



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень



Memorandum

**Lessons from the Ukrainian Crisis –
New Approaches to Security Policy
(Global, National, and Regional Levels)**

**Kiev
2014/June**



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

MEMORANDUM

LESSONS FROM THE UKRAINIAN CRISIS: NEW APPROACHES TO SECURITY POLICIES (GLOBAL, NATIONAL, REGIONAL LEVELS)

I. The Ukrainian crisis as a global challenge

The civil and political conflict in Ukraine, which resulted in armed confrontation with the active participation and direct interference of the Russian Federation testifies the outdated system of international and national security.

The immediate consequences of the undeclared war of a new type (“hybrid war” with the use of the technology of encouraging internal “molecular conflicts”) are:

- annexation of Crimea (occupation and illegal incorporation into the Russian Federation);
- destabilization of the Eastern and Southern regions of Ukraine and incitement to secession from Ukraine (armed conflicts involving intelligence services and military mercenaries of foreign origin, mainly from the Russian Federation, proclamation of new states and attempts to make illegitimate change to the constitutional system of Ukraine);
- disregard for and the actual breakdown in the performance of all the regulatory and contractual framework of the Ukraine-Russia bilateral



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

relations unilaterally by Russia (first and foremost, the treaty of friendship and cooperation between Ukraine and the Russian Federation);

- initiation of an information war against Ukraine, with an unprecedented scale of fraud and innuendo;
- discredit of the existing international-agreement basis, that was to assure the safety and integrity of Ukraine (borders, non-interference in internal affairs, economic security, etc.). In effect, the 1994 Budapest Memorandum, which guaranteed security of Ukraine provided by nuclear countries, has been annulled; undermining of the non-proliferation regime;
- occurrence of a real threat of trans-regionalization of conflicts, spreading of hostilities to other countries (primarily, Ukraine's neighbors), destabilization of the border areas, enhancement of separatist processes and ultimately – emergence of a serious threat to the security of countries in Central Europe and the Black Sea regions.

AR Crimea has become a kind of “testing ground” for the application of new warfare approaches. The Russian Federation has demonstrated a wide range of advanced post-industrial tactics. The Russian Federation has deployed an integrated information-advocacy system of influence both in the Ukrainian information space and the global information environment. In fact, a kind of cultural and psychological aggression has taken place, aimed at the destruction of national identity, formation of local identity through the manipulation of historical, cultural and political-ideological stereotypes. Ukraine's territory was technically captured by means of a “raiders” method, regular troops without distinctive features, undercover paramilitary groups with the assistance of the Crimean comprador leadership and related criminal groups. The citizens of Ukraine, with disregard for their



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

freedom and rights, through a manipulative pseudo-referendum, have been turned into “enslaved people”, whose nationality is determined externally, by violent means. Human rights, ownership rights have been violated, the basics of self-government have been ignored and the sovereignty and integrity of Ukraine has been flagrantly violated. In general, the campaign against Ukraine had a military-psychological character, and the strategy of transformation of the Ukrainian statehood externally does not have a geopolitical character, but a geo-cultural one. Attempts to use these methods are evident in the southern and eastern regions of Ukraine.

For Ukraine, the main threat from continuing the “hybrid war” with Russia lies in the possible destruction of the national community as a consolidated society, creation of phantom identities hostile towards each other (internal “molecular” conflicts) with the possible collapse of the country into several artificial, conflicting state formations.

As a result of the world community's reaction and imposed sanctions against RF the Russian Federation faces the threat of international isolation.

In turn, the world community is forced to seek answers to new challenges – the beginning of a second Cold War, the “race for arms”, the uncontrolled expansion of countries that are becoming armed with nuclear weapons, the break out of new local and regional armed conflicts.

Armed conflicts in Ukraine and the RF's undeclared military and information-psychological aggression towards Ukraine, its population and territory, destabilize the European security space and world order in general, creating a potential hazard of a “Hot” world war.

The situation, that has arisen precisely in Ukraine and around it, has become obvious evidence of the deep crisis of international institutions



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

designed to prevent aggression, as well as the weakness and vulnerability of the entire system of global security.

The international legal framework - from the UN Charter to bilateral treaties, has been violated without any tangible consequences for the offending side. The ineffectiveness of the UN Security Council, OSCE, NATO in their attempts to resolve the situation, the limited tools of influence on the aggressor-state have revealed the helplessness of the existing international security institutions.

