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ABSTRACT

Objective: The article explores issues surrounding the definition of legal world order and security in the post-Cold War era, examining the expanding concept of security within the context of globalization. It aims to analyze theoretical approaches to international security and its development in a changing global landscape.

Methods: The study employs a combination of dialectical and hermeneutic principles for analyzing the subject matter. It uses systemic-structural and functional methods to investigate the role of international organizations in global security. Various research methods, such as analogy, historicism, formal-logical analysis, and situational analysis, are applied to examine the issues under consideration.

Results: The article highlights several key findings, including the diminishing authority of the United Nations (UN) as a universal international organization in the present global context. It emphasizes the need for the international community to address the geopolitical changes and challenges of the 21st century. The current state of world politics is characterized by perpetual global instability, and existing peacekeeping and peacemaking mechanisms have shown limitations in addressing modern hybrid challenges and threats.

Conclusions: In conclusion, the article argues that the existing system for managing international relations is insufficient for the 21st century. It underscores the importance of streamlining relations between sovereign states, modernizing multilateral institutions, and establishing an effective oversight body to strengthen the global security system. The study advocates for the development of new international legal norms, including various aspects of international cooperation and the enhancement of international institutional structures to combat emerging global challenges. The future of humanity depends on the timely and effective implementation of these measures.
A INFLUÊNCIA E EFICÁCIA DAS ATIVIDADES DAS ORGANIZAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS NA FORMAÇÃO, DISPOSIÇÃO E FORTALECIMENTO DA ORDEM JURÍDICA MUNDIAL

RESUMO

Objetivo: O artigo explora questões relacionadas à definição de ordem mundial jurídica e segurança na era pós-Guerra Fria, examinando a expansão do conceito de segurança no contexto da globalização. Tem como objetivo analisar abordagens teóricas à segurança internacional e ao seu desenvolvimento num cenário global em mudança.

Métodos: O estudo emprega uma combinação de princípios dialéticos e hermenêuticos para análise do assunto. Utiliza métodos sistêmico-estruturais e funcionais para investigar o papel das organizações internacionais na segurança global. Vários métodos de pesquisa, como analogia, historicismo, análise lógico-formal e análise situacional, são aplicados para examinar as questões em consideração.

Resultados: O artigo destaca várias conclusões importantes, incluindo a diminuição da autoridade das Nações Unidas (ONU) como organização internacional universal no atual contexto global. Enfatiza a necessidade de a comunidade internacional enfrentar as mudanças e desafios geopolíticos do século XXI. O estado actual da política mundial é caracterizado por uma instabilidade global perpétua, e os mecanismos existentes de manutenção e de pacificação têm mostrado limitações na abordagem aos desafios e ameaças híbridos modernos.

Conclusões: Em conclusão, o artigo argumenta que o sistema existente de gestão das relações internacionais é insuficiente para o século XXI. Sublinha a importância de racionalizar as relações entre Estados soberanos, modernizar as instituições multilaterais e estabelecer um órgão de supervisão eficaz para fortalecer o sistema de segurança global. O estudo defende o desenvolvimento de novas normas jurídicas internacionais, incluindo vários aspectos da cooperação internacional e o reforço das estruturas institucionais internacionais para combater os desafios globais emergentes. O futuro da humanidade depende da implementação atempada e eficaz destas medidas.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Problems of the international organizations’ role in maintaining international peace and security are invariably the focus of the attention of scientists. In recent years, various studies have analyzed many issues related to the functioning of international organizations, including the normative foundations of world order (UN and other international organizations); UN reform and its impact on the modern system of international relations; the problem of discrepancies in understanding the essence of the
UN efforts in the field of maintaining international peace and security; contradictions of the collective security model, and several others (Bayeh, 2014; Sarooshi, 2007). Since the creation of the United Nations in 1945, the goals of maintaining international peace and security by preventing conflicts and assisting parties to conflict in reconciliation have always been and are fundamental to its activities. The main forms and areas of UN activity in maintaining peace and security are preventive diplomacy and mediation; peacekeeping activities; peacebuilding; the fight against terrorism; and disarmament.

The primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security lies with the UN Security Council (SC). It also plays a leading role in determining the presence of a threat to peace or an act of aggression. On behalf of the Security Council, pleas are made to the disputing parties to settle amicably, and proposals on ways or conditions for resolution are made. The Security Council has the authority to use coercive measures to maintain or restore international peace and security under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Economic sanctions to international military action are examples of such actions. The UN Security Council also creates UN peacekeeping operations and special political missions. Even though the international community, through UN mechanisms, requires states to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic "cleansing," and crimes against humanity, states' responsibility in this area frequently comes down to a political rather than a legal decision.

