

FEATURES OF CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Zafar Najafov

Military Academy of the Republic of Azerbaijan

E-mail: zafarnajafov@yahoo.com

The problem of ensuring international security has been a matter of concern for all ages. In the twenty-first century, the importance of ensuring international security has reached its peak. Thus, the end of the Cold War, the obtaining military, political, socio-economic, environmental threats transnational nature in the context of globalization as a result of the transparency of state borders, the intensification of anti-state tendencies and the development of high technology easily expanding the geography of destructive processes (ethnic-religious conflicts, separatism, terrorism etc.), the crisis of the international law institute, the erosion of absolute sovereignty and the transformation of preventive measures into pledge of subjective interests and so on. issues are considered global trends that shake the modern international security system. The dynamics of these tendencies do not allow optimistic ideas about the future of the international security system.

The term "international security" has been incorporated into the dictionary of international relations approximately 100 years ago. In the recent past, it has been expressed in terms of "war" and "peace". Until recently, international security was viewed as a phenomenon associated with a military power factor. That factor was characterized to use the military force or threaten with its application for the purpose of eliminating the probable aggression by state or group of states, to establish military alliances and in some cases to pursue their personal interests. Gradually, the military power factor enriched the diplomatic and other political tools that were used to limit the the scale of the military confrontation, the rapid armament and the possibility of the emergence of armed conflicts [1, p.148].

The final definition of "international security" in modern literature on international relations has not been given yet. Often, "international security" is traditionally understood as the military-political dimension of processes and does not attach importance to its expanding non-military, "civil" component (environmental, economic and other threats). In other cases, almost all the problems of international relations tend to be viewed from a security perspective.

The current situation of contemporary international security is characterized as "post-Cold War". The international security situation and the challenges and threats directed against it in the post-war era are associated with the following features:

1. Decentralization and polarization in the international security system. The beginning of the 1990s did not justify hopes of weakening the international tension and the soonest settlement of the conflicts. The collapse of the Yalta - Postdam regime, which was established in the context of the East-West global confrontation, has seriously changed the proportion of forces in the international arena.

It dissipated a number of obstacles in the world and accelerated the process of globalization. At the same time, the new polarization and decentralization took place in the international system [2, p.170]. Significant changes have taken place in the relative hierarchy of states. A group of developed and powerful states who have gained a sense of superiority in their political, economic, and military fields has switched to a more active attack policy. These states are the permanent members of the UN Security Council (UK, China, Russia, US and France), as well as possible candidates for membership (Brazil, Germany, India, CAR, Japan), if the United Nations Security Council is expanded.

However, the US continues to maintain its leading position in terms of power in modern world order. Some political scientists even describe the geostructure of modern international relations as a unipolar world order under the leadership of the United States. However, the events of sept. 11 once again proved that in a globalized world, even the United States as a global power center is unable to act alone. A coalition led by the United States against Iraq in march 2003 confirms our idea. Nevertheless, the US, which has a huge economy, has a leading position in the field of military technology and the country's military capability continues to grow.

Russia and China, which are opposed to the world's unipolar model, declare that it is multipolar and mark the European Union, India, Japan, Germany, Brazil and The South African Republic as alternative geostrategic centers [3, p 19].

Russia's annexation of the Crimea in February 2014 caused the restoration of the Cold War between the Russia and West (United States - European Union). On the other hand, China's growing economy and military modernization programs have made it a powerful and competitive pole in world politics.

Increasing globalization and anti-state tendencies. One of the main processes of contemporary world politics and international relations is globalization. The deepening of mutual dependence on the political, economic, ideological and others fields is characteristic of it. The process of transforming the world into a unified structure takes place. The weight of global interest is rising in comparison with national interests and the relationship between the internal and external aspects of security is deepening.

Influence of non-state actors on all areas of world politics is one of the key features of globalization. Non-state actors that began to function at the international level are steadily increasing. Historically, the state's ability to act as the principal bearer of national sovereignty in the system of international relations is limited by the following non-state actors:

- international organizations; UN or OSCE;
- international regimes (a long-term cooperation of states in the field of accurately defined problems, for example, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty);
- transnational companies with huge economic and investment opportunities, which often exceed the budgets of small states, such as large oil companies;
- NGOs engaged in human rights protection and environmental protection (Amnesty International and Grinps);

- criminal organizations, which operate internationally, such as South American drug cartels;
- terrorist organizations operating in certain regions, for example, al-Qaeda [4, p. 6].

