

УДК 341.215.2:346.548]=111 DOI: [https://doi.org/10.31617/zt.knute.2019\(102\)04](https://doi.org/10.31617/zt.knute.2019(102)04)

GONCHAROVA Yulia PhD in Law, senior lecturer at the Department of International Public Law of the Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics
E-mail: j_goncharova@ukr.net
 ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4679-3715 19, Kyoto str., Kyiv, 02156, Ukraine

IVASHCHENKO Daria senior lecturer at the Department of International Public Law of the Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics
E-mail: ivashchenko.daria@gmail.com
 ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4123-6821 19, Kyoto str., Kyiv, 02156, Ukraine

MISHCHUK Kseniia K&C Media group, senior project manager
E-mail: ksmishchuk@gmail.com
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4596-2997 11, Herbu Szreniawa str., Warsaw, 02972, Poland

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND ITS ROLE IN GLOBAL SECURITY POLICY MAINTENANCE

Globalization sets up a new range of rules and principles, under which the global system should work. The 21st century can be considered as an era of new approaches and concepts in the international relations. Security on both national and international levels needs more comprehensive study. The article examines the role of international organizations on the background of globalization and gives guidelines for the further development of their structure.

Keywords: international organization, globalization, international law, global security, international relations.

Гончарова Ю., Иващенко Д., Мишчук К. Международные организации и их роль в поддержке глобальной политики безопасности. Глобализация устанавливает новый спектр правил и принципов, по которым должна работать глобальная система. XXI век можно рассматривать как эру новых подходов и концепций в международных отношениях. Безопасность как на национальном, так и на международном уровнях требует всестороннего изучения. Рассмотрена роль международных организаций в утверждении глобальной политики безопасности на фоне глобализации и даны рекомендации по дальнейшему развитию её структуры.

Ключевые слова: международная организация, глобализация, международное право, глобальная безопасность, международные отношения.

Background. Nowadays, the process of globalization has become inevitable. In his opening address to the fifty third Annual DPI/NGO Conference the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan stated: «It has been said that arguing against globalization is like arguing against the law of gravity» [1] Thus, the time shows that globalization has no limits and cannot be stopped once it has begun so successfully. Today, international community has to face changes in the various spheres of life, including,

economy, politics, environment, health, culture and security. The emergence of interdependence forces states to take into account not only the national interests but also the concerns of others. Globalization sets up a new range of rules and principles, under which the global system should work.

Analysis of the researches and publications. The issue is widely highlighted both by international legal acts such as General Assembly, OSCE and World Summits documentation. Moreover a wide range of works of international scientists is devoted to the problem of international organizations and their role in global security policy maintenance such as Glenda Sluga, Moritz P. Moelle, Yoram Z. Haftel, Stephanie C. Hofmann [2–4].

The **aim** of article is to examine the role of the international organizations on the background of globalization and give guidelines for the further development of their structure.

Materials and methods. The normative basis of the study is international treaties, documentation of the UN, OSCE, NATO World Summits and UNPD. The methodological basis of the research is the general methods of scientific knowledge as well as those used in legal science: methods of analysis and synthesis, formal-logical, comparative legal, statistical, etc.

Results. There are several major changes in the international relations. Before the occurrence of the Second World War the international system was operating in the environment of anarchy, while the Cold War created the conditions for the bipolarity. However, the post-Cold War period allowed the emergence of multipolarity. In other words, globalization transforms the way the world power is distributed around the globe. Even the smallest states became involved in the decision-making and the global process, in which every voice is louder and has value. The powerful states cannot ignore the interests of the minor neighbors because of the emerging ties between the countries. There is no place for the small alliances. In turn, states need to cooperate on the global level and have partners as much as possible in order to successfully develop its economic policies. Thus, the global power is no longer concentrated in the narrow circle of the influential states.

