteed functions of the state [8].

Decentralization is also described as a mechanism for territorial organization of power, where state bodies delegate decision-making rights on certain issues or in a certain field to local or regional structures that are not elements of the executive power system and are relatively independent from it [8, p. 88].

French researchers have several definitions of decentralization. For example, J.-B. Albertini considers it a policy aimed at establishing such relations between central services and their territorial structural units characterized by delegation on the territory of significant powers [25]. As a mechanism for territorial organization of power, where the state delegates decision-making rights on certain issues or in a specific field to local or regional structures that are not part of the executive power system and are relatively independent from this system [23]. As a simple, integral management system in which non-central (elective) bodies have the right to make decisions on matters considered local without subordination in their relations with central authority [27]. G. Breban points to decentralization as a method of transferring powers, which is implemented from one legal entity to another, from the state to a collective at the local level or a public institution [27].

German researchers J. von Braun and U. Grote see decentralization as a way of delegating powers and responsibility for common functions from the central government to local self-government [26]. Germany is one of the countries with positive experience

in implementing decentralization. Decentralization is a path that allows civil society to participate in the political process and thus increase transparency and predictability of decision-making. Local self-government bodies are usually more informed about the needs and preferences of the local population and respond more sensitively to them than central governments [29, p. 44].

Decentralization is a form of organization of power, thanks to which the authorities in their activities in the field of direct contacts with citizens use the principle of subsidiarity, which, among other things, involves the redistribution of power load from the central level of state administration to the local one [11]. J. Litvak, a World Bank expert, presents decentralization in a broader sense – as a means of delegating powers and responsibilities for public functions to quasi-independent state institutions and/or private (public) sector from the central government.

Thus, decentralization is the transfer of power and responsibility for state functions from the central government to subordinates. These executive bodies are usually heterogeneous and complex objects that may include central, provincial and local layers. Centralization and decentralization are modes of governance, i.e., ways of exercising control and decision-making in government. Decentralization involves changing the subordination of various powers and responsibilities for decision-making among government departments [30].

According to T. Falleti, a scholar from the University of Pennsylvania, decentralization is as a process and complex of political strategies within electoral system reform or constitutional reform, during which delegation of responsibility, power and resources from higher levels of power hierarchy to lower levels occurs. The policy defined by such definitions aimed at achieving decentralization does not include the transfer of powers or resources to non-state actors, it does not imply privatization [28, p. 34].

Nobuko Kawashima, a Japanese management researcher, highlighting cultural, financial and political elements in decentralization, outlines it as an art of governance in which increasing resources of territorial units occurs without limiting ownership of central resources [1].

In the works of American scholar N. Rosenblum, who emphasizes decentralization as strengthening power structural units that are not related to central power; organization of effective management process both local authorities and intermediate level authorities; an effective way of checks and balances within the power itself; a means of stimulating citizens and non-governmental organizations to govern; platforms for the development of democratic practices and skills, we can find the

broadest view on decentralization among foreign authors [19].

In domestic scientific literature, decentralization is mostly interpreted as a mechanism of territorial organization of power, under which the state delegates the right to make decisions on outlined issues or in a certain field to local or regional structures that do not belong to the system of executive power and are relatively independent from it.

Decentralization is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon in a socio-legal, democratic state, which involves the delegation of a certain scope of powers by central state authorities to management subjects at a lower level, who possess the necessary rights, duties, and resources. The ability to approve effective management decisions at the state, regional, and local levels serves as the ultimate goal of such a redistribution of powers. Thus, decentralization can be understood as a mechanism for defining and distributing operations, tasks, and functions, most of which are delegated from the central level to the lower level and become the task and authority of bodies at the lower level. The volume of administrative types of activities is entrusted to local bodies or other subjects defined by the state.

Therefore, governance at the local level and regarding local affairs can take place in two ways: by "top-down" appointed heads of the state apparatus who act "on the ground" (officials of state authorities), as well as within decentralized governance systems that determine the functioning of local self-government and other authorized subjects by the state. Depending on the forms of state structure, administrative decentralization (which is inherent in unitary states) and political (typical mainly for federations) are distinguished. Hence – under a unitary state, decentralization is a way of redistributing functions and powers between central and local state authorities mainly at the executive power level (however, decentralization of certain powers to implement legislative functions will not be an exception), while under a federal state, decentralization reflects the mechanism for redistributing functions and powers to exercise state power first between certain federal bodies and federation subjects in legislative, executive, and judicial power, and later between bodies of federation subjects and local public administration bodies.

