

39

Presentation date: May, 2024
Date of acceptance: October, 2024
Publication date: November, 2024

THE FORMATION

OF REGIONAL DIMENSIONS OF THE NEW INTERNATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM

LA FORMACIÓN DE DIMENSIONES REGIONALES DEL NUEVO SISTEMA DE SEGURIDAD INTERNACIONAL

Aida Mamed Yusifzade

Email: aidayusifzade@hotmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5706-0050>

Azerbaijan University of Languages. Baku, Azerbaijan.

Suggested citation (APA, seventh ed.)

Yusifzade, A. M. (2024). The formation of regional dimensions of the new international security system. *Universidad y Sociedad*, 16 (6), 383-391.

ABSTRACT

The forces of globalization and regionalization are profoundly altering the landscape of international relations, challenging traditional notions of nation-state sovereignty and reshaping our understanding of global security. In the wake of the bipolar world's collapse, the emergence of interregionalism stands out as a pivotal element in the construction of a novel international security framework. While the significance of interregionalism continues to grow, there remains a notable gap in research that fully incorporates this phenomenon into the broader context of global governance and the evolving dynamics of power at global, regional, and subregional levels. This research aims to examine the formation of regional dimensions within the emerging international security system and assess the impact of interregionalism on the transformation of power structures and global cooperation. Our investigation reveals that interregionalism has not only gained traction in regional integration studies but has also captured the attention of scholars in international relations. In the new world order, entities like the European Union are assuming greater importance, accompanied by a surge in bilateral and multilateral arrangements for cooperation and competition across global, regional, and subregional spheres. The findings of this study suggest that interregionalism is fundamentally altering the essence of the nation-state through the interplay of globalization and regionalization processes. This transformation presents both new challenges and opportunities for global governance, necessitating a reevaluation of conventional approaches to international security and interstate collaboration.

Keywords: Interregionalism, New security system, Globalization, Regionalization, Governance.

RESUMEN

Las fuerzas de la globalización y la regionalización están alterando profundamente el panorama de las relaciones internacionales, desafiando las nociones tradicionales de soberanía de los Estados-nación y reconfigurando la comprensión de la seguridad global. A raíz del colapso del mundo bipolar, el surgimiento del interregionalismo se destaca como un elemento central en la construcción de un nuevo marco de seguridad internacional. Si bien la importancia del interregionalismo sigue creciendo, sigue habiendo una brecha notable en la investigación que incorpora plenamente este fenómeno en el contexto más amplio de la gobernanza global y la dinámica cambiante del poder a nivel global, regional y subregional. Esta investigación tiene como objetivo examinar la formación de dimensiones regionales dentro del sistema de seguridad internacional emergente y evaluar el impacto del interregionalismo en la transformación de las estructuras de poder y la cooperación global. La presente investigación revela que el interregionalismo no solo ha ganado fuerza en los estudios de integración regional, sino que también ha captado la atención de los académicos de las relaciones internacionales. En el nuevo orden mundial, entidades como la Unión Europea están adquiriendo mayor importancia, acompañadas por un aumento de los acuerdos bilaterales y multilaterales para la cooperación y la competencia en las esferas global, regional y subregional. Los resultados de este estudio sugieren que el interregionalismo está alterando fundamentalmente la esencia del Estado-nación a través de la interacción de los procesos de globalización y regionalización. Esta transformación presenta nuevos desafíos y oportunidades para la gobernanza global, lo que hace necesario reevaluar los enfoques convencionales de la seguridad internacional y la colaboración interestatal.

Palabras clave: Interregionalismo, Nuevo sistema de seguridad, Globalización, Regionalización, gobernanza.