The “right of force” has once again become a more effective factor than the principles and norms of international law, the humanistic foundation of the development of international relations. It has become apparent that regardless of the declared and collectively approved rules and regulations of ensuring international and national security, the sovereignty, social and territorial integrity of a country, which is not protected by “nuclear arguments”, remain vulnerable and are not secured by any international legal guarantees.

It should be noted that signs of the ineffectiveness of the existing global security system have been manifested since the crisis and the collapse of the former Yugoslavia, wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, conflicts in Libya, Syria, etc. An alarming signal was the stagnant reaction of the international community to **the 2008 intervention of Russia in Georgia**, where new means of warfare were widely used - massive disinformation, special operations, provocations, employment of separatists and mercenaries to achieve political



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

goals of the war.

But for the first time in recent history the ineffectiveness of the international security system could lead to armed conflicts on a global scale, between high-tech countries.

President Putin's speech on the occasion of the annexation of Crimea to Russia on March 18, 2014 symbolized the virtual end of the existing old world order, that had been stagnant for nearly a quarter of a century.

Essentially, the creation process of new international rules of the game has begun. And the annexation of the Ukrainian Crimea and the subsequent events in the East of Ukraine are its catalyst.

Ukraine must find a way to effectively resolve the armed conflicts, that have unfolded in the East regions (*above all, in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions*). At the same time, the development of events will largely depend on the stand of RF and the consolidated policy of the international community. The slower and weaker the response, the more active and aggressive will Russia's attempt to reformat the Ukrainian (and therefore – all of the Central European) space to fit its interests be.



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

II. From “security of existence ” to “security of development”

1. A peaceful settlement of the postwar world: security of the existing order (security of existence)

The result of the postwar settlement in the world after the Second World War was the realization of the necessity of cooperation between countries in ensuring peace and security, the resolution of pressing international problems and conflicts through non-military means. The United Nations Organization (UN), with the Charter approved in April 1945, became a global instrument for peacekeeping. The idea behind the association is not only to guarantee peace, but also to create conditions preventing aggression.

The destruction of the colonial system and the emergence of new nation-states on the world map increased the role and importance of the United Nations.

In accordance with the Charter the governing bodies of the UN are the General Assembly – an assembly of all UN members at an annual convocation, where each country has one vote, and the Security Council consisting of 5 permanent members (USSR, USA, the United Kingdom, France and China) and 6 non-permanent ones, elected by the General Assembly. The Security Council obtained the right to sanctions, blockade and the use of force against an aggressor. Each of the permanent members of the Security Council had the veto power with respect to any decision, that was not consistent with his/her best interests. In reality, the right to veto meant that the Security Council could not take any actions against the activities of one of their permanent members.



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

Another consequence of the post-war settlement became the **bipolar world**, with the dominance of USA and USSR. This world was confrontational, with clear boundary lines, spheres of influence.

The state of the Cold War was the natural order of existence in this world. On the one hand - the U.S. and its allies, calling for the unification of all the democratic forces of the world, on the other - the totalitarian USSR and pro-Soviet regimes.

Correspondingly, military alliances were set up - NATO (established in 1949) and the Warsaw Pact (1955 year). The coexistence of these blocs in the Cold War conditions was based on a policy of mutual "military" deterrence through a "race for arms". The means of this deterrence were military nuclear potential, the development of other weapons of mass destruction (chemical, biological), increase of the overall military potential, subversive activities by special services, propaganda.

The Caribbean crisis of 1962, that put the world on the brink of a global nuclear conflict and demonstrated the dangers of a bipolar security model, became the culmination of the Cold War.

The lessons of the Caribbean crisis and "race for arms", that exhausted the country's economic potential, made the world's major players take gradual steps in mutual arms control and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (*in regards to which a number of agreements were signed, including the 1968 agreement on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons*). The way out of the crisis for the bipolar model required the parties, as mutual guarantees to stop the "pursuit of arms" and a gradual decrease in total military potential, as well



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

as a more coordinated interaction in the introduction of new high-technology military potentials, limitations in the development and application of non-nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

The improvement in the international climate and the overcoming of the crisis processes in the global economy spurred economic integration processes: it allowed to speed up the transnationalization of global economy, stimulated further technological breakthroughs in leading high-tech spheres - microelectronics, space technology, communication. In particular, the improvement of conditions for economic development was accompanied by the active development of the established European Single Market as a basis for the future European Union.