In the last decades, UN peacekeeping failures in Bosnia, Somalia, Iraq, and elsewhere ushered in an era of ethnic, religious, and communal conflicts with failed states on every continent. Despite the international cooperation witnessed after 9-11, there is still no standing international peacekeeping force that can be deployed in response to threats, including terrorism, or facilitate a post-war transition to democratic governance.

Almost 30 years later, the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated instability around the globe. Witness the West’s dismal failure to achieve democratic transitions in Afghanistan and Iraq, Russia’s reckless irredentist wars in Europe, and China’s large-scale violations of minority rights. Most scholars predict that we are heading into an extended period of instability and that World War III may create a new system led by another country or civilization.

The war in Ukraine, unleashed by the Russian Federation, surpassing the Second World War in its cruelty and lasting already for more than six months, has shown the failure of the existing mechanisms of peacekeeping and peacemaking. The UN in this
military conflict takes the position of an outside observer and commentator, having no effective mechanisms for positive intervention. Possible peacekeeping operations (missions) are constrained by the fact of the inevitable resonant politicization of the peacekeeping operation in this conflict and the imbalance of interests of key UN participants, as well as economic (mainly energy) factors. Thus, the peacekeeping and peacemaking system turned out to be “cardboard”, not ready for real and hybrid challenges and threats. The world is once again on the brink of nuclear war. The current state of the world as a whole can be characterized as a situation of permanent global instability, which is recognized by many researchers. The ontological nature of this state of the global world order seems to be largely obvious - it is, first of all, a conflict of interests of states (especially the leading ones), striving to take a priority position and dictate their policy (power will) to other participants in the global space, due to which the world system turned out to be plunged into a situation of permanent turbulence.

Many have long believed that the provisions contained in the United Nations Charter are all-flexible, representing our best hope for the development of collective approaches to the maintenance of world order (Lopez-Claros et al., 2020). The Charter has proved to be less than fully inclusive: the collective security system enacted by the U.N. Charter framers has been forced to evolve through the creation of informal peacekeeping measures and a third-party “halfway house” between enforcement mediation.

Subsequently, some have observed that this newly-invented inter-positional arbitration along with the sanctions instruments contained in the Charter together provide the most effective tools for collective internationalism (Patrick et al., 2023). However, it will be seen that because of the emergence of new security dilemmas in the post-Cold War era, this assumed effectiveness must be questioned.

In general, the transformation process after the Cold War was intended to provide guarantees against the restoration of the old system, and not only the options for returning to the old ideology were considered undesirable, but also the restoration of a powerful state that could significantly influence geopolitical processes in their economic, trade and financial, military, scientific, technical, and other dimensions. Nevertheless, the restoration of a powerful state - Russia - happened, and it took place, as it were, unnoticed by the world community - just like the restoration of Hitler's “great Germany” happened, with quite similar consequences. However, the international environment in the 2000s...
was fundamentally different from the 1930s, which raises a logical question: how did the supra-governmental organizations, called upon to be the guarantors of peace, lose sight of the process of the formation of the terrorist state of Russia? The answer to this question, as well as to several other important issues of the modern security landscape (China-Taiwan relations, the Iranian nuclear program, etc.), requires a systematic approach to the analysis of the retrospective, current, and prospective state of the processes of peacekeeping and peacemaking, and the role of UN and other actors.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Issues related to ensuring international security acquired particular importance and urgency at the turn of the 90s of the 20th century due to the collapse of the bipolar system of international relations based on the policy of the balance of power in ensuring international peace and the formation of a new world order. Namely during this period, a “broad” approach to the definition of international security and the policy for its implementation became a priority, implying balanced attention to various dimensions of international security - military, economic, political, informational, environmental, personal, and social. This approach to ensuring international security today can become an effective basis for the functioning of international political institutions in the field of security: the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the European Union and the North Atlantic Alliance. However, the implementation of a broad approach to security requires a full-scale reform of the main international political institutions, which are a legacy of the Cold War and, in this regard, retain, to a greater or lesser extent, traditional structures and approaches to the implementation of security policy.

In the field of international peace and security today, there are many agencies of the UN system, as well as regional international organizations, non-governmental institutions and civil initiatives. As researchers note, international law in the conflict and security area today has gone far beyond jus ad bellum and jus in bello (Peters, 2016). As the UN Security Council gradually expands the list of “threats to international peace and security,” the problem of developing interaction between international governmental and non-governmental organizations to strengthen international peace is becoming more urgent.
Among the institutions involved in the agenda of strengthening international peace and security, experts name primarily regional, universal specialized institutions, and non-governmental non-profit organizations (Clark, 2005). Among the international organizations, the powers to maintain peace and security are vested in: the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), the Association of East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), etc.