Decentralization from the point of view of its use as one of the tools for optimizing the functioning of political-power relations has long been in the circle of interests of Ukrainian experts and scientists. This is mainly due to, not least, the successful implementation of reform in the practice of a significant number of European states. For our state, which is only on the path of reforming the political system, it is extremely relevant to gain

experience from the best examples of implementing the achievements of decentralization reform in European countries. As evidenced by the analysis of the introduction of similar processes in European Union countries, decentralization of power is often associated with certain socio-political trends in society's development, namely – the development of civil society, strengthening democracy, strengthening internal sovereignty.

The most common and fundamental tendencies of this phenomenon are the democratization of internal political relations in the state, the increase of its responsibility proportionally to the increase of its functions and competences [13, p. 17]. Decentralization is recognized as one of the fundamental rules of democracy development in European countries, a basic principle of their regional policy. Along with such principles as concentration, subsidiarity, complementarity, partnership, program approach, a significant place is devoted to decentralization, namely the distribution of powers at the regional level, for optimal use of internal potential resources, stimulation of regional initiative and division of tasks and powers of different levels of government institutions [12].

Currently, there are no universal models, technologies or methodologies in world practice that could be fully and without adaptation applied in our state. At different stages of development, various historical factors of development prompted the formation of several types of models for local self-government organization, the distinctive features of which are forms of interaction between local self-government bodies and state authorities. In order to optimize the implementation of decentralization in practical terms, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of this concept and practical conditions for implementing processes of decentralization of power relations and management sphere, their specifics, boundaries, shortcomings and strengths.

Overall, the implementation of decentralization reform in many world states is accompanied by positive and at the same time negative political consequences. French and Polish well-developed reform programs had a generally positive effect – democratization of society took place by involving the population in decision-making procedures, activation of political processes, improvement in the quality of administrative services provision, rationalization in budget resources allocation, supported initiatives aimed at local and regional development, increased public trust in government bodies and loyalty.

The study of French decentralization practice indicates that after the adoption of the law in 1982, the regional development plan was transformed into contractual agreements for several years on one hand – from the state and on the other – regional administration. This method served as a tool for

optimizing the distribution of competence and responsibility for regional planning among various state authorities in relation to strengthening the importance of the regional level as strategic partners, changing subordination relations to cooperation and partnership [15, p. 81].

Administrative decentralization in Poland supported the development of local self-government, contributed to improving the quality of life of the population, and later, as a result of Poland's accession to the EU, made it possible for newly formed administrative-territorial units to act as equivalent partners in international cooperation [6].

In order to promote decentralization reforms, the capabilities of local communities and population participation in planning, when assessing development indicators in certain states, institutions of regional development have been established – fundamental factors of national policy. According to many experts, the decentralization processes of Central and Eastern European countries, in addition to trends of increasing the importance of the non-profit sector in providing administrative services, are characterized by the progressive establishment of a system of state aid and financing from the provision of administrative services, regardless of which sector they are provided by; introduction of market mechanisms at the level of consumption of territorial formations [9].

The formation of a balanced, effective and functional system of government bodies capable of bringing the government and the population closer together, helping to optimally satisfy their requests is one of the significant problems that is currently most relevant in the majority of world states. The result of such a system, analyzing practical experience, is the introduction of an alternative system for providing quality administrative services to citizens within the decentralization of power, increasing the significance of the role of municipal bodies in European countries.

Decentralization as a process of redistributing powers from central government to local authorities is an important trend in the development of modern democratic states. It provides more effective governance, promotes active citizen participation in decision-making and creates conditions for regional development. The theory of participatory democracy emphasizes that decentralization strengthens popular sovereignty, as it allows citizens to control the activities of local self-government bodies, influence decisions and shape the political agenda. Successful examples of decentralization, such as in France and Poland, demonstrate that expanding the autonomy of local communities can contribute to economic growth, increase efficiency in using budget resources and strengthen democratic institutions.