Political and security conditions for peaceful coexistence and development were designed to be provided by the **Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe** 1972 (CSCE). The purpose of the member states was to determine international standards of conduct of all state-parties, in particular in the political and military spheres, respect for human rights and freedom. In 1975 the Helsinki Final Act was adopted, which virtually completed the formation of the postwar world on the principals of inviolability of borders and peaceful coexistence.

Thus, the post-war peace settlement was in line with the objective of a peaceful coexistence and interaction of states within their national territories. The essence of "security" came down to non-infringement of borders, sovereignty, preventing hostilities between the parties of the Helsinki Act.

Undoubtedly, the progressive for those circumstances move by the



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

opposing parties stimulated economic progress, laid the foundation for future rapid globalization of the world economy and the formation of a new global division of labor, accelerated macro-regional economic integration. At the same time, it nullified the possibility of further globalization, as under the conditions of intense competition for promising new markets and the resource of traditional military force politics, limited by obligations, it began to be substituted by more flexible means - cultural and information “war”, the active use of special operations, in particular, to encourage inner “molecular conflicts”. The stiff old order of balance of interests, embodied in the 70's of the 20th century, began to crumble. Accordingly, the security mechanisms did not meet the needs of rapid global development.



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

2. Attempts to form a new security paradigm. “New mentality”

The beginning of the reforms in the 80's in the former USSR, caused by economic hardships as a result of the “race for arms” led to the gradual destruction of the bipolar world.

Postcolonial countries, the so-called “third world”, significantly increased the number of subjects requiring their place in the global system. The economic system was gradually recovering from the effects of the Cold War, the international markets were on the revive. In the context of global transformations attempts were made to create models of collective management of development, a shift from “force politics” with its antagonistic world order.

The concept of “new political thinking/mentality” is introduced in the paradigm of the future development of international relations and the security sector, which means joint development based on universal values. The world is recognized to be interdependent, global threats to development and stability – mutual. These include economic, social and environmental problems that require combined efforts. The project of a new, multi-polar and secure world order was created through the contributions of Mikhail Gorbachev, Ronald Reagan, Rajiv Gandhi, Helmut Kohl.

*In international documents the new political mentality is reflected in the US-India **Delhi Declaration** on the Principles of a nuclear weapon free and non-violent world (New Delhi, November 27, 1986). Subsequently, in M. Gorbachev's speech to the UN General*



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

*Assembly December 7, 1988 a proposal was formulated to build a new world order based on universal values and non-use of force and ideological approaches. This gave rise to a **debate in the UN** on a new concept of world building, reflected in the **Charter of Paris**. U.S. President Ronald Reagan defined the new approaches to global development as the “beginning of a “new era”.*

The global architecture of the new era of security was based on **new principles, conditioned by the logic of progress**. These include - common values, a nuclear-free world, disarmament, a shift from a bipolar world to a world of global partnership. A human being, a human life and human rights have been acknowledged as the greatest values. Peaceful coexistence presumed the abandoning of all weapons of mass destruction, which made wars that threatened the existence of civilization impossible. Conditions were created for each country to have a free choice of a development model.

A romantic perception of the “new era” as the new global era, where the ideal of freedom triumphed, in the early 90's of the twentieth century was depicted in Fukuyama Francis's reflections about the future of the world (“The End of History”).

However, the subsequent processes in the USSR, Central Europe, the Middle East and Asia changed the balance of power and forced the postponement of plans for a new world. With the collapse of the USSR and radical changes in Europe (*the unification of Germany, the disintegration of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia*) the old order, which was based on the policy of disarmament and the 1975 Helsinki obligations, was virtually destroyed,



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

whereas the rules and obligations became purely nominal. The CSCE, which was transformed into OSCE, failed to become the basis of a common European security system.

New states and new borders required recognition.

Military conflicts took place in Asia (Iraq, Afghanistan), the Middle East. Their resolution was from a position of strength. The strategy of “containment of development” was being more actively applied in regard to new developing countries.

The dramatic changes in the post-soviet space and Central and Eastern Europe intensified competition for influence on the continent and virtually put a stop to the global dialogue of the future of a balanced world order. New conflicts and new threats to stability, above all in Europe, resulted in the urgency of going back to the old, post-war security paradigm - “security of existence”.