Issues of international peace and security are integrated into the mandate of universal specialized organizations (both included in the UN system and independent), such as UNESCO, UNICEF, WHO, UNDP, Interpol, etc. A special role and function in matters of maintaining international peace and security are performed by international courts - the International Criminal Court (ICC), as well as the so-called “hybrid” tribunals, created ad hoc or as part of reconciliation processes, including post-conflict justice mechanisms, etc.

Ukrainian scientists also dealt with issues of security, application of the "FIVE-HELIX" model in business development in Industry 4.0 countries (Megits et al., 2022), financial – economic security of financial markets during European integration (Novak et al., 2022), and the impact of digital platforms on transformation strategic consulting in public administration (Klochan et al., 2021). The experience of state administration in the field of security was considered (Akimov et al., 2020), the legal regulation of temporary protection in the European Union in the context of an aggressive war against Ukraine (Kortukova et al., 2023), ensuring the maturity of the public administration project (Bondarenko et al., 2021), and professional burnout of employees of the public administration system (Kryshtanovych et al., 2022).

Thus, it can be stated that the role of international organizations in maintaining peace and security today is multifaceted and diverse; international cooperation and coordination of efforts of international organizations are developing to strengthen peace and security. At the same time, their activities in many respects remain insufficiently effective, which is currently an objective circumstance reflecting the turn of states towards the ideas of their sovereignty.

The Soviet Union and the world socialist system collapse brought an end to more than four decades of a global order in which the world was divided into spheres of
influence between two poles of power. The balance of political forces achieved during this period did not allow one state to dominate the international system.

The strategy of mutual deterrence, aggravated by nuclear deterrence, made the world, in a certain sense, predictable and stable. The implementation of such a policy required enormous resources diverted from solving other important problems. Moreover, the forceful military bipolarity of this model of the international world order, as it turned out, not only did not exclude the dispersion of global power but even provoked it. Smaller states faced a dilemma: on the one hand, the desire for sovereignty, a tendency to escape the tutelage of the superpowers, and on the other, a forced desire to have these superpowers’ guarantees of protection from military threats.

According to political experts in the fields of geopolitics and international studies, the central problem of international relations is the problem of order – its constituting, destroying, and restoring (Scharf and Williams, 2013). In the context of this article, we will choose the approach that considers the concept of "world order" as the state of the system of international relations, appropriately programmed for its security, stability, and development, and regulated based on criteria that meet the current needs, (red-stars.org) first and foremost, of the most influential actors in this global community (Lopez-Claros et al., 2020).

In today's post-bipolar realities, although the United States today still retains most of the instruments of global power - economic, financial, technological, and military leadership -, its role in the modern architecture of international relations has begun to change in the last decade. The response to the policy of expansion and unipolarity pursued by the United States is the search for a new architecture of the world order. Considering the rapid economic growth of China, the strengthening of the national power of India, the return of Russia to the number of active and aggressive international actors, as well as the emergence of such new players as Brazil and Iran, the need to develop the rules of a new world order that eliminates the imbalance of power, is becoming increasingly relevant for world politics.

It can be assumed that the process of forming a new world order will take quite a long time and will be accompanied by significant risks for humanity. The guarantee that this period will not become a period of chaos and anarchy in the system of international relations must be targeted actions not only by major world powers but also by
international organizations responsible for the formation and maintenance of global law and order.

In the context of globalization, security risks are fundamentally determined by the relationships between sociopolitical factors in world politics. The diversity of participants, as well as the multi-level nature of interaction in the field of international relations, some scientists believe, are forming a new world order. Its main feature is the “disconnected, mutually excluding fixed state territorial formations, the “new territoriality” that is emerging in world politics (Brassett and Tsingou, 2011).

The traditional National Security Paradigm is gradually giving way to new ones (Hough et al., 2015):

- Global-Security Paradigm;
- Regional-Security Paradigm;
- Transregional-Security Paradigm.

These and other paradigms address today's complex national and global security dynamics. The unfolding global processes need to be understood from the perspective of new analytical approaches that can provide their conceptualization.

Issues of ensuring international peace and security have traditionally attracted the attention of political scientists and international relations scholars. Considerable attention in these studies is paid to the analysis of theoretical approaches to the definition of international security. At the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, four main theoretical directions in the study of security problems emerged: neorealism, globalism, regionalism, and constructivism.

Neorealism (Neorealist perspective) is distinguished by a state-centric approach and the priority of the thesis about the polarization of the influence of superpowers in the system of international relations, namely the ideas of bipolarity, unipolarity, multipolarity, and other combinations of polarity in the structure of the world system. The topic of the distribution of economic influence in the system of international relations as a determining element in the global political structure, which in turn defines the security structure, is the subject of research undertaken within the context of neorealism theories (Booth, 2008).