Secondly, the importance of the internal conflicts shifts from the state to the international level. International community cannot stay apparent to the human sufferings and civil conflicts inside the country. Furthermore, the state government is often unable to solve the internal problems without the interference from the outside. Thus, the concept of international responsibility emerges. For instance, in 2001 International Commission on State and Sovereignty proposed the notion of Responsibility to Protect (R2P). R2P transforms the notion of state sovereignty and gives a new meaning to it. Before, the concept of sovereignty was seen as the supreme power of the government over its internal and external policies without any interference from the other state. Today, sovereignty is widely considered as a responsibility of the state to protect its citizens and to maintain their welfare. However, if the state government is unable to promote such responsibility, it shifts to the international community. The latter can use all the appropriate measures in

order to eliminate the mass atrocities and protect the lives of civilians. Furthermore, the internal conflict becomes the center of the world attention due to the mass media and spread of information through the international organizations. The matter of concern for the one state has also become the challenge for the other. The internal conflicts cannot avoid the reflection and response from the international community. The only difference is the way the world responds to the particular conflict.

Thirdly, the globalization has raised the value of the international organizations. As it was mentioned before, the emergence of multipolarity forces the states to create an appropriate form of friendly environment. The anarchy in the international relations shifted to the emergence of global governance. The latter is promoted through the intergovernmental intentional organizations, for instance, the United Nations. Moreover, globalization has become the main catalyst for the spread of different IGOs and NGOs and the increase in the number of their members. IGOs and NGOs play the role of instruments, arenas and main actors in the maintenance of balance in the international relations in the today's global environment.

As it was mentioned before, the emerging ties between the states force them to be involved in different spheres. The issue of security has become one of the most relevant spheres of global cooperation. The dramatic events of the first half of 20th century transformed the notion of security and shifted it to the international level. From the very beginning, the security was considered from the perspective of the one state. However, today, security is seen as a global responsibility of every state to maintain the peace and stability in the whole world.

Furthermore, modern world created conditions for the emergence of the new challenges, which cannot be faced by the state alone. Such challenges include the environmental protection, global warming and international terrorism, rise of ethnic and religious conflicts, nuclear weapons, incurable diseases and world economic crisis. Modern challenges and dangers do not fit the state borders. They need the coherent and efficient response from the international community. Therefore, the new theoretical approaches like collective security, human security and securitization occurred.

The post-world wars period was marked by the emergence of the international security system. The latter embraces the creation of international law, in particular, international criminal and humanitarian law, and the emergence of new international organizations. International or global security obliges the states to conduct according to the internationally recognized rules and principles. Even though, there are no effective measures to force the states to act according to those rules and principles, still states realized that cooperation is much more effective than confrontation.

In order to identify the role of international organizations for the global security policy, firstly, it is needed to describe the notion of security and its transformation; secondly, to find the roots of international security and conditions under which it has emerged; thirdly, to find out the relations

between the IOs and security; finally, to sum up with the evidences of the increasing role of the international organizations in the issue of global security.

The 21st century can be considered as an era of new approaches and concepts in the international relations. Security on both national and international levels needs more comprehensive study. Modern threats are much more dangerous and can lead to the disastrous consequences on the global environment. The development of the technologies along with the erasing borders opens the way for the spread of threats all over the world. This fact stimulated the reproach of the security. Thus, the rapid development of security studies allows following the transformation and broadening of the security notion. Today, the concept of security can be observed from two completely different perspectives. The first refers to the traditional notion of security, while the second definition is developed as a critical approach. Traditional notion of security was created by the proponents of realism and neorealism. In turn, the critical approach was developed by the Copenhagen school of security studies. Thus, today, the concept of security is much broader than in the previous century.

The notion of international security is a creation of the second half of the 20th century. Before, the concept of security was considered in the context of national or state security. In turn, the latter has its roots in the 17th century. In 1648 the Peace of Westphalia determined the creation of future world order. Westphalian world order embraced two main principles – the principle of sovereignty and non-intervention. The states existed in the anarchic environment, in which the national interests had always a primary position. Prior to the Second World War, the anarchy dominated in the international relations. The existed environment allowed to create a traditional notion of security, which puts the state and its nation to the center: «A nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values if it wished to avoid war and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war». Walter Lippmann considers the notion of security from the point of view of the particular nation, which should protect its self-identity and core values. He sees the external threat, but ignores the existence of the internal conflicts which can be sometimes much more violent than foreign aggression [5].