At the same time, decentralization carries certain risks, including the threat of weakening internal state sovereignty if the redistribution process takes place without proper control and checks and balances mechanisms. Decentralization can also become an environment for localized corruption practices. Without proper state oversight and accountability mechanisms, local authorities may use their expanded powers for personal gain or to reinforce oligarchic influence at the regional level. As the experience of some states has shown, decentralization without effective anti-corruption control can lead to a situation where corruption simply shifts from the central to the local level instead of being eradicated. Thus, in the process of decentralization, it is essential to incorporate effective anti-corruption mechanisms, such as transparency in budgetary processes, public oversight, independent audits of local authorities, and the implementation of digital technologies in public administration. Only under these conditions can decentralization fulfill its democratic function, strengthening popular sovereignty and enhancing the internal sovereignty of the state as a whole.

This is especially true for countries with unstable political systems or ethnically heterogeneous populations, where decentralization can be used as a tool for regional separatism. The success of this reform depends on a balanced policy that takes into account both the need to expand local self-government and the need to preserve the unity of the state. Thus, decentralization should be seen as part of a comprehensive reform of public administration, which ensures effective interaction between central government and local communities, strengthens democratic mechanisms and promotes social stability.

Conclusions. State sovereignty and its internal dimension remain the main principles of power organization in democratic states, but their practical application changes according to political and social transformations. The internal sovereignty of the state is closely linked to popular sovereignty, which implies the supremacy of the people's will in the political process. However, in the modern world, the realization of popular sovereignty requires not only formal recognition of the supremacy of the people, but also the creation of effective mechanisms for their participation in state governance.

In this context, decentralization appears as one of the key tools for ensuring democratic participation of citizens in decision-making. It allows to increase the responsibility of local authorities, enhance transparency of administrative processes and involve citizens in solving important social issues. At the same time, the success of implementing the principle of popular sovereignty and decentralization reforms depends on the state's ability to balance between transferring powers and preserving unity of state governance.

Excessive decentralization without proper control mechanisms can lead to weakening state power and increasing regional fragmentation.

Therefore, decentralization processes should be carried out within a single state policy that takes into account the peculiarities of the political system, level of civic activity and threats to national security. In such an approach, the realization of state and popular sovereignty complement each other, creating a stable basis for effective management and development of democracy.