The logic of neorealist security theories is based on such an understanding of the structure of international security, which allows the legitimacy of the idea of changes in the conditions of globalization (in the post-Cold War period) of the structure of the
relationship of power at the global level. Within the framework of the logic of the theories of neorealism, accordingly, the position about the end of bipolarity is substantiated, and the purpose of the research is to identify the nature, the essence of the changes taking place to reveal their impact on the level of security of the world order. For neorealism, the priority of the global level of political analysis remains undeniable. The range of changes being studied is limited to the framework of this level, which is reflected in the equally limited set of conceptual tools of these theories, limited by the choice between the concepts of Unipolarity or Multipolarity.

A neorealist focus on the problem of transition from a bipolar to a unipolar world, as well as the study of the corresponding effects of changing the balance of forces in world politics, is characteristic of the studies of K. Waltz, S. Walt, B. Hansen, and several other proponents of this approach. Three key issues are a priority for modern neorealist studies of the security of international relations and the risks associated with international terrorism:

- The problem of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) and the threat of their use by transnational terrorist organizations.
- The problem of increasing risks of using armed forces and military methods to solve the problem of ensuring security from any type of threat, including the threat of international terrorism.
- The problem (considered as a key one) of the conflict of civilizations, the lines of which are determined by the main patterns of differentiation of cultures, primarily by the differences between Western and Islamic civilizations.

The second direction in the study of the problem of security in international relations is represented by the theories of globalization (Globalist Theoretical Perspective).

Globalism in the theory of international relations is a kind of antithesis of the neorealist theoretical direction and the inherent idea of the latter about the static structure of the system of international relations, modifications of which are interpreted as limited by changes in the balance of political forces on the world stage.

The methodological basis of globalization theories consists mainly of cultural and political-economic approaches. Globalism can also be based on Marxist or liberal theoretical paradigms (Bayeh, 2014). Globalist security theories are distinguished by putting forward the concept of “deterritorialization of world politics” as their starting
point. In this regard, there is a certain conceptual commonality between the liberal and Marxist versions of globalist theories, which equally focus on the increasing role of economic and transnational integration, and, accordingly, the weakening of the importance of territoriosity and the role of the state in the sphere of world politics (O’Connel, 2011). According to the logic of the theories of globalism, the state and the system of state power cease to be a priority object of political analysis of world politics. Accordingly, the scope of political analysis should also include the activities of non-state actors and structures. Based on the thesis about the complexity of the relationship between state and non-state actors and systems coexisting in world politics, a position is put forward on the need for an integrated approach that goes beyond the state-centric approach to the analysis of security problems and the risks of international terrorism. The key idea of globalist theories is to justify the independent role in world politics of both types of transnational entities: corporations, non-state social and political organizations, and intergovernmental (international) organizations and regimes.

The focus of research conducted within the framework of theories of globalism is the problem of the influence of networks, which constitute the structure of interaction between diverse actors of world politics at various levels, on the revision of the principle of territorial sovereignty as fundamental one in the system of international relations. Globalist theories contain a provision about the tendency of growing influence not of the state, but of network structures as exerting a certain pressure and influence on the state. Assessing the nature of the relationship between globalization and security, supporters of globalism substantiate the thesis about the strengthening, under the influence of globalization, of the tendency to complicate the problem of security in the modern world, which is accompanied by a simultaneous weakening of the role of the state in ensuring security and a reduction in mechanisms for effective control and implementation of relevant strategies. In this regard, globalists put forward the thesis about the greater effectiveness of political strategies that involve cooperation between states in the field of security, especially at the regional level (Booth, 2008).

The subject field of globalist research into the security risks of international relations in the context of the growing threat of international terrorism consists of the following priority problems:

- The problem of economic security, instability of the liberal international economic order (LIEO) and the threat of crisis development. Traditional topics
remain the following: the development, implementation, and effects of regimes governing the global trade system and the development of financial infrastructure. Relevant problems have been studied in the works of J. Arquilla, D. Ronfeld, Ron R. Gunaratna, C. Sterling, and other researchers;

- The threat to economic security and stability of the liberal international economic order from transnational organized crime, associated, in particular, with money laundering, drug and weapons smuggling, illegal immigration, and other types of crimes. These problems are being developed in the research of H. Abadinsky, A. Bossard, P. Chalk, A. Dupont, R. Godson, Ph. Williams, C. Hernandez, G. Puttugalan, R. Kendell, P. Lupsha, R. Naylor, A. Schmid, D. Vlassis.

