

INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

ІНСТИТУЦІЙНІ АСПЕКТИ МІЖНАРОДНОЇ БЕЗПЕКИ

Qasimova Laman Abid,

*Lecturer at the Department of Political Science and Sociology
Baku State University*

The study of international security institutions is connected with the potential institutional aspects of the global security system. According to modern scientific approaches, the relevance of international security institutions is closely related to the key features of the development of the global security system. Due to the relevance of the topic, the role, powers and functions of international security institutions were discussed as the most important issues. A particularly important object of study is the characteristics of the international security environment in which international political institutions perform their functions. The main directions of research are characterized from modern scientific and analytical positions. The object of study of the article is also related to the direct influence and integrative features of international security institutions on the functioning of the international political system. The classification of international security institutions and various theoretical and conceptual approaches are included in the analyzed objective issues.

The main purpose of the article is based on perspective analysis in different directions. Initially, an analysis was made of the characteristics that distinguish international security institutions from other international political institutions. These distinctive features are mainly based on elements of the real institutional manifestation of the global security system. It should be emphasized that while these types of institutions are not unique to security issues, they can be objectively distinguished on the basis of a basic analytical difference. In addition, a special place is given to the importance of international security institutions. The article discusses a number of leading theoretical views that offer different and especially important analytical assessments of the degree of significance of international political institutions. From the point of view of modern political realities, a special place in the article is given to the analysis of both theoretical and empirical approaches.

Key words: International security institutions, international security, international political system, international political institutions.

Дослідження інститутів міжнародної безпеки пов'язане з потенційними інституційними аспектами глобальної системи безпеки. Відповідно до сучасних наукових підходів, актуальність інститутів міжнародної безпеки тісно пов'язана з ключовими особливостями розвитку глобальної системи безпеки. Зважаючи на актуальність теми, як найважливіші питання обговорювалися роль, повноваження та функції міжнародних інституцій безпеки. Особливо важливим об'єктом дослідження є характеристики середовища міжнародної безпеки, в якому міжнародні політичні інститути виконують свої функції. Охарактеризовано основні напрямки дослідження із сучасних науково-аналітичних позицій. Об'єкт дослідження статті також пов'язаний із безпосереднім впливом та інтегративними особливостями інститутів міжнародної безпеки на функціонування міжнародної політичної системи. До аналізованих об'єктивних питань включено класифікацію інститутів міжнародної безпеки та різноманітні теоретико-концептуальні підходи.

Основною метою статті є перспективний аналіз у різних напрямках. Спочатку було проведено аналіз характеристик, які відрізняють міжнародні інститути безпеки від інших міжнародних політичних інститутів. Ці відмінні риси базуються переважно на елементах реального інституційного прояву глобальної системи безпеки. Слід підкреслити, що хоча ці типи інституцій не є унікальними для питань безпеки, їх можна об'єктивно розрізнити на основі базової аналітичної різниці. Крім того, особливе місце приділяється значенню міжнародних інститутів безпеки. У статті обговорюється низка провідних теоретичних поглядів, які пропонують різні та особливо важливі аналітичні оцінки ступеня значущості міжнародних політичних інститутів. З точки зору сучасних політичних реалій особливе місце в статті відведено аналізу як теоретичних, так і емпіричних підходів.

Ключові слова: інститути міжнародної безпеки, міжнародна безпека, міжнародна політична система, міжнародні політичні інститути.

Introduction to the problem. International security as a field of research is considered one of the primary sub-fields of international politics. The article focuses on institutional aspects of international security. The role, powers and functions of international institutions in this respect are discussed as crucial issues. Accordingly, the other legal aspects of international security are focused upon only if and insofar the considerations based on the primary subject of the research. Analysis of the role of international organizations in the field of international security requires to analyses the nature and character of the environment in which those institutions exist and

develop. This environment is called the international society, in which the nation-states constitute the primary category of actors.

The degree of research of the problem. Designing the research directions of the article, the key points are characterized trying to prove or the “cause-and-effect relationship” between objects of the research topic. Eventually, the research work is designed to meet the objective of the research object. Scientific research methods of the article generally comprises of the significant subsections: participants, apparatus, and procedure. The significance subsection research of the international security institutions is

related with two issues. Primarily minority of the researchers or scholars have discussed international security institutions. A poor academic literature exists on the more general topic of international institutions. Security affairs is the arena in which international institutions have been expected, on theoretical grounds, to be least consequential. This approach can be observed with a number of varieties depending on the key features of the international political institutions. Eventually the characteristics of international security institutions is the source of the second obstacle. For the reasons stated numerous researches on specific types of international security institutions, such as laws of war, alliances, arms control agreements, and collective security systems, and countless analyses of particular institutions, such as the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the nuclear non-proliferation regime, and etc. The main research objectives will focus on the significance of two issues. The first concerns those features that distinguish international security institutions from international political institutions in other issue areas. It must be emphasized that these types of institutions may be usefully differentiated on the basis of two fundamental analytical distinctions that are especially relevant, if not unique, to security affairs [1]. The second focus is on the significance of the international security institutions and multilateral interrelations among the actors of international security issues.