INTRODUCTION

One of the key issues in modern international relations theory is the regional division of global space. The study of this topic is closely related to the “regional” concepts of “regionalism.” Each term can be refined and applied to the analysis of certain aspects, including the administrative-territorial composition of states and the international political structure of the global world. K. Doyç defines a region as a group of countries connected to each other in various ways (Deutsch, 1981, p. 2). Gantman (1984, p. 363) identifies the International Political Region as a subsystem of interstate relations characterized by shared political problems within a specific region. A group of authors, led by D. Heldin, understands the general characteristics of “political regionalism” as a geographically proximate group of national activities marked by high levels of interaction and institutional cooperation (Held, 2004, p. 88). From an economic perspective, T.V. Zonova views regionalism as a phenomenon resulting from the crises and development of globalization and the evolution of integration processes (Zonova, 2003, p. 235). Torkunov & Malygin (2017, p. 108) distinguish “regionalism” from “regionalization,” proposing “international regionalism” as a higher level of national interests within a regional framework. According to Kulmatov & Mitrofanova (2010, p. 50), “regionalization” should be fundamentally separated from the empirical process of increasing political, economic, cultural, and other regional relations, which leads to the formation of “regionalism” as an ideology and a conscious project. Thus, regionalization refers to a set of macro-processes that define the conventional contours of a region, often culminating in the interstate institutional association of states. This newly scaled regionalization is a significant trend in the international relations system, influenced by globalization and fragmentation.

Regionalism, since World War II, was an important approach whereby countries were urged to create alliances based on shared geographical, cultural, and economic interests. This shift from universal, overarching solutions underlines the proliferation of complexities in international politics and points to the increasingly imperative necessity of locally crafted solutions to security, economic cooperation, and geopolitical issues. The EU, ASEAN, and the Arab League are examples among many other bodies of the way regionalism facilitates stability and cooperation on critical aspects. This growth has, in turn, been marked by a number of agreements and institutions through which members attempt to address a range of common

challenges, largely as a response to globalization and the changing balance of power (Destradi, 2010; Long, 2020).

Interregionalism, or formal interactions across different regions, has in its own right become significant, as part of a process through which shared confidence in security matters is developed and cooperation between regions is promoted. Notably, however, interregionalism is not without its challenges, as aligning the interests of various regions and grappling with issues such as cybersecurity and geopolitical competition may turn out to be an uphill task. Though they present frameworks wrapped in optimism, debates about their effectiveness to national sovereignties, and most importantly solving emerging global threats, continue unabated. Issues such as governance structures, the influence of globalization, and how best to balance regionalism with global integration continue to provide a focus for many explorations regarding their potential contribution to the shaping of international security frameworks (Braun, 2024; Nyadera & Ceter, 2024; Soriano, 2019).

Relating to the above, the concept of hegemony plays an important role in understating how dominant states shape regional orders, thus determining stability within the international system via setting norms and rules that guide other nations. Hegemony may manifest itself in various ways; it can be persuasive, where subordinate states internalize the norms of the dominant one, coercion-based, imposed dominance, or a mixture of the two techniques where the internalization of values would have been possible. The regional institutional development can also be seen as a process determined by a few key decision-making points, which cause qualitative changes and path dependence. From this perspective, the development of institutions depends more on shared identity and trust than on structural factors. Conditions arising before such moments intersect with underlying forces in producing different outcomes. The mechanisms of layering and conversion, for example, provide the avenue through which existing institutions are modified and evolve to tackle new challenges by underpinning how historical context and agency interact in shaping institutional development and regionalism and interregionalism within the broader framework of international security (Cartwright, 2024; Ikenberry & Nexon, 2019).

Taking into account the aforementioned elements, the primary objective of this research is to analyze the emergence of interregionalism, which has become a pivotal factor in shaping the evolving landscape of the new international security system. To achieve this, it was employed a documental analysis of relevant sources aiming at exploring the significant impact of interregionalism on global governance structures.

DEVELOPMENT

Characteristics of regionalism in the new international security system

In European sources, this is a relatively new event. Before the beginning of the twentieth century, the region was understood as a unit or subsystem of the international system. Unlike the modern concept, empires, powers, unions of states, and even the region itself were identified under the concept of "region" as the main arena for international events of the time (Fawcett, 2008, pp. 3–5).