The activities of some of the above-mentioned non-state actors are seriously threatening international peace and stability. Those non-state actors include terrorists, armed extremists, separatists or other anti-government armed units, sea pirates, drug traffickers, and so on. Pessimistic ideas about the increase of violence and wars as the result of the weakening of states are increasing. First of all, such threats are driven by weak, falling states and incompetent governments.

That is why in some parts of the globe long-term instability zones and violence incubators are created [4, p. 6].

The global export of democracy and the rejection of absolute sovereignty. The enlargement of the global democracies zone means the expansion of peace and security between states.

Democratization characterizes the process of political and social change aimed at the establishment of a democratic system. Democracy is the process of development, expansion and renewal of ideas and principles, institutions and procedures. Democracy does not guarantee the solution of these or other problems, but it creates conditions for achieving the goals. The outcome depends on the conditions of development of the democratic process, the characteristics of the forces and their influence on the democratic process, the ability to solve problems and the external situation affecting the domestic policy.

Samuel Huntington, who has suggested the concept of "wave of democratization," underlines the terms of transition from the non-democratic regime to the democratic regime under certain conditions. According to him, the world passes through three stages of global democratization. The first stage covers the years 1828-1926. This stage is characterized by the fact that people gain the right to vote under the influence of the US and French bourgeois revolutions, the role of parliament and common elections in the formation of power increased. In 1922-1942, the formation of fascist, totalitarian and militarist regimes was regarded as a tendency to escape from the first democratization wave [5, p.26-29].

The second wave covering 1943-1962 was remembered by the establishment of democratic institutions in Western Europe as a result of the end of World War II. The decolonization process was the cause of the second democratization of 1958-1975. As a result of this process authoritarian regimes were established in most Latin American continents [5, p.29-32].

The third wave began in 1974 and continues to this day. This stage is associated with the end of decolonization, the collapse of the communist regime in the world, and the emergence of new democracies [5, p.32].

One of the main results of global democracy is the growing consensus among the issues of increasing the gravity of human rights (freedoms) and its defiance of the state. Because of the openness of the system of relations in the modern world and the globalization processes, massive

human rights abuses and other illegal actions of the authorities can not be disclosed to the world community and that is why there is a real need for international intervention. The increasing number of conflicts and the international terrorism push the world's major powers to prevent such violence without the consent of any other state. Increasing the importance of humanitarian interventions as an instrument of foreign policy in the modern world is increasing the relevance of this topic.

Humanitarian intervention is a policy of using of force or threaten with force by the state or group of states against another state without its consent. Its main purpose is to prevent or eliminate massive and gross violations of human rights. The use of this concept for the sake of the realization of private geopolitical interests is not overlooked. The military operations and revolts carried out by super powers in Afghanistan, the former Yugoslavia and the Middle East have been realized under the name of "humanitarian intervention".

In some cases, humanitarian intervention is justified. For example, the existence of "failed states" in third-world countries indicates that such states have lost their economic and political supports. Local authorities, who lose control over the population take tough measures, causing tensions in the domestic relations and socio-political chaos. Humanitarian intervention can justify itself because of the inability of these leaders to resolve internal problems. Otherwise, chaos within the country will make not only regional, but even international order unstable.

Attempts to develop the concept of "humanitarian intervention" are carried out on the background of "absolute sovereignty restriction". Due to the increased mutual dependence on the economies and markets of the states, sovereignty is not regarded as an indestructible and inviolable one. The supreme structures and governing bodies are established and some of the authorities are delegated to them. Under such conditions it is easy take advantage of humanitarian intervention.

On the other hand, the 2005 UN Declaration on Protection has put an end to the erosion of the sovereignty category and has succeeded in implementing such an idea that if governments fail to cope with this or that situation, then solving the problem go into the hands of the international community. This Declaration has substantially facilitated the justification of humanitarian intervention and legitimized the right of third parties or parties to interfere into the domestic affairs [6]. In September 1999, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan stated that sovereignty during the massive violation of human rights could be eliminated through humanitarian intervention [7, p.96].

But the explanation of the ideas contained in the Declaration can be misused for personal purposes and attempts to justify aggressive activities can not be excluded. In the background of these processes sovereignty, which is the basis of the existence of the state, loses its power and the influence of more powerful states on weak states increases.

Transfer of technological development to dominance and force relations. In the first half of the twentieth century, no one could predict that in a few decades, scientific and technical progress will give humanity communication with its new, invisible wires gradually connecting the whole world [8, p.276].