The third direction in the theory of international relations is represented by the regionalist theoretical perspective. Regionalist theories of security are based on two theoretical assumptions. The first premise is based on the idea of a decrease in the confrontation between superpowers and a new quality of modern world politics associated with a change in the structure of political interests and the loss of interest of most of the countries of the world in the struggle for global dominance. The second assumption is to interpret the structure of the system of international relations that emerged after the end of the Cold War as characterized by the predominance of national interests in ensuring the dynamic development of their state, which contributes to the formation of a position of non-participation of states in military campaigns and strategic confrontation in conflict zones. This position presupposes a determination (attitude) to reconsider military-political relations in such a way as to avoid the possibility of superpowers’ interference in internal affairs (Lawson, 2020).

Thus, the regionalist tradition in the interpretation of security is distinguished by its emphasis on the starting position, which contains a statement about the essential significance of the dynamics of regional security as an integral part of the entire international security system as a whole. The corresponding positions are held by B. Buzan, A. Stein, S. Lobel, D. Lake, P. Morgan, and other researchers. Regionalism has elements of both neorealism and globalism. At the same time, regionalism is distinguished by a different, not world (global), but regional level of political analysis. It is characteristic that namely, regionalism represents that segment of the international relations theory within which there are real prerequisites for the formation of an integrated
approach that combines the most constructive ideas and technologies of neorealism, globalism, regionalism, and other approaches. In particular, Buzan (2004) emphasizes the importance of considering regional security as a key component of global security and the stability of the world order. His position seems correct, on the one hand, taking into account the transnational nature of al Qaeda’s methods and the global qualitative characteristics of the organizational structure, and providing for the need to consider the activities of this terrorist network as related to the dynamics of regional security in the Middle East, which is determined by the process of functioning of the unipolar global structure of international relations, from the other hand.

At the same time, differentiation remains the leading trend in the development of the modern system of theoretical knowledge about the security problems of international relations in the context of globalization. Research on the effectiveness of international law in ensuring international security, as well as the mechanisms, factors, nature, and prospects of law as an instrument of international security are presented in the works of K. Abbott, D. Snidl, A. Moravcsik, E-M. Slauter, M. Finnemore, S. Tuupe, etc.

The fourth direction is established in the modern theory of international relations constructivism (Constructivist Perspective). The difference between this theoretical perspective and the approaches discussed above lies in the orientation of political analysis towards the study of the dynamics of socio-political interaction and the processes of constructing semantic meanings that are common to the intersubjective understanding of processes associated with interaction. The constructivist approach leaves outside the scope of political analysis the traditional problems of choosing the level of analysis and choosing a certain type of unit in the political analysis of security. The priority for constructivism is the study of social and political actors’ behaviour (McCourt, 2022).

The advantage of constructivism lies in its ability to identify and recognize discourses that define the conceptual foundations of organized terrorism and counter-terrorism, as well as specific implications corresponding to these discourses that determine the functioning and structure of the security system of international relations. In political security analysis, one of the pressing problems is identifying the motives for violence, primarily associated with religious terrorism. Namely, the constructivist models of political analysis contain the schemes and technologies necessary to solve this problem, which is important for ensuring the effective influence and real role of international organizations in ensuring global security and order. However, due to the
exceptional dynamics and complexity of the modern global security landscape, it seems necessary to develop a flexible (Agile) multi-vector or matrix model for the functioning of relevant international organizations.

3 METHODS

The initial methodological basis is the dialectical principles of knowledge of geopolitical reality, which are concretized in a whole range of guidelines and special techniques for studying the material covered by the topic. The dialectical method in the study is complemented by the hermeneutic principle of understanding: the whole is understood based on the analysis of individual parts, and the part - based on the analysis of the whole. At the same time, the theoretical interpretation of global international security is carried out based on a specific methodological principle: the complete scientific picture of the phenomenon under study is not only a picture of it as an object, but also a picture of the subject’s cognition of this object. It implies the study of existing conceptual approaches to understanding international security, which are determined by various socio-historical contexts, and methodology of knowledge and reflect certain stages and aspects of its doctrinal understanding.

The study of the UN activities was carried out taking into account the modern achievements of the complex of social sciences - political science, the theory of international relations, international law, and conflictology.