After the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the disappearance of the Soviet Union from the world map, the United States of America became the established geopolitical and geo-economic world leader. The bipolar world was replaced by a unipolar one - “Pax Americana”, the concept of which corresponded to the transition model of the world and new threats: the spread of terrorism, including islam, the militarization of the third world countries, the emergence of new “hot spots” in Africa.

The new, conflict paradigm of Samuel Huntington (“Conflict of civilizations”) was the most consistent one with the interests and needs of the renewed world order, although it



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

received criticism from the supporters of the “new mentality”. The ideologically simplified concept of the “war of civilizations” (just like the previous version of “democracy against communism”) allowed the leaders to find adequate justifications for their interests in other parts of the world, without violating the foundations of the adopted regulations of the integrity of national sovereignty, borders, etc.

Profound changes in the world order were delayed, the disarmament process was limited only to the reduction of arms, the reform of international institutions was frozen. The bloc system of military balance remained as an outline, as Russia and its allies, having created a new military alliance in the Eurasian region – CSTO, retained sufficient military capacity to oppose NATO. The algorithm of the Cold War gradually manifested itself as a “cool competition”, but with one important difference - the low capacity of the entire obsolete global security system.



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

3. The end of the postwar world order and demand for a new security architecture

The “Pax Americana” period was not lengthy. The global economic crisis that unfolded in the late twentieth century and continues to this day, was part of the systemic crisis of the unipolar world order and the unsolved problems of building a balanced development system - a multi-polar “new world order”. Therefore, the “new world order” process is developing spontaneously, with conflicts, with no orderly influence of international organizations.

The UN, OSCE proved to be outdated, unprepared to respond to the changes in the security situation. The reason for this in particular is the intellectual crisis of the elite, that was in thrall to old ideas and could not, unlike their predecessors - the world leaders of the 80's, offer the world a collective post-crisis development model.

An intensification in regional integration projects is witnessed with new projects being created - BRICS, SCO and Customs Union, discussions take place of a Euro-Atlantic economic community and others. Meanwhile, a number of new nation-states that emerged in the late twentieth century, found themselves outside of regional integration, with no strong public institutions, and poorly integrated into economic projects. They are localized and vulnerable, potentially causing the emergence of new centers of instability.

As a result, the transition to a multipolar world is based on the conflict separation into "worlds" - the Euro-Atlantic / European (*with a tendency to*



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

unify) - Russian-Eurasian - Pacific (*with a tendency of rapprochement with the Euro-Atlantic one*) - Islamic-Middle Eastern – South American. And this is only the beginning. The new centers of influence actively compete for development resources. In the conditions of full-scale globalization the struggle for territory is replaced by the struggle for social capital and on this basis - the redistribution of resources and territories.

More and more often, the control of access to resources is becoming a tool for achieving geopolitical goals. An increasing number of resources (*not just oil and natural gas*) are being used as external coercion leverage. “Energy” wars, restrictions on the export of strategic materials (*including rare-earth metals*), limited access to water resources, setting price controls (*the creation of new raw materials' cartels, etc.*) and manipulations in commodity markets became commonplace at the beginning of the XXI century.

The global information and communication space is gradually becoming a field of confrontation of forces that construct images of the future of humanity, using their own ideological tools for the creation of a new global world order.

This confrontation results in an ideological controversy between a liberal-libertarian and a national-conservative vision of social organization models. The ideology of the Washington Consensus and the opposing ideology of the Beijing Consensus as prospects of global development do not give a clear vision of the future of some countries, causing controversy in the humanitarian field. Motives and factors for confrontations actualize in the public and elite awareness. This leads to the destabilization of sociocultural



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

processes of individual countries and regions, destroys the foundations of traditional social balance and the integrity of the cultural codes of social interaction.

By means of global information tools the contradictions between the ideologies and models of global development are projected in the national information space, disintegrating them.

Under the circumstances of this disintegration new threats arise:

- social subjects destructive for the existing order (*network communities, information terrorists, hackers*);
- the spread of destructive sociocultural phenomena (*pornography, information piracy, antisocial and inhumane values*);
- cyber weapons are used as an instrument of maintaining economic struggle, undermining national security (*both informational and the functioning of the security sector – database, management system, etc.*).

These new phenomena and factors have a destructive affect on the socio-cultural notions of people, leading to delegitimization of historically stable structures of social interaction, which is the basis of social order in some nations and states.