Moreover, the Westphalian order allowed the theory of realism to dominant the international relations. Realism, which was widely promoted by Hans Mongenthau [6], put the emphasis on the state existence and its interests. The state should be perpetuated by any possible means and tools. From the realist perspective, the concept of security refers to the military capability of the state and its capacity to confront any external aggression: «The international system was viewed as a rather brutal arena in which states would seek to achieve their own security at the expense of their neighbors» [7]. Even the creation of the League of Nations after the First World War became the failed attempt to shift the way international relations were conducted from realism to idealism. The founder of neorealism Kenneth

Waltz in his Theory of International Relations describes the security as the «highest end of the state». For him the security is the equal to the survival, while the latter is the guarantor of the state's welfare: «Only if survival is assured can states seek such other goals as tranquility, profit, and power» [8]. Thus, the security from the realist perspective can be considered as a state centric concept.

Furthermore, the dominance of the realism on the international scene spread the idea of security dilemma. This term was created by the German scholar John Herz. He argues that in anarchic society states are afraid of being attacked by others. Therefore, they accumulate power and constantly increase their military capacity. However, such defensive measures may lead to the false impression of offensive intentions and force the other state to accumulate power in the same way: «In turn, renders the others more insecure and compels them to prepare for the worst. Since none can ever feel entirely secure in such a world of competing units, power competition ensues, and the vicious circle of security and power accumulation is on» [6, p. 157]. Thus, the Westphalian world order put the emphasis on the state security, leaving aside any attempt to cooperate in order to avoid wars. In turn, states were ready to face the threat and to begin the military campaign against the other country instead of maintaining a peace and stability in the global environment.

The changing point occurred after the Second World War, which embodied the whole scale of human suffering. Even though, the war was conducted mostly on the European ground, the whole world felt the consequences of it. The end of the Second World War marked the beginning of the new security concepts and approaches. The international community realized its responsibility to maintain the world peace and stability. Thus, there were two possible ways to create a new world order, in which every state would try to guarantee its non-aggressive behavior and secure its own citizens. The first way was the further development and recognition of the international criminal and humanitarian law. Moreover, it was supported by the increased importance of the human rights. The center of attention was shifted from the state to the individual. Human life was recognized as the highest value. The responsibility of every state was to secure the civilians and promote their welfare. Thus, for the first time, the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights put the emphasis on the protection of people.

The other way, which could be used to allow the new world order to emerge, was the creation of international organizations, in particular United Nations and NATO. Both of these organizations were aimed to avoid the new world war and the same scale of human suffering, which was experienced in the first half of 20th century. Even the failure with the League of Nations could not prevent the international attempt to face the future threats.

However, the development of Cold War temporarily shifted attention of the world from the issues of international security and protection of human rights to the possible emergence of a third world war. The newly established international organizations could not operate under the conditions

of bipolar world, where two super powers divided the spheres of influences. Till the 1990s the minor states did not have any voice in the international arena. The states like Korea, Vietnam and Afghanistan became the battle grounds for the Soviet Union and the US to show their military capacities. Only the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union returned the issue of the international security to the agenda.

The whole historical process of the second half of 20th century created completely new vision of the security notion. Firstly, international community realized the importance of the security studies. One of the major determinates for the development of this particular field of studies was the occurrence of humanitarian crisis in Yugoslavia, Rwanda and Somali. The end of the Cold War was the perfect time for the reemergence of the international organizations and increase in their power. However, international community, embodied in the UN, failed to respond in coherent and efficient manner to the events of 1990s. Therefore, firstly, security needed a new broader interpretation. Secondly, it had to be adopted into the work of international organizations as the major actors in a new world order.

The development of security studies allowed the creation of completely new visions of the issue. The traditional realistic approach transformed into the theory of global or collective security. Furthermore, the state centric security changed into the concept of human security, in which human life received much more value than the interests of the country. The broader interpretation of the security studies was proposed by the professor of international relations Barry Buzan. His book *People, States and fear; the national security problem in international relations* became the incentive for the development of the Copenhagen school. The latter adopted a critical approach towards the notion of security and tries to broaden its traditional vision. Considering the issue of security Buzan states: «in the case of security, the discussion is about the pursuit of freedom from threat. When this discussion is in the context of the international system, security is about the ability of states and societies to maintain their independent identity and their functional integrity». Buzan divides security to three different levels, in particular, individual, state and international. Furthermore, he adds new sectors to the notion of security, for instance, the political, military economic societal and environmental (Stone 2009). Thus, Buzan broadens the scopes of security studies [9].