The subsequent ideas of regionalism and relevant regionalization processes did not take the form of effective units for much of the twentieth century. In the first half of the century, most states continued colonizing, so no one created regional organizations. The ability to establish such organizations arose from the destruction of the colonial system as a result of World War II. However, the Cold War soon influenced the nature of these new regional organizations. From this perspective, the regional model of this period is called "Hegemon" (Kulmatov & Mitrofanova, 2010, p. 57). Nevertheless, under the UN's initiative, in conditions of antagonism, it was possible to create several regional organizations to prevent neocolonialism in the development of third-world countries. While the issues of regional and subregional subsystems were easily explained in the context of superpower conflict, new questions emerged in the theory of international relations, termed "new regionalism" in the early '90s. Among these remains the potential formation of numerous subsystems as a projection of the world's multipolarity. At the same time, some sources refer to "old" or "new" regionalism (Soderbaum & Shaw, 2003, p. 3), or "open" regionalism (Doidge, 2011, p. 11).

Regardless, the establishment of political, economic, and social interactions between platforms like the ASEM Forum, which is understood as a dialogue platform, is envisaged. It emphasizes aspects such as transferable partnerships with individual countries or their groups, integration associations, or harmonious interaction in some form. "Regionalism" and "transregionalism" are distinct but not contradictory. This is because "transregionalism" can be considered an integral part of the "regionalism" configuration. This approach is appropriate for cooperation between a group of countries that represent an institutionalized yet coordinated and organizational region of regional associations. Alongside states, in the format of interregional and transregional interaction, the participation of other actors is increasing. These include regional authorities and departments (internal levels), civil society, socio-political actors, and academic circles. This type of cooperation, including the involvement of business circles

that add significant contributions, is essential. However, in the new environment, the search for answers to the regional dimension of international relations continues. This trend involves the establishment or expansion of various regional associations, including the entry of previously contradictory states, and the involvement of regional organizations in peacekeeping and conflict resolution efforts (Kulmatov & Mitrofanova, 2010, p. 59).

In addition, regional levels are preparing a quality approach to the system of international relations. Different regional subsystems establish positions on the global agenda and systematize international problems in various ways. Often, in such cases, the regional concept of global processes is presented as an alternative to the global. The latest trends in the global impact and strength of the international relations system will shape the configuration of new regional orders in the second quarter of the 21st century (Torkunov & Malygin, 2017, p. 105).

In this regard, the main task of modern international relations theory is the constant analysis of specific activities of regional subsystems and the unique conditions created by regionalization processes. The theory of analysis is crucial to ensuring the sustainability of the international relations system. Otherwise, neglecting the study of new trends in global development may result in negative consequences. First and foremost, the failure to conceptualize the activities of regional subsystems increases the risk of foreign policy mistakes. In turn, such mistakes can heighten the potential for the formation of new depressed regions on the world map, relegating a specific state or even an entire region to the periphery of global development. Currently, international relations continue to investigate the problems of regional subsystems within the framework of "new regionalism" issues. The first approach is conventionally called state-centered. Its essence is that regionalization is viewed as the result of a conscious agreement between states. For these states, multilateral regional interaction is a mechanism for addressing various duties and problems. Simultaneously, the state-centered approach is grounded in the reliance and demands of regional interaction among states, presenting an almost opposite concept.

According to the first concept, regionalization stems from external factors. States enter regional structures to respond to both economic and political external challenges and threats. States that subscribe to this concept are geographically proximate, economically similar, or culturally aligned, and they benefit from positive opportunities and advantages. The primary gravitational force driving regional unification is the facilitation of national economies within the system of global economic relations. Regional

integration of states is the process of bringing national economies closer together and fostering interaction, leading to the formation of regional economic groups (Sheryazdanova, 2016, p. 1). From this perspective, the form of regional organization is expected to become a staple of interstate relations. A multifunctional superstructure opens new opportunities for member states within their regions. Chief among these opportunities is access to new markets for goods and services within the regional organization. However, it should be noted that the member state shifts to an economic “block” mode with others. The depth of these relationships limits maneuverability in certain negotiations, as it becomes necessary to consider the positions of partners and adjust their stance, often resulting in concessions. Nonetheless, membership in a regional organization does not deprive the state of its independence or its national interests.