Bibliography

1. Бабарикіна Н.А. Розділ 2. Внутрішній суверенітет як принцип організації влади в державі. Державний суверенітет в умовах глобалізації: теорія та практика : монографія / Н. А. Бабарикіна, Н. В. Горло, М. Ф. Заболотна, О. М. Кіндратець, Т. І. Сергієнко; за заг. ред. О. М. Кіндратець. Запоріжжя : Запорізький національний університет, 2022. 226 с. С. 71–105. URL: <https://dspace.znu.edu.ua/jspui/bitstream/12345/11735/1/0051974.pdf>
2. Бевз Т.А. Суверенітет як невід’ємна ознака держави у документах і практиці українського державотворення. *Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України*. 2013. Вип. 3. С. 190–212. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nzipiend_2013_3_11
3. Богів Я. С. Народний суверенітет та проблеми його реалізації в умовах демократичної трансформації в Україні: теоретико-правовий аспект. *Вісник Національного університету «Львівська політехніка»*. Сер.: *Юридичні науки*. 2017. № 876. С. 304–312
4. Богів Я.С. До питання про сутність суверенітету: теоретико-правовий аспект. *Часопис Національного університету «Острозька академія»*. Серія «Право». 2018. №2(18). URL: <http://lj.oa.edu.ua/articles/2018/n2/18bystpa.pdf>
5. Боден, Жан. Філософський енциклопедичний словник / В. І. Шинкарук (гол. редкол.) та ін. Київ: Інститут філософії імені Григорія Сковороди НАН України. 2002. 742 с.
6. Бориславська О., Заверуха І., Захарченко Е., та ін. Децентралізація публічної влади: досвід європейських країн та перспективи України. Швейцарсько-український проект «Підтримка децентралізації в Україні-DESPRO. К.: ТОВ «Софія». 2012. 128 с.
7. Воронинський В.В. Вплив гібридної війни на формування державного інформаційного суверенітету України. *Держава і право. Юридичні і політичні науки*. 2024. Вип. 95. С. 266–279. URL: <http://jnas.nbuv.gov.ua/article/UJRN-0001505224>
8. Гапотій В. Д. Вплив глобалізаційних процесів на теорію та практику державного суверенітету. *Вісник Національного університету внутрішніх справ*. 2004. №27. 243–250
9. Головатий М. Ф. Демократія: історія, теорія, практика: навч. посіб. для студ. вищ. навч. закл. та асп.-політ. Київ: Вид. дім «Персонал». 2011. 230 с.
10. Горло Н. Вплив регіоналізму на державний суверенітет. *Вісник Львівського університету*. Серія *філос.-політолог. студії*. 2022. Вип. 44. С. 171–178. URL: <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2022.44.20>
11. Гройсман В. Місце та роль децентралізації влади у процесах становлення громадянського суспільства. *Демократичне врядування*. 2015. № 15. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/DeVr_2015_15_22
12. Загородиш Ю. Дослідження громадянського суспільства: модель нормативних досягнень. *Політичний менеджмент*. 2004. №3. С. 10–19.
13. Колодій А. Транзитологічна парадигма суспільних змін в світлі Помаранчевої революції. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»*. Серія: *Політичні науки*. «Демократичний транзит в Україні: підсумки електорального циклу 2004–2007 рр.». 2008. №3. С. 7–24.
14. Кузнецова З.В. Співвідношення внутрішнього та зовнішнього суверенітету держави. Політико-правова доктрина державного суверенітету в умовах глобалізації: міжнар. наук.-практ. конф., присвяч. 100-річчю з дня народж. Л. М. Стрельцова, 26 жовт. 2018 р. / М-во освіти і науки України, Нац. ун-т «Одес. юрид. акад.», Півден. регіон. центр Нац. акад. прав. наук України. Одеса : Вид. дім «Гельветика», 2018. С. 156–160.
15. Лелеченко А. П., Васильєва О. І., Куйбіда В. С., Ткачук А. Ф. Місцеве самоврядування в умовах децентралізації повноважень: навч. посіб. К.: ТОВ «Софія». 2017. 110 с.
16. Машура Х.А. Проблеми просторового впливу інтеграційних процесів та еволюція державного суверенітету. *Гілея: науковий вісник*. 2014. Вип. 83. С. 370–374. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/gileya_2014_83_99
17. Мельник Н.Т. Проблема державного суверенітету в умовах глобалізаційних процесів. *Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України*. 2012. Вип. 3. С. 295–307. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nzipiend_2012_3_15
18. Пархоменко Н.М. Суверенітет держави: соціально-політична сутність та юридичний зміст. *Науковий часопис НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 18 : Економіка і право*. 2011. Вип. 14. С. 113–124. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nchnpu_018_2011_14_20
19. Розенблум Н. Громадянські суспільства: лібералізм і моральні впливи плюралізму. *Незалежний культурологічний часопис*. 2001. URL: <http://www.ji.lviv.ua/n21texts/rosenblum.htm>
20. Семчишин С.І. Постмодерністське прочитання суверенітету в теорії міжнародних відносин. *Гілея: науковий вісник*. 2014. Вип. 90. С. 251–256. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/gileya_2014_90_63
21. Скрипнюк О. Децентралізація влади як чинник забезпечення стабільності конституційного ладу: теорія й практика. *Віче: громадсько-політичний і теоретичний журнал*. 2015. № 12. С. 22–24.
22. Скрипнюк О.В., Крусян А.Р. Концепт «державний суверенітет» у класичних західних теоріях. *Альманах права*. 2021. Вип. 12. С. 11–19. URL: https://ccu.gov.ua/sites/default/files/library/skrypnyuk_o_krusyan_a_kocept_derzhavnyy_suverenitet.pdf
23. Турне Б. Державне управління / Пер. з фр. В. Шовкуна. К.: Основи. 1993. 165 с.
24. Хижняк І.А. Держава всупереч: імперативи забезпечення її суверенітету – двадцять років потому

Української Незалежності. *Гілея: науковий вісник*. 2013. №78. С. 357–360. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/gileya_2013_78_109

25. Albertini J.-B. La deconcentration: l'administration territoriale dans la reforme de l'Etat. Paris: Economica. 1997. 238 p.

26. Braun von J. Does decentralization serve the poor? 2002. URL: www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/seminar/2000/fiscal/vonbraun.pdf.

27. Endo K. The Principle of Subsidiarity: From Johannes Althusius to Jacques Delors. 2000. URL: [http://eprints.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2115/15558/1/44\(6\)_p652-553.pdf](http://eprints.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2115/15558/1/44(6)_p652-553.pdf)

28. Failed T. G. Decentralization and Subnational Politics in Latin America. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2010. 285 p.