As a result, anomie occurs in the political and legal organization of nation states, spontaneous processes of cultural localization unfold, social conflicts exacerbate on the historical, ethnic and socio-cultural basis.

Under the circumstances of a global ideological conflict the information and cultural security of national communities becomes a critical factor in their future existence, it becomes a challenge for the security of development,



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

collective and personal safety.

Conclusion:

With growing imbalances and contradictions accumulated in the global economy and international relations, new challenges arise on all levels: for global, regional and national security. The following global trends are considered the most dangerous ones:

- **exacerbation of conflict in international relations, particularly in the relationship between the “new” and “old” centers of global influence.** Efforts of the new centers of influence are intensifying to convert the growth of their economic power into military and political strength. These states strive to create their own geopolitical “dominance zones”, with limited presence of international players, including international security institutions. Following a long period of the internationalization of international relations management and delegation of sovereignty to the international level, a reverse process can be observed. The desire of some individual countries to reduce the scope of their international legal obligations is becoming more and more evident. In effect, there is a return to the “real politic” system of international relations, in which the main players are sovereign states and their political association, with an interaction based on “projections of forces”. Consequently, tension in the entire system of international relations is increasing. A large number of medium and small countries are under threat of “forced inclusion” into the “domination zone” of a



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

more powerful player.

– **revival of the bloc principle of maintaining security.** In the context of formal declarations of the abandonment of the bloc security principle the process of revitalization of existing alliances (NATO, CSTO) and the formation of promising military-political ones has begun. A tendency of a gradual transformation of regional economic “clubs” into stricter political association with a military component (EC, SOC) manifests itself. In this environment, the risks of a large-scale inter-bloc conflict significantly increase.

– **inefficiency of global, regional and national security systems, destruction of dialogue platforms.** Most of the existing international global and regional institutions of security maintenance (UN, OSCE) are outdated and are not adapted to the realities of a post-bipolar, furthermore, a multi-polar world. These institutions continued their existence in the post-bipolar world solely because the remaining pole was able to use them, what is more - in the ad hoc mode. In cases where legitimizing solutions failed to be provided (Yugoslavia 1999, Iraq 2003), this decision was virtually ignored. At the same time, the reform of international institutions and the emergence of new interactive platforms (G-20) was being delayed. Given the ineffectiveness of multilateral safety maintenance institutions and low dialogue efficiency, the wager is often placed on power methods, including military ones for implementing foreign-policy goals. A new round in the “race for arms”, the acute problem of expansion of the “nuclear club” countries is evidence of the crisis in the system of regulation. The likelihood of armed conflicts, including the use of weapons of mass destruction increases.



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

- **low regulatory effectiveness of international law.** The principle of decision making ad hoc destroyed the international-legal field of regulating conflicts. The practice of “double standards” is widely used and a very broad interpretation is given to the right of legitimate violence. The threat of failure to protect their legitimate interests in a legal way encourages small and medium states to seek more powerful guarantors of their safety, especially through participation in military-political blocs. The main risk is that in the environment of total disregard of legal principles and the low efficiency of security maintenance global structures, any conflict could lead to the “triggering” of bloc security guarantees. In the past twentieth century humanity faced the practical implications of this development of events twice.
- **complications, multifactorial nature of external challenges and threats to national security associated with new types of impact on society.** The main object of external aggression becomes the social organization of society as a whole, not just its political component (the actual state). In particular, there is an increase in the threat of social disruptions as a result of informative-propaganda influences, limitation of access to markets and resources and the strategic infrastructure.



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

III. New approaches to security policy

The ongoing conflicts, new types of wars (“hybrid”, “molecular” armed conflicts managed from outside) testify that within the new security policy the **humanitarian component** is in the foreground.

Geo-sociocultural strategies affect the security situation more than military instruments. “Geo-cultural worlds” destroy borders no less aggressively than once the geopolitical scenarios of physical redistribution did. Weak, unstable societies become victims of “molecular” armed conflicts, tactics of localizing certain social groups from a single community are used. The fight for Ukraine was just one of the episodes of this division.

The change of the security policy paradigm – from the “security of order” to “security of development” causes the objective. The struggle for resources focuses on the greatest asset – social. And the redistribution of natural resources, markets and lands occurs primarily through designed and managed transformation of social space, mental and cultural victories, the creation of complementary to the aggressor new communities.