The systemic-structural method is used to describe the structure of global international security and its subsystems, while the functional method is employed to identify the place and role of international organizations in the mechanism for ensuring global international security. In addition to philosophical and legal approaches, general scientific methods of analogy and historicism, as well as formal-logical and situational methods were used to investigate the issues under study.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The end of bipolar confrontation has opened up new opportunities for constructive cooperation between states at the regional and global levels, in the UN and other international organizations. The threat of a global conflict of the previous type should, in theory, be reduced to a minimum, but it becomes obvious that almost all institutional mechanisms for maintaining international security created after World War II and during
the Cold War (UN, NATO, OSCE, etc.) are not adequate, and sometimes helpless about the challenges and threats of the new century. Attempts to reform these structures have not yet been successful. There is also no political will to create new, more effective international security structures. As a result, the level of controllability of international crises and processes drops sharply. It can be assumed that indirectly, namely the decrease in the effectiveness of the activities of international organizations in ensuring global law and order became one of the key reasons for the significant increase in the potential for conflict in today's geopolitical landscape, as well as the emergence of entropy processes in it. According to the ACLED Conflict Index (2023), a 27% increase in political violence incidents recorded in the past 12 months, 1 in 6 people are estimated to have been exposed to conflict so far. The map of conflict index ranking and the chart of ongoing state-based conflicts in dynamics from 1946 to 2022 are alarming (see Figure 1 and 2 below).

Figure 1. World map of conflict index ranking.
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Source: ACLED Conflict Index, 2023.
As it is known, most international conflicts that threaten global security and peace have their source either intra-state or regional instability caused by various economic (desire for the redistribution of energy resources, food, drinking water, etc.), political (struggle for power and spheres of influence), ethnic (a sense of national superiority, envy, enmity and hostility), religious (lack of spiritual and moral maturity of conflicting peoples), and other factors (related, for example, to terrorism, extremism). Therefore, the supposed constitutionally programmed and guaranteed mechanism for early warning and peaceful (legal) resolution of international conflicts and problems must be based, first of all, on an understanding and analysis of the causes and nature of all kinds of confrontations and sources of danger.

In modern conditions, the international security system includes a set of fundamental security principles, interstate mechanisms and structures, international legal norms, multilateral treaties, and other elements created and functioning to prevent military clashes, their localization, settlement of political, economic and military-strategic contradictions politically, as well as a special regime of control over international, especially military, activities and a corresponding information regime. The most significant role in ensuring international security is played by interstate institutions with an internal rigid structure, bodies of coordination and control, and clearly expressed
policies in military-political and economic terms, in which the “specific political, economic, and military weight” of their participants is significant (Grant, 2015).

Sometimes the timely identification, recognition, and diagnosis of national and regional problems that can become the beginning of certain global conflicts can be no less difficult than their lawful and peaceful resolution. The fact is that any global problem, to be resolved, as a rule, requires the mandatory participation and legitimate and coordinated will of all interested and involved states in a given conflict. The measure of effectiveness in preventing and timely solving global problems related to the preservation of international peace and security mainly depends on the success of maintaining a constant dialogue between territorially or politically related states, on the development of common grounds and long-term interests in their diverse religious, political, and economic life, and also the ways of their daily coexistence.

According to analysts, the main factors influencing the growth of global defence spending were: military operations in Iraq, Egypt, Libya, Syria, and other countries of the Middle East; increasing the US military presence in various parts of the world; the return of Russia to the global world stage, as well as the growing power of China, which claims leadership. These are factors that have become catalysts in the context of a general increase in the level of tension in the modern world (Lawson, 2020).

An equally significant contribution to this crisis is made by the lack of a consolidated policy of the permanent members of the UN Security Council towards actual and potential countries violating the nuclear non-proliferation regime, including the adoption of effective political, diplomatic and economic sanctions. This, for example, concerns DPRK, whose leadership ‘skillfully’ plays on the contradictions between the leading countries of the world and, in essence, ignores UN Security Council resolutions.

Accordingly, general nervousness and military-political instability are increasing. Some states will be tempted to launch pre-emptive strikes, a clear example of which is the large-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022.

At the moment, there is a need to develop an integrated long-term strategy in the field of non-proliferation of conflict potential, a strategy that synthesizes diplomatic, economic, and other measures. The priority should be the development of new global and regional security structures, improving the interaction of intelligence services and systems of international security guarantees, as well as the development of military force operations, but as a last resort.
International law is a solid foundation for the international security system. Of course, agreeing on an optimal model for improving the international legal framework for international security depends on political will, on the functioning and development of a complex system of cooperation based on international agreements and including states, international organizations, national security agencies, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Combining the efforts of various subjects of international relations based on the principles and norms of international law necessitates the creation of a global system of international security. However, the problems of ensuring global international security objectively facing the international community today speak eloquently of a change in the international legal paradigm of global security. While earlier, when speaking about global security, we meant only military-political security, today it also means food security, climate security, space security, energy security, and information security. It should be noted that all these subsystems of global security are interconnected and must be maintained precisely based on international law.

In the context of globalization, the close connection of integration and fragmentation with the concept of identity makes it necessary to discuss the relationship between identity and security, since although globalization has accelerated the process of integration in the economic, political, social, and cultural spheres, it has destabilized existing actors with its homogenizing tendencies and contributed to the resistance of local identity. Today, the nation-state has been subjected to the pressures of globalization and centralization from both above and down, resulting in new possibilities for manoeuvring in the international political arena.