The notion of international security revived the aspirations of collective security, which were promoted by the League of Nations Covenant and give the incentive for the development of new concepts, for instance, the human security. Today, the collective security is embodied in the Responsibility to Protect doctrine, which was adopted by the UN in 2005 World Summit Outcome document. R2P recognizes the responsibility of the every state to protect its citizens. however, when is unable to follow its obligations, the whole responsibility shifts to the international community, embodied in the UN, which can «use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means,

in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter, to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity» (Article 139 Outcome Document 2005). In turn, the concept of human security was introduced and broadly described in the Human Development Report issued by the UN Development Programme (UNDP) in 1994. Human Security recognizes the human life as the highest value and put it in prior to the principles of state sovereignty and non-interventions. Besides that, UNDP document identifies the new areas of threat which include the economic, food, health, personal, and political (UNDP 1994) [10]. Human security concept was constructed under the several determinants, including, the end of the Cold War, emergence of the new democratic states, mass atrocities in Balkans and Africa, and finally revived importance of human rights protection. As with the case of R2P, human security shifts the main interests from the state to its citizens. It contradicts the principles of realism, putting the state actions under question if they threaten the well-being of people: «The traditional security discourse has changed in line with the idea of human security from military conflict between sovereign states towards the well-being of citizens within states». Thus, new security concepts give a way for the further development of international cooperation in the sphere of peace and stability building [11].

Conclusion. With the emergence of completely new vision of security and with the rapid development of security studies, it became obvious that states cannot deal with the new challenges alone. There are several determinants that prevent the states to be in isolationist position and force them to abide the rules of new world order. Firstly, today international relations are conducted according to the existing international law. Therefore, the actions or inactivity of the states can lead to the responsibility before the international community and some sorts of sanctions. Secondly, the notion of security was broaden as a response to new threats: «Current threats to world peace are manifold and enduring: the continued presence of nuclear weapons in countries with political instability; the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to non-superpower states; indigenous Third World disputes; intra-state, trans border conflict; and ecological threats to security» [12]. All these issues have to be covered by the whole international community. The process of globalization erased the borders. Therefore, every internal crisis became the global issue. For instance, the Arab Spring was followed by the destabilization of the whole Middle East region and further militarization of the conflict in Syria. Furthermore, today's conflict in Ukraine involves the security issues of the whole Europe and post-soviet states. The multipolarity needs the coherent and strong global government. The latter cannot be effective without the international organizations. Finally, the experience of wars and interventions prevent the powerful states to take the full responsibility for maintaining peace. For instance, the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the war on terror prevented the US to take the leadership in the 2011 Libyan intervention. In turn, the US had a supportive role. Thus, the modern

environment created a chain in which global government, new world order and international organizations make the system workable and stable.

Nowadays, the issue of security is covered by the global and powerful intergovernmental organizations that include the UN, NATO, OSCE, Interpol and law enforcement organizations, for instance, International Criminal Court and International Court of Justice. The global security is one of the most important and relevant issues in the modern environment. Therefore, IOs permanently develop the tools and measures to overcome the modern threats.

The United Nations is «the major IGO at present concerned with international peace and security» [13]. The UN acts according to its Charter, which identifies the maintenance of peace as the main goal of the organization (1 Article 1945). Furthermore, the UN has the whole dimension of tools to prevent or react to the existing threats, including the mechanisms of preventive measures, peacekeeping missions, peacebuilding capacity, countering terrorism and disarmament. All these issues are covered by the special offices, for instance the Peacebuilding Commission and office for Disarmament Affairs. Chapter VII of the UN Charter affirms the authority of UN Security Council in the security matters. Security Council can use different measures, including sanctions and interventions, in order to maintain peace and stability. The doctrine of R2P, which was mentioned before, recognizes the Security Council as the only legitimate authority that can implement it. Thus, today, UN plays the role of global authority in the issues of international security.