In general, the “Closed” regional model is inherent in the concept of the first regional organization. According to the second concept, the main factor driving regional mergers is neither foreign stimuli nor government policy. Intra-regional cooperation (i.e., interaction between states within the region) occurs naturally. In the process of natural zoning, the state takes a back seat, while market players and civil societies play a significant role. One of the driving forces of regionalization is the mobility of ordinary citizens within the region. The region is characterized by a high level of economic relations among its countries, with minimal external impact. In this case, the purpose of a regional organization is to capture the dynamics of mutual dependence and simplify the process.

However, the state’s role in the process of natural zoning cannot be entirely ignored. If necessary, the state can support the leading forces of non-state regionalization and even strengthen the process itself. Moreover, the state remains a strategic institution, and if natural regionalization processes are delayed, it can provide a push. It has been noted that the core point of the state-centered approach to regionalization in the two concepts considered is linked to the concept of “regional identity” (Kulmatov & Mitrofanova, 2010, p. 64).

The second approach to explaining regionalization theoretically is the concept of “regional identity.” In this case, regional identity refers to the existence of a certain consciousness inherent in a specific region. This regional consciousness is a political or economic entity that predates the region itself. This approach is known as “cognitive regionalism,” which explains the merger model between regions based on cognitive mutual dependence. There are two concepts within the “Cognitive Regionalism” approach to regionalization. The first concept is rooted in a

constructivist understanding of the regionalization process. The theory of state-building forms the foundation of the constructivist concept. In particular, it holds that regions are not “natural” like nations but are created “artificially.” In this context, regional identity is formed on the one hand by shared elements such as history, culture, political past, and economic relations, and on the other by the need for an “other.”

One argument in favor of the constructivist understanding of regionalization is that the modern political map of the world has been shaped by many significant events, such as the two world wars, which brought about structural changes. In modern realities, a model of regionalism based on constructivism supports the formation of regional organizations through the selection of member states, regardless of their geographical region. Moreover, constructivism does not associate the region with location as defined by state borders. Parts of a state may belong to several different regions. In turn, regions, whose membership is considered to consist of imagined communities, are subjective entities. Therefore, from the perspective of constructivism, the regionalization process is always “in motion.”

The only difference from the first notion is that the concept of “identity” at the center of regionalization is considered exclusively in its natural sense. The “civilization” component takes precedence over the political and economic components. This approach theoretically implies a small number of macro-regions (Huntington, 2003, p. 8). The process of globalization not only raises concerns about the weakening of economies but also threatens to divert countries as political units. As a result of uncontrolled globalization, the essence of state sovereignty is being compromised. This process can be analyzed purely from an economic perspective or examined in terms of socio-economic costs and financial and economic benefits. At the same time, each individual region responds uniquely to the challenges of the time. This response is shaped by its national, cultural, historical, geopolitical, legal, and social characteristics (Zonova, 2003, p. 235).

“Closed” regionalism stands in opposition to globalization and is designed to protect the region from its negative impacts. This model of regionalism is aimed at achieving self-sufficiency within the region. In this sense, “Closed” regionalism is essentially protectionist. However, there are opinions suggesting that protectionism often conceals another influential factor: it strengthens negotiating positions by fostering regional trade cooperation, thereby enhancing the potential for global competition (Armstrong et al., 2004, p. 214).

The modern world is a diverse mosaic of various cultures and civilizations, states and ethnic institutions, religious beliefs, and social aspirations. It presents a contradiction comparable to the global objective of protecting humanity, which can only be resolved by creating multiple equivalent security systems.

The growing interdependence of countries and peoples has increased the role and significance of national and international security, as well as the threats to it, which continue to grow. Ensuring the safe existence of human civilization will be one of the most important priorities in the coming decades. In this regard, it is essential to emphasize that peace protection among states, as a political category of international security, involves preventing and eliminating any threats and safeguarding the integrity of national and state sovereignty.