Literature survey is performed to gather as much information as relevant from previous research works. They are important for the topic and help validate the research. Generally estimated the contemporary academic researches and their consequences related to the institutional aspects of international security organizations. Barry Buzan emphasize that the concept of security is penetrating and useful method to approach the research of the institutional analysis of international security issues in the international relations [8]. Security provides an analytical framework between the extremes of power and peace in the institutional analysis context. However, concept of security has not been exactly formed yet. The term security in the institutional context is connected with a series of different aspects of human existence and with the common processes and related activities in the form of multilateral institutional inter-relationship context [10].

According to Anthony D. Smith's research consequences in the work "State and the Nation in the Third World" it is distinctively observable that, the establishment of the state security is considered to be a civilizational and cultural category that relates with all aspects of modern life at local, national, international levels. [9] Therefore, security in the institutional analysis context can be defined as an organized human attempt to form the institutional aspects of security

through empirical activity. Conducting special empirical researches in the current field of topics are generally estimated due to the relevance of the activities to the contemporary realities and possible predictable changes of the current realities from the scientific-research perspectives.

The purpose of the article. The aim of the article is to analyse the peculiarities of an environment in which international organizations operate and exercise their functions in the field of international security, also related with the significance, role of international security institutions in international world, their types, and various approaches to them.

In the field of international security institutions a number of concepts and meanings have been researched by the scholars over the years. International institutions and "international security" have a variety of interpretations. Security has historically been a contentious idea.

Classification of the international security institutions. There has been much discussion on the types of security, such as military, economic, social, environmental, as well as the proper scales of concern with individuals, national groups, states, the global community, etc. International security is concerned with deliberate, politically motivated physical acts of violence committed against another political actor, usually but not always a state, that cross international borders [2]. Accordingly, international security institutions are those that aim to address or regulate the following issues:

- 1) The danger of threat and use and proliferation of weapon designed to harm or kill people as well as damage or destroy physical objects, as well as responses to such threats and uses by other actors;
- 2) The production, possession, exchange, and transfer of weapons of various types;
- 3) The deployment and activities of armed military forces during times of peace. However, it should be remembered that many international security institutions also include issues that go beyond these ones.

The most crucial issue related with the international security institutions is about the influence on world politics [3]. Of course, the fact that there have been so many types that states have shown a readiness to devote a lot of time, effort, and money to them is sufficient to establish their significance. It should be stated as the example of the United Nations Security Council. Security Council of UN is charged with ensuring international peace and security. Its powers also include establishing peacekeeping operations, enacting international sanctions, and authorizing military action. It is for the Security Council to determine when and where a UN peace operation should be deployed [4].

Differentiation among basic types of international security institutions it is observed a potentially

confusing variety of forms, including international treaties, agreements, organizations, regimes, and possibly more. It might be initially attempted to group them based on their functional or spatial range. As an alternative, we could differentiate between various levels of formality or explicitness. Despite the value of numerous conceptualizations, they hardly provide any original insights about these institutions and their general characteristics.

It might be emphasized that a number of additional fundamental analytical distinctions that are particularly pertinent to security matters and may perhaps be unique can be used to distinguish between their types. The first and more well-known division is between inclusive and exclusive types of international security institutions that generally represent essentially different aim orientations [5]. The main goal of inclusive or internally focused types is to increase the security of their participants in relation to one another by lowering the possibility of armed conflict. They consist of agreements on armaments control, collective security measures, and other prospective agreements between current or potential enemies. Exclusive or externally focused types of the institutions, in contrast, primarily serve to protect their participants from non-members who are viewed as providing real or prospective physical risks. Although achieving this purpose frequently necessitates influencing the behavior, intentions, and capacities of participants as well, their ultimate goal is to influence the behavior, intentions, and capabilities of such non-members. Allies and agreements limiting the export of weaponry or products and technologies with military applications to foreign nations come under this category.