29. Levick B. Claudius. Psychology Press. 2012. 143 p.

30. Litvack J. What is Decentralization? URL: www.ciesin.org/decentralization/English/General/Differentforms.html

Summary

Babarykina N. A. The impact of the decentralization process on the internal sovereignty of the state. – Article.

The article is dedicated to the study of internal sovereignty as a key principle of power organization in the modern state, particularly in the context of decentralization processes. The author examines the evolution of sovereignty from its classical understanding as absolute state power to the concept of popular sovereignty, which emphasizes the legitimacy of power through the will of the people. Special attention is given to the challenges posed by globalization, democratic transformation, and information security, which influence the realization of internal sovereignty. The study highlights decentralization as an essential mechanism for implementing popular sovereignty by transferring power from the central government to local authorities. The author analyzes successful cases of decentralization in France and Poland, demonstrating its positive effects on governance efficiency, public trust, and regional development. However, the article also underscores the risks associated with excessive decentralization, particularly in politically unstable or ethnically diverse states, where it may weaken state control or fuel separatist tendencies. The author concludes that maintaining a balance between centralized authority and decentralized governance is critical for ensuring both effective administration and national unity. Properly implemented decentralization strengthens democracy, enhances citizen participation, and fosters social stability, making it an integral part of modern state-building strategies.

Key words: internal sovereignty, popular sovereignty, information sovereignty, territorial integrity, good governance, anticorruption, state.

Анотація

Бабарикіна Н. А. Вплив процесу децентралізації на внутрішній суверенітет держави. – Стаття.

Стаття присвячена дослідженню внутрішнього суверенітету як ключового принципу організації

влади в умовах децентралізації. Авторка аналізує еволюцію поняття суверенітету, починаючи від класичних теорій Ж. Бодена та Т. Гоббса, які розглядали його як абсолютну владу монарха, до концепції народного суверенітету, що визначає народ як єдине джерело влади. Особливу увагу приділено взаємозв'язку між внутрішнім суверенітетом та демократичними процесами, які змінюють традиційні уявлення про механізми управління державою. У статті розглядається децентралізація як процес перерозподілу владних повноважень між центральним та місцевим рівнями, що сприяє підвищенню ефективності управління та забезпеченню участі громадян у прийнятті рішень. Досліджуються різні підходи до децентралізації, які пропонують західні та вітчизняні науковці, наголошуючи на її потенційних перевагах для зміцнення народного суверенітету та розвитку місцевого самоврядування. Авторка аналізує історичні приклади Франції та Польщі, які впровадили успішні децентралізаційні реформи, що дозволили посилити підзвітність влади та ефективність використання бюджетних ресурсів. У цих країнах децентралізація не лише покращила якість адміністративних послуг, а й сприяла розвитку громадянського суспільства та демократичного врядування. Разом із тим у статті наголошується на ризиках децентралізації, серед яких можливе ослаблення внутрішнього суверенітету держави у разі недостатнього контролю з боку центральної влади. У країнах з етнічно неоднорідним населенням або слабкими інституціями децентралізація може використовуватися як механізм регіонального сепаратизму, що створює загрозу територіальній цілісності держави. Авторка підкреслює, що без належного контролю передача владних повноважень на місцевий рівень може сприяти поширенню корупційних схем. Запобігти цьому можна завдяки прозорості бюджетних процесів, громадському контролю та впровадженню механізмів незалежного аудиту місцевої влади. Також у статті аналізується вплив децентралізації на демократичні процеси, зокрема на залучення громадян до управління. Децентралізація розглядається як спосіб підвищення політичної активності населення та формування ефективних механізмів громадської участі. Авторка наголошує, що баланс між централізацією та децентралізацією є критичним для збереження стабільності та функціональності державного управління. Підсумовуючи, авторка доводить, що внутрішній суверенітет є динамічним поняттям, яке змінюється під впливом політичних, соціальних та економічних факторів. Збереження внутрішнього суверенітету можливе лише за умови ефективної взаємодії між центральною владою та місцевими громадами, а також створення дієвих механізмів контролю, які запобігатимуть зловживанням владою. У статті робиться висновок, що децентралізація може бути ефективним інструментом розвитку демократії та зміцнення державного управління, але потребує ретельного планування, врахування потенційних ризиків та запровадження механізмів протидії корупції та сепаратизму.

Ключові слова: внутрішній суверенітет, народний суверенітет, інформаційний суверенітет, територіальна цілісність, належне врядування, протидія корупції, держава.