From the 21st century, one of the main issues of world politics is a scientific and technological leap that can produce significant results in all aspects of human activity. Modern processes of globalization have increased the role of information technologies in the military sphere. In the past century the fast armaments, which have shown itself in the past, have been replaced by a relentless struggle for information supremacy. Computerization and information revolution has led to scientific and technical progress in the military field. The introduction of high technologies radically changed the character and capabilities of ordinary armament, intelligence and troops management systems and expanded the ability to conduct war at a distance.

The role of information technologies in the military sphere is increasing in the context of globalization. Information systems have become a powerful tool for both potential opponents and hostile countries. There is no doubt that our modern world can not survive without war, especially without a conflict of information. Information war is an urgent aspect of modern society, and it is not easy to understand the processes in modern political life and geopolitics without understanding it. In the report of the UN Secretary-General (October 3, 2001) information wars are associated with the following threats: the preparation and use of sanctioned intervention methods in the information field of another state; Illegal use and damage of others' information resources; the effect of purposeful information on the population of the foreign state; attempts to dominate the information space; expansion of terrorism and so on. [9].

At present, the concept of "information war" is perceived differently. This is due to the fact that the term "information warfare" has several meanings. It can be interpreted as "information war," "conflict of information", "information-psychological war". In turn, the information warfare used by one state to weaken and destroy another state; information warfare among rival competitors; a military information conflict between two major enemies (for example, the army) [10, p.239].

It is safe to say that the role of information technologies in the military-political processes will continue to grow. Under the influence of information technology, the nature of modern armed conflicts and the military-political leadership's vision of military-power policy are changing. The concept of cybernetic warfare describes the new threats facing the modern society. Thus, the management infrastructure of modern societies depends on information and communication technologies. Through the Internet, it is possible to disrupt the functioning of both the military command structure of the enemy and civilian areas of activity.

The crisis of the International Law Institute. Today the crisis of the international law institution is clearly visible and affects the behavior of actors operating in the international security sector. First, the idea that the UN is not as effective as a system is widespread. Secondly, the practice of "humanitarian intervention" radically changed the traditional approach to sovereignty. The threat of transnational terrorism has highlighted the entirely new "preventive shock" problem. The expansion of the practice of the armed forces against non-state actors (terrorists, separatists, and rebels) has highlighted the problem of the proper use of military power and the protection of peaceful and innocent civilians from military operations. For that reason, in accordance with the reality of contemporary international politics, the development of international law and reform in the UN should be carried out. Third, the United States and a

number of countries are trying to work beyond the legal field to deal with international security issues.

To tell the truth, the effectiveness of international law is measured by how the hegemon state sees it. The views of John Bolton, a former US diplomat in the United Nations, give rise to this kind of thinking. He said: "The international law or the rights of peoples of the XV-XVI centuries was, first of all, a kind of conduct for the countries. It was an agreement that countries would act on the world scene. At first they were basically bilateral agreements, and the state which signed the treaty had to adhere to it. After the Second World War, the number of multilateral treaties began to rise dramatically, followed by the creation of a large group of lawyers-professors who sought to establish an international legal system, which was not necessarily followed by states. From this point of view, I think that the efforts aimed at establishing an international legal system were artificial. This was an attempt to reconcile the concept of "law" with international relations, whereas most of the decisions in that area are legal, not political. In addition, the comparison of domestic, national and international law does not make any sense because they are two different areas. In other words, it seems that it was impossible to fulfill the task - to create an international legal space. However, as time passed it became clear that this was not possible. In many aspects of the behavior of countries in the international arena, in principle, can not be considered legally. The law is a very good mechanism for managing a particular country, but it is impossible in international relations "[11, p.15]. The effectiveness of international law is measured by how the hegemon state sees it. The experience of the last decade shows that the US has formed a nihilistic attitude to the importance and content of international law. The views of John Bolton, a former US diplomat in the United Nations, give rise to this kind of thinking. He said: "The international law or the rights of peoples of the XV-XVI centuries was first of all, a kind of conduct for the countries. It was an agreement that countries would act on the world scene. At first they were basically bilateral agreements and the state which signed the treaty had to adhere to it. After the Second World War, the number of multilateral treaties began to rise dramatically, followed by the creation of a large group of lawyers-professors who sought to establish an international legal system, which was not necessarily followed by states. From this point of view, I think that the efforts aimed at establishing an international legal system were artificial. This was an attempt to reconcile the concept of "law" with international relations, whereas most of the decisions in that area are not legal, are political. In addition, the comparison of domestic, national and international law does not make any sense because they are two different areas. In other words, it seems that it was impossible to fulfill the task - to create an international legal space. However, as time passed it became clear that this was not possible. In many aspects of the behavior of countries in the international arena, in principle, can not be considered legally. The law is a very good mechanism for managing a particular country, but it is impossible in international relations "[11, p.15].