Changes empower new actors and produce new concentrations of power, which become targets of political opposition and resistance. The rise of global networks, for example, strengthens smaller and weaker non-state players by enabling them to coordinate their operations with like-minded individuals all over the world. As a result, asymmetrical types of war and conflict become more important, rendering traditional “national” security approaches ineffectual. Because local settings become “microenvironments on global circuits” (Simmons & Danner, 2010), many local players become entangled in bigger global networks. Thus, one actor or tiny network acting in Manchester or Paris can be linked to similar small networks functioning in Libya, Syria, or elsewhere, indicating a critical truth of contemporary reality: various types of political arenas are becoming linked worldwide chains of extremist violence. Such tactical
advances call into question the essence of traditional wars and “postmodern” conflicts, transforming them into “wars of hearts and minds” fought in part through multimedia communication networks.

The development of technology has created incentives for the growth of network structures and has also significantly expanded the powers of entities such as diasporas, which go beyond the territorial boundaries of states, remaining tied to their policies. The existence of such transnational diasporas has a broader structural effect in that it calls into question the correspondence between the “state” as a territory or bureaucratic structure and the “nation” or state identity. Diasporic political entrepreneurs can mobilize transnational forces to engage in politics beyond the state by making use of the political opportunity mechanisms that emerge in an interconnected global economy. Transnational diaspora politics do not always coincide with the advent of cosmopolitanism, but rather with the globalization of local conflicts and identities (Tallberg and Zurn, 2019).

Diaspora politics has various effects on global security. First, as in the cases of the Tamil, Kurdish, and Syrian diasporas, violent conflict can result in diasporas, where populations are compelled to flee to avoid persecution or violence. Second, diasporas can influence the dynamics of internal conflicts and civil wars by affecting the local balance of power through resource transfers or participation in protests, lobbying, or other political activities. Third, diasporas can globalize and transnationalize civil conflicts by engaging in activities that have spillover effects in their home nations. Finally, diaspora politics can be a force for peace, development, and transitional justice (Voeten, 2005).

The significance of transnational diasporas in global security reveals how transnational forces and external variables alter power relations in the context of intrastate conflicts. Transnational ethnic groups, diasporas, refugees, foreign fighters, international organizations, multinational corporations, and other actors can all have an impact on the dynamics of “internal” conflicts, implying that what appear to be “local” conflicts are frequently usefully understood as manifestations of larger structural and systemic factors.

Understanding the future international security landscape necessitates methods and instruments that transcend the “territoriality trap” of methodological nationalism and allow for the study of linkages that occur across a wide range of areas and actors. Geography, sociology, anthropology, and geopolitics are all relevant disciplines for interacting with the shifting geography of international security. Using such techniques
does not imply abandoning traditional notions of power, identity, and interests, but rather considering how they act in specific political circumstances outside of the state.

Scale and vector processes can help us grasp the dynamics and configurations that define the new security and global law order landscape. While scholars have endeavoured to distinguish between national (or domestic) and international levels of international security in their various approaches to evaluating levels of international security, vector approaches assist in highlighting how these different levels are related or interconnected.

Despite recent trends indicating the restoration of nationalism and the continued relevance of national borders, larger structural changes in world politics in the era of civilizational conflict continue to point to the need to address security issues while taking into account the situation beyond the spatial boundaries of the state, i.e., the complex realities of a globalizing world. Increased connection facilitated by information and communications technologies, as well as other beneficial aspects of globalization, will necessitate continued efforts by government agencies and other actors to address security concerns in "non-national" regions that straddle territorial boundaries. Blurring the lines between zones of conflict and zones of peace will make deterrence and strategic discussions less effective, as they rely on states being seen as unitary actors. A significant issue shortly will be to discover ways to collaborate to improve global security and stability in this new environment without jeopardizing other vital collective goods such as civil liberties, privacy, and freedom of movement.

There are now many independent actors, both public and private, each driven by its own goals and priorities, with its clients and constituencies, its own technical language and organizational culture, shaped its own technical language and organizational culture and implements its mandate along with specialized core functions. These attributes may have been acceptable at a time when the focus of international relations was focused on a few significant issues affecting only a small number of significant countries. However, the long-term effect is that we have inherited a system that is fragmented and depends heavily (perhaps too heavily) on market forces, competition, and ad hoc public reactions in the direction of effort and allocating resources.