International security is being shaped at the global, regional, local, and interstate levels, serving as the cornerstone for the development and preservation of the global community. The state of national security is foundational to global security, and in three levels of international security—global, regional-subregional, and local—security problems are rooted in regional analysis. According to the interests of national security and its development, in a given socio-political context, it is necessary to assess the level of political organization, considering the historical past and various sectors of public life. Additionally, it is crucial to establish a connection between the various factors that determine the security of individuals, society, and the state, and to assess the degree of stability and variability under the influence of socio-political realities.

In the context of objective global changes, the essence of security requires new measurements, ideas, and criteria that focus not on the state and its political institutions, but on the protection of human beings and society, as well as the evaluation and safeguarding of existence. At the global level, international security primarily concerns the promotion of peace and the protection of humanity, encompassing the biosphere, information spheres, and technosphere. The foundation of global security lies in collective and multilateral efforts to uphold well-established norms of interstate relations and to restore these norms collectively when they are violated.

The current international security system is designed to prevent military and political threats, such as attacks from other states. However, neither the state nor its citizens are adequately protected from the unlawful actions of organized criminals. The creation of a global system to combat new threats and challenges could shape a new world order based on genuine partnerships. Modern international

cooperation in this area is progressing dynamically and efficiently, demonstrating its significant practical capabilities and high potential. Humanitarian forms and methods are proving attractive, broadening areas of mutual activity and fostering new peacekeeping forces.

Unlike during the Cold War, researchers now argue that the security of a specific subregion or region can only be ensured within the framework of a broader security system, whether regional or global. This concept is gaining increasing relevance in modern times. For example, despite the absence of clear military threats, northeastern Europe could become a security zone, benefiting from the positive experience of Russian and Euro-Atlantic cooperation.

Global security involves safeguarding all of humanity from global dangers that could drastically worsen living conditions on the planet. Ensuring global security entails mitigating the pressure of global-scale problems that impact the vital interests of humanity, including states, peoples, and every individual on the planet. These challenges represent an objective factor in the development of modern civilization and have become increasingly urgent. Addressing them requires the concerted efforts of all states and the global community. Key issues include the ongoing threat of nuclear war, the developmental stagnation of many countries, and the resolution of ethnic, energy, raw material, food, environmental, and demographic problems.

At the regional level, international security is promoted through the development of cooperative regional models among countries. The evolution of international relations has begun to reflect the growing complexity of the geopolitical significance of world regions, influenced by factors such as natural resources and the vital interests of regional states. Regional and subregional security systems, as well as new economic and military-political alliances, are contributing to a new level of solidarity and cooperation. Many countries, unable to compete with more developed nations economically or militarily, are seeking alternative ways to ensure their security.

As part of Europe's modern security policy, the "European Security Charter" addresses the need for early conflict warning and resolution. The Charter emphasizes that the nature of threats has changed significantly. While the primary threat to international peace once stemmed from military conflicts, the focus has now shifted towards economic and environmental challenges, as well as the global threat of international terrorism. Criminal organizations engaged in illicit activities are increasingly using advanced technologies to facilitate widespread criminal operations, including the trafficking of weapons, drugs, and even human beings. At this stage in history, an analysis of global

development trends highlights the need to reassess the nature of challenges facing humanity in the post-bipolar world. “Hard” military security concerns are giving way to competition in the high-tech sector, moving away from military confrontations, especially for developing nations.

Transformation of the global security system

At present, the only European international organization designed to consider the interests of both large and small nations equally is unique in its approach. Meanwhile, Western countries are attempting to create a security system centered around the North Atlantic Alliance. While such a system, grounded in military-political cooperation, may serve as a security guarantor for its members, it poses challenges for the broader European continent. The foundation of an innovative collective security system lies in the recognition that civil society, distinct from the state, is paramount and that the state exists to serve it. Civil society, being superior to the state, demands evaluation and monitoring of state activities, framed by key value concepts and legal provisions. Hence, there is an urgent need for new social structures, relationships, and guarantees that foster the development of a “safe personality” and safe political and social dynamics. The prioritization of security at global, regional, interstate, and domestic levels must become a guiding principle of foreign and domestic policy.