Regarding the kinds of substantive rules that form the basis of an international security institution, there is a second, much less well-known distinction. Operative rules and contingent rules can be used to categorize these features. Operative rules should apply to a state's continuing operations. A state can be said to be in conformity with an operative regulation or not at any given time, in theory. Most of them which are based on operational rules can be divided into three groups: export control agreements, arms control agreements, and laws against the use of force. While the latter are exclusive, the first two are inclusive [6]. Most operative rule based types take the form of arms control agreements. Some actively limit the size, form, or use of the armed forces that members may set up and sustain. Others impose restrictions on military activity, such as training, military exercises, and other measures intended to prepare forces for combat and to enhance their readiness. Their purpose is to limit the military capabilities of potential adversaries, thereby minimizing or even preventing the emergence of external threats and thus enhancing the security of their participants. Contrarily, contingent rules

are concerned with what states do in hypothetical situations that may never happen. They are typically prescriptive, outlining the steps members should take if the triggering circumstances emerge. In essence, the goal of contingent regulations is often to avoid the occurrence of the mentioned circumstances in the first place. To put it another way, the main question at hand is not whether states will follow the rules when required to do so, but rather whether the prospect of following the rules will enough affect the behavior of other states to eliminate the need to invoke them.

Theoretical basis of the international security institutions. Neorealism is the main theoretical approach for the null hypothesis that international security institutions do not matter. This method highlights the likelihood of conflict that results from nations' ability to employ force against one another, the anarchic aspect of the international system, and the presence of a high degree of uncertainty regarding the intentions, potential, and actions of other states [7]. Scholars who subscribe to the neorealism school of thought are quite pessimistic about the importance of international organizations in general and international security institutions in particular. For several reasons, neorealists contend that international institutions have little impact on how states behave and how the world turns out. Another leading neorealist argument is that international institutions are epiphenomena. Even if states do choose to create international institutions, the latter merely reflect the calculations of self-interest of the most powerful states.

However strong theoretical grounds exist for concluding that these institutions may have important independent consequences. The most well-developed school of thought on the impact of international institutions is neoliberal institutionalism or, more simply, neo-institutionalism [8]. Neo-institutionalists employ a functionalist logic to argue that states will create sets of more or less formal rules where they expect such rules to serve their interests. Institutionalists argue that international law can be profoundly significant. They assert that when states sign a treaty or agreements, it eventually becomes costlier to take actions the law forbids and less costly to pursue policies the law condones. That is, treaties in the other words "tie the hands of current and future leaders by increasing the cost of renegeing." The Constructivist approach of international institutions in international security matters can illustrate the fact that it regulates and gives a roadmap to state's behavior, enable them to enter in relationship with each other; because they are legally bind by customary law and they decide to have legally binding obligations through treaties [9].

Conclusion. Consequently the importance of international security institutions and their role in real practice is indeed a controversial topic of research. It is important to emphasize that international institutions

define the status, the rights, the responsibilities, and obligations of the nations in foreign policy. Thus, it is the responsibility of every state to observe the norms and laws, failure to which there are consequences. I assume that each theory mentioned above has its share of truth. It is true that international security institutions have a significant importance in ensuring and protecting peace and security in the international arena, and in practice we can see the real results of this in the form of humanitarian aid, the fight against terrorism, the provision of assistance to the civilian population during wartime, and the peacekeeping forces. It is also true that they define rules, norms, principles, and laws to maintain international peace and regulate inter-state relations. However, it is also acceptable the opinion put forward by realists. Yes,

indeed, in practice, we can clearly see that in solving most issues, international security institutions do not act according to norms, but in accordance with the interests of hegemonic states. For example, the invasion of Iraq by the United States in 2003 and the international community's inadequate response to this is an example of this. We don't need to go far, the most obvious example of this can be observed in Azerbaijan. The Minsk Group, which was created to resolve the Azerbaijan-Armenia conflict, did not take any real steps to resolve the conflict [10]. In summary, it is not correct to rely on only one theory for the study of international security institutions. Each of them should be considered as advantages and disadvantages of and taken into account while evaluating them.

REFERENCES:

1. Frankel J (1968). *The Making of Foreign Policy*. London Oxford University Press.
2. Robert O. Keohane, *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1989), p. 163.
3. Padelford NJ, Lincoln GA (1977) *The Dynamics of International Politics*. Macmillan Company, New York.
4. James D. Fearon, "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science," *World Politics*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (January 1991), pp. 169–195.
5. Karns, Margaret P. and Mingst, Karen A. 2004: *International Organizations. The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Boulder/London.
6. Steve Smith, Amelia Hadley and Tim Dunne (eds), *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, 1st ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
7. William R Thompson, "The regional subsystem: a conceptual explication and a propositional inventory" , *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol 17, No 1, 1973.
8. Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1991, ch 8.
9. Anthony D Smith, *State and the Nation in the Third World*, New York: St Martin' s, 1983, ch 7.
10. L.A.Qasimova, "Security in international circumstances", *Progressive Science Journal*. 2020. Vol.3. № 4(6). 2020. Vol.3. № 4(6), <https://ijpsat.ijshj-journals.org/index.php/ijpsat>
11. "Nagorno-Karabakh's Gathering War Clouds," *International Crisis Group*, June 1, 2017, <https://www.crisisgroup.org/europe-central-asia/caucasus/>