Security issues in the global and regional levels have become the part of NATO and OSCE. NATO became the strong promoter of western values. The end of the Cold War threatened the existence of NATO, because the major threat of that time had disappeared. However, in 21st century NATO has to revive its security role on the global level. For instance, in 2011 NATO led the humanitarian intervention in Libya. Moreover, the emerging threat from Russia forces NATO to rebuild its capacity and guarantee the security for the western and central Europe. In turn, OSCE with 57 participating states is one of the largest organizations in the world in the sphere of security. Creation of the forum for the considerations is the main function of OSCE. It covers the different dimensions of security, including, the «arms control, terrorism, good governance, energy security, human trafficking, democratization, media freedom and minority rights» [13]. Today, its missions are involved in conflict in Ukraine, even though, its role there is rather contradictory issue.

ICC and ICJ are the law enforcement bodies, which functions as independent actors in the international relations. Both of them are involved in litigations concerning the crimes against humanity, war crimes, mass atrocities, human rights violations. Furthermore, they play the preventive role, increasing the value of the international law.

There are several determinants that create the environment in which global security cannot be maintained without the international organizations. Firstly, the end of the Cold War aspired the development of security studies and emergence of a broaden notion of the security. Secondly, the new world order needs the existence of the strong global governance. The latter is

ineffective without the special arenas, which are embodied in IOs. The UN continues to follow its role of the main peace maintaining and stability building body. Modern threats cannot be overcome without the global cooperation, which is possible only on the level of IOs. The process of globalization strengthens the ties between the states and creates the conditions of interdependence. There are no longer internal conflicts, as they have reflections on the international level. International community cannot stay apparent to the security threats. Therefore, globalization strengthens the role of the international organizations and gives a strong incentive for the further development of their structure. Thus, today, IOs are the main actors in the international security.

REFERENCES

1. Annan, Kofi (2006). Address to DPI/NGO conference, World Summit, viewed 17 April 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/dpi/ngosection/annualconfs/53/sg-address.html> [in English].
2. Glenda, Sluga (2019). *Remembering 1919: international organizations and the future of international order*. International Affairs. (Vol. 95). Is. 1, 1 January, (pp. 25-43) [in English].
3. Moritz P., Moelle (2017). *The International Responsibility of International Organisations: Cooperation in Peacekeeping Operations*, Cambridge University Press. (Vol. 31). Is. 3, (pp. 734-739) [in English].
4. Rivalry and Overlap: Why Regional Economic Organizations Encroach on Security Organizations, Yoram Z. Haftel, Stephanie C. Hofmann, 2019. Retrieved from https://scholars.huji.ac.il/sites/default/files/yoramhaftel/files/hh_rivalry_and_overlap_jcr_final_jan_2019_ssrn.pdf [in English].
5. Herz, John (1950). Idealist internationalism and the security dilemma. *World Politics*. (Vol. 2), 2, (pp.157-180) [in English].
6. Hans, J. (1985). Morgenthau and Kenneth Thompson, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 6th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill [in English].
7. Baylis, John (2008). International and global security in the post-cold war era. In Baylis, Smith, and Owens ed. *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations*. London: Oxford University Press [in English].
8. UN General Assembly, 2005. World Summit Outcome Document, A/Res/60/1. Retrieved from <http://www.refworld.org/docid/44168a910.html> [in English].
9. Buzan, Barry (1983). *People, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*. Chappel Hill: University of North Carolina Press [in English].
10. OSCE, 2014. «What is the OSCE», OSCE official web site, viewed 20 April 2015. [http://www.osce.org/secretariat/35775?download=trueStone; 112. Marriane, 2009. «Security according to Buzan: a comprehensive security analysis». *Security discussion paper series*. \(Vol. 1\). Retrieved from \[http://www.geest.msh-paris.fr/IMG/pdf/Security_for_Buzan.mp3.pdf\]\(http://www.geest.msh-paris.fr/IMG/pdf/Security_for_Buzan.mp3.pdf\) \[in English\].](http://www.osce.org/secretariat/35775?download=trueStone; 112. Marriane, 2009. «Security according to Buzan: a comprehensive security analysis». Security discussion paper series. (Vol. 1). Retrieved from http://www.geest.msh-paris.fr/IMG/pdf/Security_for_Buzan.mp3.pdf)
11. Gottwald, Marlene (2012). Humanizing Security? The EU's responsibility to protect in the Libyan Crisis. *FIIA Working Paper 75*. Retrieved from http://www.fiaa.fi/en/publication/261/humanizing_security [in English].
12. Archer, Clive (2001). *International organizations*. New York: Routledge [in English].
13. UNDP, 1994. *New Dimensions of Human Security*, Human Development Report. New York: Oxford University Press [in English].