It is clear that international relations are not the norms of universal law, the fact that political interests are at the forefront and it does not allow the international order to be sustainable. The problems of the settlement of the conflicts in Yugoslavia in 1994-1999, the beginning of the international military campaign against Afghanistan in September 2001, the beginning of the international military campaign in Iraq in March 2003, the Crimean events in 2014 and unrestricted violence in military-political processes in Iraq and Syria, as well as

attempts to legitimize ethnic separatism through referendum and so on. the processes have seriously undermined the authority of the international law institution. It may seem necessary to make urgent reforms in the direction of bringing international legal norms to the contemporary reality as a way out.

Non-military aspects of global security. Traditionally, security has been reviewed in terms of military threats. At the end of the twentieth century, such concepts began to emerge that not only military and military-technical aspects ("tough security"), but also economics, energy, ecology, migration, food and other non-military fields are very important to include a wider range of issues into the security area. The reason for the appearance of such a wide spectrum of security is mainly related to the "transparency" of the borders of national states since the end of the 20th century. This process is linked to the performance of non-state actors on the world stage. Rapid development of information and communication technologies has created favorable conditions for their activities. This process is linked to the performance of non-state actors on the world stage. Rapid development of information and communication technologies has created favorable conditions for their activities. As a result, governments and citizens have been exposed to many negative (drug trafficking, illegal arms trafficking, international terrorism, etc.) and positive (economic growth, international communication, access to the international environment, etc.) factors.

This, in its turn, contributed to the rise of non-military security problems on the international agenda [1, pp. 537].

Non-military security is a complex set of conditions for the elimination of social, economic and environmental challenges and threats to human development, both nationally and internationally. For the first time this conceptual approach was related to B.Buzan and his colleagues. He criticized the traditional concept of security, which focuses on the state and the military factor. Instead of the traditional approach, he tried to lay the foundations for a comprehensive new structure in security research. The new approach incorporates traditional military factors as well as other (economic, social, political and environmental) issues covering "soft power fields" [12, p.21-23].

Indeed, in the XXI century, the role of the non-military spheres of mutual dependence - economic, humanitarian and ecological has significantly increased. In the 21st century more economic, social and environmental crises than military problems create anxiety in national, regional and international security systems.

Economic instability was caused by social conflicts, as well as armed conflicts and are interpreted as the cause and consequence of instability that exists in various forms. Any trend of economic deterioration threatens national interests.

Ethnic origin based on the formation of ethnic nationalism or national state creates social and political chaos in most countries of the region. A more serious threat to stability is when ethnical nationalism manifests itself in a border dispute or with unequal economic conditions, and the leaders of these countries do not hesitate to use this dissatisfaction to strengthen their political position.

In addition, uncontrolled displacement of the population as a result of conflicts, ethnic strife, wars or unexpected economic conditions can shorten the resources of any small state, lead to chaos and public disobedience. Illegal immigrants encourage increased crime, including drug and arms trafficking.

Environmental risks are reinforcing their place in the range of threats to stability. Non-rational use of water, waste of industrial production, military experiments, inadequate disposal of toxic nuclear and chemical waste have a negative impact on the environment. These factors lead to a decline in agricultural land suitable for agriculture, a decline in the health of the population, and a reduction in jobs.

Expansion of the spectrum of threats. The collapse of the Cold War results in a change in the nature of military threats. At the beginning of the 21st century threats in military-political spheres are divided into traditional and new threats. "Traditional" threats derived from the strongest states and the direct competition between their alliances have moved to the second plan. Therefore, most of these threats are "sleeping" today.

The "new" threats include the triangle of international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery and internal armed conflicts [13, pp. 85-85]. Although these threats existed before, they remained in the shadow of "traditional" threats. Over the past few years these threats have been primarily associated with the development of their internal capacity and the increased security of each one.

Russian researcher A.B. Loqunov divides the threats to global security into four categories:

1. **Traditional threats** arise from states that use military force and means in military competition and conflict forms. These challenges are often due to the fact that states use military, naval and military air force. Traditional military challenges have not lost their importance yet. So many states have the potential to influence security in their region. The advantage of Allied States in traditional fields, it seriously weakens the desire of the enemy to compete with them in this field [14, p.34-35].