Modern societies-nations are multicultural and open to informational influences - they are formed by various ethnic, subcultural and religious communities. This diversity is a source of both greater variety of productive forces, a source of innovations as well as a source of threats. In the absence of an effective policy of national unity, conditions are created for a cultural and informational aggression that leads to the disruption of political and legal order, embodied by the state power.

The target of aggression becomes the national unity of the population



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

around a fixed in the political-legal forms single social order of relations between groups of people that make up the national formation as a whole. This consolidation is achieved by creating a consensus through a dialogue on mental values, the carriers of which is the population. The tools for such consolidation are the means of information influence on public consciousness and conceptual impact on the experts. **The main objective of influence (aggression) are - rejection of social cohesion images, violation of the consensus model on the diversity of values and norms, that is actually present in any society.** This influence is carried out at the conceptual level by imposing the model of a monocultural or mono-ethnic state on the expert community, at the level of mass consciousness - through the absolutization of significance of the corresponding forms of social organization on the examples of antiquity or the present. The impossibility of a consensus leads to a rejection by the population of the prevailing social order, discarding the legitimation of laws and subjects of the political world. This creates a state of social life in which the rules of law and morality begin to contradict and mutually exclude one another.

This is accomplished through artificial selection of a certain value system as the most significant in terms of political governance practices and cultural development – i.e. *indoctrination* of one of the segments of a varied cultural field, according to which people that are united into a single nation live. Under these conditions, other value systems (which always co-exist in society) are marginalized and become the building material for alternative ideological constructs, that motivate the political activity of certain individuals



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

and their groups. For warfare an alternative version of historical memory is created, that is positioned by means of information influence as an example and a practical basis for solving any social contradictions.

Thus, the imposed on the conceptual level principle of construction of a **monocultural** national environment in today's society is becoming a threat to national unity and the basis of the localization and subsequent secession.

Given the impossibility of maintaining social order through direct violence against large groups of people the created artificial ideological split in society becomes both a condition for the delegitimization of the existing social order as well as the chaotisation of society in general. Specified on the basis of the alternative models of historical memory and symbolic means of presentation of images of social groups the models of political organization, oriented at foreign subjects, are the basis for constructing a new social order as a way out of chaos.

As a result, a new order of relations in society is formed, which is focused on the legitimacy of the influence of other subjects, and ultimately consolidating them in the political-legal forms of life of new society.

Nowadays the conditions of modern society maintenance are:

- the ability to see the cultural differences of various social groups;
- constructing a symbolic representation of the cultural interests of these groups in the political and legal process of national life;
- cultivating values of diversity and political practices oriented at a **dialogue** as the basis of social order.

Mechanically, by means of weapons and technology a state (territory,



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

population) can no longer be defended. There is demand for socio-cultural planning.

Conclusions:

1) The formation process of a new multipolar world order is taking place spontaneously, with conflicts, without the orderly influence of international organizations. The UN, OSCE proved to be unready to respond to the changes in the security situation. One reason for this is the intellectual crisis of the elites, who were in thrall to old ideas and were unable to offer the world a collective post-crisis development model.

2) The logic of world development requires the development of new principles and approaches to guarantee international security on the global, regional and national levels. In particular, under the present conditions the effectiveness of the new security system will be high, if along with the already established international principles and standards, that are reflected in the articles of the UN and the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, its activities are based **on the following principles:**

- **Imperativeness** (of international law) - strengthen the role of international law in the regulation of activities of all subjects of international relations by intensifying responsibility for violations of its standards (by expanding the "sanction" part of standards) and mandatory fulfillment of obligations by all parties of international-legal agreements;
- **Inclusiveness** (engagement) – an increase in the number of international relations players in the development and decision-making



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

process, directed at ensuring collective security;

- **Proportionality** – comparability of methods and practices of global use of force in case of threats and challenges that arise for the safety of each individual participant of international relations;
- **Responsibility personification** - ensuring penal responsibility for a country's leadership that makes deliberately wrongful decisions in relation to other subjects of international law;
- **Security of social development** - by expanding the regulatory functions of international law to the threats and challenges to social stability.