Regional security, in terms of territorial coverage, involves geostrategic areas formed by clusters of countries that play pivotal roles in world politics. These regions often contain smaller geopolitical subregions linked by strong political, economic, and cultural ties. Organizations such as the OSCE, OAS, and AU are instrumental in securing these regions. However, disparities exist in the involvement of major powers in regional security across the globe, leading to differing levels of effectiveness. For instance, during the 1970s, the power dynamics between the USSR, the US, and China contributed to a flexible security configuration in the Asia-Pacific, though significant conflicts persisted in areas like the Korean Peninsula, China-Taiwan relations, and various regional ethno-religious conflicts. As globalization intensifies, there is a growing focus on subregional security, with attention given to the interplay of economic, social, environmental, and technological factors. This deepens the interdependence of security at different levels—individual, national, regional, and global—creating a need for a more nuanced understanding of security across these domains.

In addition to the general system of primary international security for the creation of a subregional security system, it is understood the possibility of creating regional systems

to protect international peace. The subregional security system envisages the development of its legal basis for its formation from an organizational point of view, as well as the adoption of the regional agreement on the establishment, activities, and use of monitoring tools for analyzing, forecasting, warning, and protection that combines relationships associated with important interests.

Subregionally vital interests should take into account the national interests of the subjects that form the system of national interests, as well as regional and global interests that do not contradict the goals of the Subregional Association. According to the priority of interest, it can be divided into secondary, external, and internal categories.

The forces and means of providing the subregional security system include the military and civil structures of the sections allocated by both general and participating states, which can perform strategic, tactical, and current tasks.

Thus, the changes in the field of international security in the early 21st century are mainly explained by the significant expansion and complexity of problems related to full security. It should be noted that sometimes in a statement of separate security concepts, inconsistencies can be observed due to different approaches to the development of security principles and practical implementation. It is possible to explain that the concept of “...” safety is applicable, regardless of the localization of the concept of consciousness; the interpretation and emphasis are possible. The first direction is a diversified idea, and the third, characterized as a state, is described as a purpose (Panarin, 2000, pp. 18–19).

In the post-war period, changes in the world security system could not have been ineffective in influencing the concept of national security within the international security relations that occurred at that time. Based on the investigations of the first half of the twentieth century, the majority of states summarized the national security concept. These generalizations are formed in four paragraphs; the first two of them were adopted by every one and took a strong place in academic and political life:

National Security has become “international security,” covering the system of national states, not just a single state.

- The list of factors related to this transformation has changed, with military factors being complemented by a number of other factors—such as the environment, migration, etc.
- Security has shifted from the nation, as the “nation” and “state” often do not even coincide.

- In the concept of national security, the emphasis is directed toward individual and public associations, which are becoming a basic point of security (Kuhlmann & Callaghan, 2000, p. 22).

In characterizing the transformation of national and international security, importance is placed on an important change in emphasis toward new dimensions. If the traditional concept of national security was generally "militarist" in the 90s, a new concept began to form with more extensive dimensions.

The main result of the global security transformations was the emergence of a new model. The changing security model was examined in detail by organizations such as the Global Management Commission, the International Institute of Strategic Studies, and the UN Development Program in the 1990s.

However, the end of the period of superpowers led to the emergence of a number of newly formed armed conflicts. At the same time, the international community began to worry more about the increase in other sources of instability, such as social violence, growing poverty, organized crime, growing migration, and mass uncontrolled actions (Morgun, 1999, p. 12). One of the important results of the changes in the global security system was the realization of a gradual shift from traditional conflict to strengthened international cooperation to achieve goals.

In other words, in the 1990s, there was a transition to "soft" security challenges that called for humanitarian military responses (such as uncontrolled migration, drug threats, terrorism, natural environmental depletion, etc.). Thanks to the expanded security concept, it is now clear that the main factors threatening international and national security in the modern stage are transnational, and in most cases, it is impossible to eliminate these threats on time. In connection with this change like security, a wider concept has been needed, addressing ethnic and religious conflicts as well as newly emerging problems related to the environment, organized crime, terrorism, and demographic changes.