Under such conditions, organizations become more internally oriented, placing greater emphasis on evaluating and seeking to improve their results rather than working collaboratively with partner organizations to achieve common goals. The weaker the governance structures and processes within specific sectors, the lower the degree of
external orientation and awareness, and the less coherent action between different actors. Each institution becomes less efficient, and this negatively affects the system as a whole (Vreeland, 2019). “International organizations are no longer seen as the good guys of global governance which produce global public goods that states alone cannot furnish. Instead, there is a “growing awareness of the internal pathologies and ideological biases of the most dominant international institutions” (Collins and White, 2010: 2).

International law, like any other legal system, cannot do without coercive measures. The challenge is to improve their application. Currently, one, but not uniformly understood, term “sanctions” quite often defines essentially different, although interrelated, legal phenomena, not only without distinguishing between them but even sometimes trying to attribute to them properties that they do not possess. Adhering to an overly broad understanding of international legal sanctions, many international lawyers identify or confuse them with forms of international legal responsibility. This blurs the boundaries between sanctions and responsibility, preventing a clear understanding of the nature of these institutions and a correct understanding of the role of each of them in the system of international legal regulation. To avoid this, it is necessary to note the following provisions, which duly take into account the peculiarities of international law and are based on trends in the modern practice of international relations.

The use of the term “sanction” about the concept of “coercive measure of a non-military nature of the UN Security Council” cannot cause absolute rejection, since in this case, it will carry the semantic load of a coercive means of ensuring the obligations of states under the UN Charter, which, in the opinion of the specially authorized body of this international organization, jeopardize international peace or security. It is unproductive to identify these sanctions with measures of international responsibility since the UN Security Council is not a party to the legal relations of responsibility that develop between the delinquent state and the victim of an international offence. The application of non-military sanctions by the UN Security Council does not prejudge the possibility of bringing a delinquent state to international responsibility in the future.

Experts believe that improving the activities of the Security Council should first of all be achieved by revising the methods and procedures of its work. The key to the effectiveness of this body is, among other things, constant interaction with interested countries (countries-stakeholders) and impeccable legal support, including strict compliance by all participants in international communication with the provisions of the
UN Charter regarding the place and importance of the Council in maintaining international peace and security (Thompson, 2009). Also, it seems necessary to make further progress in the work of the UN International Law Commission on the codification of issues of international responsibility and the use of coercive measures.

More than 70 years have passed since the creation of the United Nations, and significant changes have occurred in the international arena. The UN has remained largely unchanged, even though several changes have occurred. The UN Charter, Article 1, sets out the four fundamental purposes of the organization. These goals are formulated universally; they lack any specificity. But in our modern era, the UN solves problems that require clarity in formulation to achieve greater effectiveness of the UN.

The Security Council should make more active use of the resources of the Military Staff Committee in maintaining international peace and security through the creation of regional subsidiary bodies. In particular, it is advisable to create a committee that will cooperate with regional international organizations to ensure the monitoring of potential conflict situations in various regions and their prevention. It seems appropriate to use the stakeholder approach, i.e., balancing interests to achieve the desired goals in the field of world legal order, based on the utilitarian paradigm rather than the categorical imperatives of ideology.

5 CONCLUSION

Unfortunately, as history has shown, neither the League of Nations nor the UN appeared able to fully cope with the task of creating an effective system of international security. Time passes, but a permanent threat to global security remains. Local wars break out with sad regularity in all parts of the globe, including in Europe. The beginning of the 21st century was marked by a sharp increase in political and military conflicts. Historical parallels with the terrible events of the past century emerge. That is why today’s need to reform the existing world order is quite objective.

The evolution of the concept of international security has gone from a military bloc security system to a multi-component global security system, which includes various subsystems and operates based on international law. Building global security today is very difficult – too much depends on the political will of states. At the same time, it is important not to exaggerate the capabilities of international law, nor to underestimate its role. The first leads to the construction of schemes divorced from the reality of
international life, while the second undermines the role of the most important means of maintaining global security. Thus, it can be stated that international legal regulation represents an integral part of the global system of international security.

At present, it is no longer possible to assert that the existing system of supervision of international relations is adequate for the 21st century. Improving the effectiveness of managing global interactions requires action on three fronts: streamlining relations between sovereign states, modernizing existing multilateral institutions, and creating an effective oversight body.

Strengthening and improving the global security system in today's globalizing world requires not just the adoption of individual new international legal norms, but the development of a whole series of international legal acts in all areas of international cooperation: military, economic, environmental, space, energy, information, etc. When developing these international documents, it is important to take into account the universality of the problems, the regional specifics, as well as the interests of stakeholders in all their diversity and inconsistency. It is also necessary to strengthen the international institutional framework to combat new challenges: create or reform expert or interstate bodies, commissions and committees. The future of humanity depends on how effectively and timely this is done.
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