These principles can be put into practice in practical planes by taking the following measures:

At the conceptual level:

- **Affirmation of the “safety of development” concept**, based on the idea of creating and securing the conditions for a non-conflict development of society, state, intergovernmental union. At the national level “safety of development” implies society orientation at the harmonization of the social structure, the priority-driven development of the life support infrastructure, the creation of a single national humanitarian space that prevents internal cultural conflicts, the guarantee of high quality of life and the overcoming of antagonistic social inequality, the creation of incentives for continuous technological updates based on ensuring the availability of advanced technologies in the world market;



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

- **“Dialogue of cultures”** as a paradigm of global civilization development. Dialogue institutionalization through the development of new functions and abilities of international organizations (global, regional);
- **Sustainable development as a global approach to the modeling of national and regional economies** (economies of regional intergovernmental economic associations), **the “greening” of economies** and implementation of **dynamic models of economic development “under changing climatic conditions”**;
- **Demilitarization of the world**, a global program of gradual disarmament, including limitations and future rejection of nuclear weapon technologies and the prohibition of the introduction and use of other weapons of mass destruction (including post-military technologies - geotectonic, biological, etc.).

At the institutional level:

- **Reform of the UN, the UN Security Council.** In particular, the expansion of the permanent membership of the Security Council (using flexible, gradual mechanisms) to include India, Brazil, Germany and the introduction of a collective members institution on behalf of the League of Arab States, the African Union. Expanding the powers of the UN General Assembly. Giving it the right to overcome a veto of the UN Security Council by 2/3 of the votes from the total number of the UN General Assembly special Session members. Strengthening the UN General Assembly Resolutions



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

imperative.

UN should be given new, effective controls of influence to ensure the sustainable development of a multipolar world:

1) **Strengthening the global information security** based on awareness of the shared threats to the information and cultural human space, absence of guarantees for any of the national communities. It is necessary to ensure the ecology of the information space of humanity. In particular, through signing an appropriate UN Convention. Regulators of the development of global information space (monitoring and imperative control over the use of information control networks, regulating distribution of cultural-provocative and immoral content, the formation of a unified cultural and educational resource system as the basis of a universal “open education”). Security mechanisms for the prevention and combat of cybercrime and cyber-terrorism (which should be equated to armed military aggression and terrorism);

2) **Conflict prevention on ethnocultural, historical or confessional grounds** by creating a UN operative dialogue mechanism (with representation in international and domestic law);

3) **Preservation and accessibility of cultural heritage**, enhance the financial and regulatory capacity of UNESCO;



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

4) **Collective mechanism for monitoring and sanctioning the use of nuclear technology** (weapons, energy), prevent individual decision-making on the use of nuclear weapons or the proliferation of nuclear technology to all countries without exception;

5) **Global control mechanisms to monitor the operation of a “critical infrastructure”**, that provide life support systems at the national level (maintenance of safety standards, protection, reaction mechanisms to threats). Energy infrastructures, transportation networks of strategic importance, water resources and their usage infrastructure, etc.;

6) **Expanding the powers of the UN International Court of Justice in the Hague**. Providing international legal confirmation of its decisions in the form of UN Security Council Resolutions, international legal Agreements and Conventions. Granting the Court's rulings power to introduce preventive and enforcement measures when considering international armed conflicts (bring in UN peacekeeping forces, international administration into disputed territories). Expenditures required to implement the decision will be charged to the party recognized by the Court as the aggressor;

7) **The adoption of the UN Convention on the order of gaining the status and international legal guarantees of permanently neutral states**. In particular, the inclusion of rules relating to the automatic introduction of international sanctions against an aggressor by all parties of



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

the Convention;

8) **Providing international law regulations through special UN Conventions on access to basic resources** (water, energy, food). As well as specification of the international legal regime of access to resources that are outside areas of national sovereignty, such as the Arctic, Antarctic, seabeds and ocean floors. Establishing an open access regime and the removal of restrictions for the transfer of "green" technologies.

9) **Accelerate the implementation of the International initiative of extractive industries transparency** (Extracting International Transparency Initiative), which provides disclosure of companies' financial payments, especially to the state budget, which will allow the global community and international organizations alike to control natural resources. The direct control over the implementation of the EITI standards in their countries is exercised through a coalition of non-governmental organizations "Publish What You Pay", which includes Transparency International, Revenue Watch Institute, Open Society Institute, Global Witness, Oxfam.

10) **Increased international supervision over the activities of global corporations of international cartels, trusts and syndicates, including in the financial sector.** In particular, expanding the authority of the World Bank by empowering it with supervisory functions over the activities of global financial institutions. Formation and provision of regulatory support



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

to the new specialized surveillance bodies at the United Nations.