Achieving the necessary level of cooperation in solving new security problems requires significantly preventing certain ideological differences, which are a significant obstacle due to regional or national interests. At the same time, despite existing obstacles, the process of expanding international cooperation is strengthening with the establishment of new information and communication technologies and weakens principles such as national sovereignty and the inviolability of national sovereignty and borders. As a result, the UN Security Council adopted a more complex approach to the review of international

security issues and adopted a special declaration in January 1992. There, it was noted that the sources of non-military instability in economic, social, humanitarian, and environmental areas have become threats to peace and security (United Nations, 1992).

Despite the limited and incomplete influence of many steps in the UN activities, the main result was the reemergence of international security priorities. In particular, it was a principled manner that placed human and social security issues at the forefront, with individual security issues playing a secondary role. This factor reflects the main and most important difference between national security and general security. According to S. Sanari, the detailed understanding of this difference clarifies:

First of all, the general security concept expands the competence of its internal development to prevent the detrimental development of individual states, including the overall security system.

Second, the general security concept intersects with the territory of the National State as a security priority and emphasizes a collection of human security ideas. The main point here is the concept of physical security, which provides for the security of human life and protection against various negative effects (Panarin, 2000, p. 26). According to the UN Development Report, especially in 1994, there are two main aspects of human security: protection from sudden disasters, chronic conditions, epidemics, and repression (United National Development Program, 1994, p. 23).

The optimism seen in the 1990s has gradually given way to skepticism in the past ten years regarding the establishment of a new democratic multiparty system (Kim, 2008, p. 121). The world's leading analysts argue that the coming of a new era, coupled with the existence of a number of radical changes in international development, will require the same tools but will determine completely different paradigms to "optimize" the current situation (Fukuyama, 1992, p. 37).

The theory of "Hegemon Stability" and its practical importance in its implementation are most clearly described in the book "Only World Super Power," authored by Z. Brzezinski, aimed at direct system formation (Brzezinski, 2012, p. 43). Brzezinski claims that the United States must be integrated into the following major areas of world administration—the world economy and technology, as well as global cultural expansion—to attain the status of a superpower. Based on this, US policy should be aimed at ensuring its dominant position in the world by at least 2050, in Brzezinski's opinion, for more decades. For the sake of objectivity, after September 11th, 2001, Brzezinski's

position should be reconsidered. He believes that the position of the global leadership of the United States is more applicable in modern conditions.

CONCLUSIONS

As we enter the third decade of the 21st century, the global landscape has undergone significant transformations. Zbigniew Brzezinski's views on unipolarity have gradually lost traction, giving way to a more multipolar system of international relations. This new reality has brought forth proposals from emerging power centers, reshaping the world order. The current state of global affairs is marked by sharp contradictions, conflicts, and economic sanctions between nations, indicating a systemic crisis that may catalyze humanity's transition to a new paradigm. Historical precedents show that societal shifts—from slavery to feudalism, capitalism, and socialism—have driven economic growth and adaptation of social relations. Now, humanity stands at the threshold of a new historical stage, moving beyond traditional economic and social paradigms such as liberalism and classical socialism.

In this evolving landscape, new realities of existence and security are taking shape, influenced by shifting psychologies and the multipolar nature of the world. The conditions for a transformation of the world order are coalescing. The capitalist system, which until recently relied on the exploitation of less developed nations and colonies, faces challenges as the global economic dynamics change. Thus, the effectiveness of capitalism in driving economic growth is increasingly dependent on specific conditions that allow for its optimal functioning.