2. **Non-standard threats** are the forces that apply "unconventional" methods against the traditional advantages of stronger enemies. The state's interests in the field of modern security are more threatened by non-standard methods such as terrorism and rebellion. There are two factors that increase the risk of non-standard calls: the rise of extremist ideologies and the lack of effective governance. Political, religious and ethnic extremism continues to lead international conflicts. The lack of effective governance in the majority of the world leads to the creation of shelter for terrorists, criminals and rebels. Most states can not effectively control their territory and borders [14, p. 35-36]

3. **Catastrophic threats** include methods that can lead to the acquisition, storage and use of weapons of mass destruction (WMS) or the use of WMD. The advantage of the state in the field of traditional warfare make the enemy forces can get catastrophic means, especially the WMS. Transparent international borders, weak international control and unobstructed access to information technology making these efforts easier. Transnational terrorists, distribution of WMD and troubled states who want to acquire or possess this weapon are of particular concern.

Coping with catastrophic challenges as a result of the spread of technology and the experience of creating the WMD becomes an urgent task [14, p.36].

4. Destructive threats can be realised by enemies who develop and implement advanced technologies in order to undermine of the state in key operational areas. Rarely, revolutionary technologies and military innovations associated with them may change the concept of warfare. Some potential competitors try to take advantage of the weaknesses of the state and eliminate the advantages of the state and its partners by trying to get provocative potential [14, p.36]. An example of this is the armed struggle of Al-Qaeda against the United States and its allies.

Certain types of scientific discoveries with devastating potentials, particularly biotechnologies, cyberspace or energy-based weapons, can seriously threat global security. Unexpectedly occurring such threats require that they generate potential outcomes and actualize the need for insurance from them.

Finally we can conclude that:

- the strategic stability during the Cold War will remain a dream and the modern security environment will be chaotic, indefinite and dynamic;
- the modern global security system will continue to exist and operate in the context of "fragmentation (conflict) - integration (consensus)" paradigm;
- the mutual influence of traditional and new threats to the international security system will continue and this will be manifested in hybrid form;
- the role of non-military aspects of international security will increase and the impact on international relations will rise steadily;
- technological advancement will affect both bilateral and multilateral relations in all areas and in particular will change the conditions of military operations.

References

1. Baranov V.G. Bogaturov A.D. Modern Global Problems / Res. old M .: Aspect Press, 2010, 350 c.
2. Torkunova A.V, Malgina A.V. Modern international relations: Учебник / Под ред .. М .: Ассист Пресс, 2012, 688 с.
3. Military intervention in the international arena: the aid of collective / collective authors; под общ. old Annenkova VI, Ms. : КНОРУС, 2011, 496 с.
- Wilfried Von Bradov. "Новые вызовы". Informationen zur politischen Bildung, 2nd quarter 2006, p. 4-10.
5. Huntington S.X. The Third Walnut. Democratization in the Concentration XX century / Per. с., Российская Политическая энциклопедия (РОССПЭН), 2003., 368 с.

6. Andreevna R.N. Humanitarian interventions in modern international relations (unecon.ru/sites/default/files/gumanitarnye.pdf).

7. Modin N. "Humanitarian intervention" is the method of international regulation of conflicts. // VLAS 03'2007, с.94-97.

8. Ivanov S.A. The information security: the basic and basic forms of the evolution. 2013, с.276-279. (<https://cyberleninka.ru/.../informatcionnaya-voyna-suschnost-i-osnovnye-formy-proyavl.>).

9. Krutskikh A.K, International Security Policy, International Trade Law, 2007, p. 15, p. 1, p.

10. Манойло А.В. State-of-the-art information politics in particular cases. Monograph. М.: МИФИ, 2003, 388 с.

11. Merajka A.A Crisis of the Modern Mirror and Future of International Law in XXI. // Almanyakh international law. 2010. 2. с.12-24.

12. Buzan B., Waever O. Jaap de Wilde Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998, 239 p.

13. Kulagin V.M. Современная международная безопасность: учебное пособие. М.: КНОРУС, 2012, 432 с.

14. Логунов А.Б. Regional and national safety. Учебное пособие. М: Vuzovskaya manual, 2009, 432 с.

Summary
Features of modern international security
Zafar Najafov

This article examines the radical geopolitical changes observed in the international security system in the 21st century. In the author's opinion, the main changes in the current international security system are characterized by decentralization, expansion of destructive activity of non-state actors and the growing role of civil security components (ecological, economic, information). These changes have a global character and exert a serious impact on the international security system.

Keywords: international security, decentralization, non-state actors, globalization, traditional and new threats.