– **At the regional level (in Europe) one of the most pressing issues is the reformation of the OSCE.** The formation of a new European security architecture should be executed in such a way that the right to direct control of arms, military technology, the use of armed forces are placed under broad “collective sovereignty”, which the OSCE must be empowered with.

In essence, the following is proposed:

1) **A reform of the OSCE in order to transform it into an organization with pro-active security functions**, that will combine the interests of the member parties of the current military-political blocs, conduct non-aligned policy and are neutral. Formation of OSCE combined forces, that can locate and deal with conflicts at the regional level;

2) Give the organization **the right to provide preventive military aid** of collective forces to the country involved, in the event of a request for assistance;

3) **Formation of a mechanism to ensure “collective sovereignty” to the countries involved**, which means resolving territorial conflict issues (regionalization, disputed territories, self-determination of communities) only



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

on the basis of the consensus decision made by OSCE members.

4) Creation of a monitoring and control system to supervise the militarization of advanced “civilian” technologies, scientific inventions with the aim of limiting the possibilities for their implementation in the field of arms (perhaps it would be best to work out such a mechanism with the UN);

5) Formation of the system of GIS monitoring (Space Technology for the Earth Observation) of military, infrastructure and environmental security on the continent under the OSCE. Establish within the OSCE an international intelligent network of research centers on security issues.

The new agreement on security on the continent is key to the OSCE reboot. The discussion and preparation of the contract should be launched as early as 2014, the basis for which is the challenge posed by the Ukrainian crisis.

In the future, the OSCE model could be implemented at the level of the world's macro-regions at the same time creating a system of communication and subordination with the UN and the UN Security Council.

At the forefront of the Ukrainian national security project is the



Нова Україна
інститут стратегічних досліджень

problem of consolidating Ukrainian communities around a specified, acceptable to the majority of the active population development project, maintenance and development of human potential. The short term objective is to achieve national reconciliation and to ensure civil peace, the maintenance of social and territorial cohesion of Ukraine, the pro-active policy of "reverse integration" of Crimea to Ukraine.

Balancing relations with the Russian Federation, reconsideration of the “strategic partnership” concept in favor of “economic partnership” (from antagonism to competition). Building a new contractual framework in Ukrainian-Russian neighboring relations, the overcome of the conflicting nature of the relationship, the termination of the “information war”.

An important part of the security policy in the short term is the completion of the signing of the Association membership agreement and the free trade EU-Ukraine agreement, as well as the initiation of the action plan leading Ukraine to full EU membership with the agreed schedule and program of deep modernization of Ukraine.

The basis of the internal security policy should rest on the geo sociocultural strategy and the creation of an effective security sector capable of responding to current challenges (territory, internal conflicts) and integrated into the regional security systems in Europe as an integral component.

- 1) In the post-conflict period - accelerated development of a single national humanitarian space (informational, cultural, educational components);



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

- 2) Create a new conceptual-programmatic framework of the development of national security and defense sectors (national security strategy, policy documents of the Armed Forces, law enforcement agencies, etc.). Implementing changes to the legislation, strengthening the coordinative and supervisory role of the National Security Council). Deep reform of the security and defense sectors (armed forces, intelligence agencies, security services, law enforcement agencies). An important focus in the military reform lies in defining the specialization of units of the Armed Forces, which will be part of peacekeeping forces of the OSCE and the UN, the development of this specialization for the future. An integrated approach to reforming the armed forces and national defense industry (DIC);
- 3) Collaboration and cooperation with NATO and the OSCE by special programs that guarantee collective support in case of new military threats;
- 4) Promoting Ukrainian initiative on further development of global and regional security systems.

Conclusion

The situation, which arose around Ukraine, requires, first and foremost, an urgent settlement to prevent destruction of the Ukrainian state and, secondly, a pressing revision of the approaches to the forming of security policy at the global, national and regional levels, enhance the requirements to the efficiency of the functioning of international security institutions to prevent



Нова Україна

інститут стратегічних досліджень

further development of the crisis on the European continent

The Memorandum covers the issue of the development of the national security system in the form of theses. The objectives of the Institute for Strategic Studies, "New Ukraine" is to draw up detailed proposals for new approaches to national security policy. Also, the document does not reflect the problem of global and local environmental and technological safety, that require a particularized study as well.