The stability of the capitalist structure, which has long provided a means for social control and citizen management, was predicated on the promise of sufficient earnings for all. This was achieved through rapid economic growth, driven by increasing production rates and expanding consumer needs, often at the cost of intense labor exploitation. However, as we move forward, this model is being called into question, necessitating a reevaluation of global economic and social structures. Summing up, the world stands at a critical juncture, poised for potential systemic changes that could redefine international relations, economic models, and social paradigms. As we navigate these transformative times, it becomes imperative to critically examine existing structures and consider new approaches that can address the challenges and opportunities of our increasingly interconnected and complex global society.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, D., Lloyd, L., & Redmond, J. (2004). *International Organization in World Politics* (3rd ed.). Palgrave.
- Braun, M. (2024). The European Union and the Eurasian Economic Union – three rationalities of interaction and the problem of non-democratic regionalism. *Journal of European Integration*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2024.2407088>
- Brzezinski, Z. (2012). *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power*. Basic Books.
- Cartwright, M. (2024). Embedded hegemony and the evolution of the United States' structural power. *International Relations*, 00471178241268418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00471178241268418>
- Destradi, S. (2010). Regional powers and their strategies: Empire, hegemony, and leadership. *Review of International Studies*, 36(4), 903–930. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210510001361>
- Deutsch, K. (1981). On nationalism, world regions, and the nature of the West. In P. Torsvik (Ed.), *Mobilization, Center-Periphery structure and nation-building. A volume in commemoration of Stein Rokkan*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Doidge, M. (2011). *The European Union and Interregionalism: Patterns of Engagement*. Ashgate Publishing House.
- Fawcett, L. (2008). *Regionalism in World Politics: Past and Present*. Oxford University Press. https://www.academia.edu/2076109/Regionalism_in_historical_perspective
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. https://old.tsu.ge/data/file_db/anthim/011.pdf
- Gantman, V. I. (Ed.). (1984). *The System, Structure and Process of Development of International Relations*. Nauka.
- Held, D. (2004). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economy, Culture* (V. V. Sapova, Trans.). Praxis Publishing House.
- Huntington, S. (2003). *The Clash of Civilizations*. AST Publishing House.
- Ikenberry, G. J., & Nexon, D. H. (2019). Hegemony Studies 3.0: The Dynamics of Hegemonic Orders. *Security Studies*, 28(3), 395–421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09636412.2019.1604981>
- Kim, M. C. (2008). The influence of global security threats on the transformation of security concepts at the beginning of the 21st century. *Bulletin of KRSU*, 8(3), 120–125.

- Kuhlmann, J., & Callaghan, J. (Eds.). (2000). The Development of a "Common Risk" Society: A Theoretical Review. In *The Military and Society in Western and Eastern Europe: A Comparative Study*. George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies.
- Kulmatov, K. N., & Mitrofanova, A. V. (2010). *Regional aspects of international relations: Textbook* (A. N. Panov, Ed.). East - West Publishing House.
- Long, T. (2020). Historical Antecedents and Post-World War II Regionalism in the Americas. *World Politics*, 72(2), 214–253. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887119000194>
- Morgun, Y. (1999). *The situation of refugees in the world. 1997-1998. Displaced persons—A humanitarian problem*. Interdialect Publishing House.
- Nyadera, I. N., & Ceter, A. (2024). Revisiting the Challenges and Opportunities for Emerging Powers in a Multipolar International System: Lessons from Türkiye. *International Journal*, 79(2), 171–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00207020241257632>
- Panarin, S. (2000). Migration in the Context of Security: Conceptual Approaches. In *Migration and Security in Russia*. Carnegie Moscow Center.
- Sheryazdanova, K. G. (2016). *Modern Integration Processes*. Kazakh University.
- Soderbaum, F., & Shaw, T. (2003). *Theories of New Regionalism*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Soriano, J. P. (2019). High expectations. Interregional agendas on global security challenges: East Asia, Europe and Latin America. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 62(1). <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/358/35860327006/html/>
- Torkunov, A. V., & Malygin, A. V. (Eds.). (2017). *Modern International Relations*. Aspect Press Publishing House.
- United National Development Program. (1994). *Human Development Report*. Oxford University Press.
- United Nations. (1992). *Security Council Summit Meeting, New York, 31 January 1992*. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/197036>
- Zonova, T. V. (2003). *The modern model of diplomacy: The origins of formation and development prospects*. ROSSPEN Publishing House.