Articles submitted to editor office of 30.01.2019.

Гончарова Ю., Іващенко Д., Міщук К. Міжнародні організації та їх роль у підтримці глобальної політики безпеки.

Постановка проблеми. Глобалізація встановлює новий спектр правил і принципів, які керують глобальною системою. XXI століття можна розглядати як еру нових підходів і концепцій у міжнародних відносинах. Безпека як на національному, так і на міжнародному рівнях вимагає всебічного вивчення.

Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій. Питання діяльності міжнародних організацій широко висвітлено у правових актах міжнародних організацій та дослідженнях зарубіжних вчених.

Метою статті є вивчення ролі міжнародних організацій у підтримці глобальної системи безпеки.

Методологічною основою дослідження є загальні методи наукового знання, а також методи, що використовуються в юридичній науці: аналізу та синтезу, формально-логічні, порівняльно-правові, статистичні та ін.

Результати дослідження. У міжнародних відносинах у XX–XXI ст. відбулися серйозні зміни: до початку Другої світової війни міжнародна система діяла в умовах анархії, тоді як холодна війна створила умови для біполярності. Тобто глобалізація змінила спосіб, у який світова сила розподілилася по всьому світу. Навіть найменші держави стали залучатися до прийняття рішень і глобального процесу, в якому кожен голос має значення. Потужні держави не можуть ігнорувати інтереси сусідів, які є не настільки економічно розвиненими. Глобальна влада більше не зосереджена у вузькому колі впливових держав.

Міжнародне співтовариство не може бути осторонь людських страждань і громадянських конфліктів усередині будь-якої країни, а державна влада, у свою чергу, часто не в змозі вирішити внутрішні проблеми без втручання ззовні. З огляду на це, Міжнародною комісією з питань державного суверенітету у 2001 р. запропоновано поняття відповідальності за захист (R2P). Концепція R2P, що надає новий зміст поняттю державного суверенітету, який раніше розглядався як вища влада уряду над її внутрішньою та зовнішньою політикою без будь-якого втручання з боку іншої держави, сьогодні розглядається як відповідальність держави за захист своїх громадян і збереження їхнього добробуту. Однак, якщо державна влада не в змозі нести таку відповідальності, вона звертається до міжнародного співтовариства, що може використовувати всі відповідні заходи для ліквідації масових злочинів і захисту життя цивільних осіб.

Висновки. Держави у сучасному глобалізованому світі поодиночі не здатні протистояти новим викликам, не можуть перебувати в ізоляціоністській позиції і змушені дотримуватися правил нового світового порядку, оскільки, по-перше, їх дії або бездіяльність можуть призвести до відповідальності перед міжнародним співтовариством, а по-друге, поняття безпеки розширено як відповідь на різноманітні та стійкі загрози: постійна наявність ядерної зброї у країнах з політичною нестабільністю; розповсюдження зброї масового ураження недержавними утвореннями; спори корінного третього світу; внутрішньодержавний, транскордонний конфлікт; екологічні загрози безпеці. Оскільки глобалізація стирає кордони, кожна внутрішня криза стає глобальною проблемою. Мультиполярність потребує послідовного і сильного глобального уряду, який не може бути ефективним без міжнародних організацій, зокрема, ООН, НАТО, ОБСЄ, Інтерпол та таких правоохоронних організацій, як, наприклад, Міжнародний кримінальний суд та Міжнародний суд. Глобальна безпека – одне з найбільш важливих і актуальних питань у сучасних умовах, тому міжнародні організації постійно розробляють інструменти та заходи для подолання сучасних загроз.

Ключові слова: міжнародна організація, глобалізація, міжнародне право, глобальна безпека, міжнародні відносини.