

УДК 327.7:341.1

*Marchuk S. P.*

**THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL  
ORGANIZATIONS  
IN MAINTAINING PEACE  
AND SECURITY AFTER 2022:  
PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS**

*The article provides an analysis of the effectiveness of international organizations in ensuring international security and peace against the background of the ongoing large-scale invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation. Significant attention is paid to the fundamental international institutions that are actively acting during the war in Ukraine, such as the UN, the IAEA, the International Society of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, and the International Criminal Court. As part of the analysis, the problem of the effectiveness of organizations as actors of international relations after the collapse of the bipolar system of the world and the collapse of the world order during the "Cold War" period is considered. In particular, the article highlights the possible reasons for the decrease in the influence of international institutions over the last decades on solving critical humanitarian issues, making important political decisions, and issues of war, peace and security in the world. As examples for evaluating the activities of international organizations, their activities in the face of the main challenges of the international security system in recent years are cited: the full-scale war in Ukraine and the Covid-19 pandemic.*

**Key words:** *international organizations, war in Ukraine, international security system, UN, world order.*

**Problem statement.** *With the beginning of the full-scale invasion of the*

Russian Federation into Ukraine in 2022, the international community faced the question of the effectiveness of existing international organizations in resolving the conflict, ending the war, and restoring peace. Russia's attack on Ukraine became a sad precedent that had no place in the 21st century, where state sovereignty, a nation's right to self-determination, and mutual respect for the choices of each nation are recognized by the whole world as indisputable universal values that govern international relations. With this, a simple question arose. How should the world order continue to exist, built on the basis of the activities of international organizations as arbiters of international relations and guarantors of world security and peace in the conditions of the largest war in Europe since the end of the Second World War? So, the problem that we will consider as part of our work is the role of international organizations as guarantors of world order, in maintaining peace and security against a background of the largest full-scale war in Europe in the 21st century.

**Analysis of current research and publications.** Recently, among scientists and researchers, the question of the importance of the role of the activities and influence of international organizations in international relations is increasingly being considered. Among those whose works we might refer to in the article are the director of research at the Institut de Recherches Economiques et Fiscales (IREF) in Paris, Enrico Colombatto [2], a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Political Science, Maastricht University, Maria Josepha Debre [3], an Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science of Maastricht University, Hylke Dijkstra [3], and an independent research organization The International Crisis Group. Also, one of the first who in their works gave assessments of the effectiveness of the activities of international bodies against the backdrop of the Pandemic Covid 19: Deputy Director of the Fondation pour la recherche stratégique (FRS), a leading French

think-tank on international security issues, Bruno Tertrais [10] and the chairman of the Centre for Liberal Strategies and permanent fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences, IWM Vienna, Ivan Krastev [6]. Analyzing the events of the last year, the war in Ukraine, the activity of international organizations, we resorted directly to the information of news agencies, "Reuters" [8], "Hromadske" [1], "Ukrinform" [12] for example, as well as analyzed official documents, reports and publications of international organizations themselves [4; 5; 7; 9; 11].

**The aim of the article** is to analyze and evaluate the role of international organizations as guarantors of world order, in maintaining peace and security against a background of the largest full-scale war in Europe in the 21st century. *The tasks of the article are:* 1) to determine the practical steps taken by significant international organizations, such as the UN and its agencies, the International Criminal Court, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement for maintaining peace and security after the full-scale invasion of Russia into Ukraine started. 2) to evaluate the influence of those steps on restoring peace. 3) outline the prospects for the activities of international organizations after 2022.

**Main part.** The hypothesis that we propose to consider in this essay is that the main international organizations, in particular, those created after the end of the Second World War and during the period of the "Cold War", lost their effectiveness in the years after the end of the last one because they did not meet the modern challenges of the international security. This became evident already 10 years after the end of the "Cold War", in the early 2000s, when the issue of reform of the main international organization was actively on the agenda. At that time, the international community focused on the issue of reforming the UN Security Council, taking into account the changed geopolitical world

landscape. In particular, there have been calls to expand the membership of the Council to include more developing countries, as well as to create new permanent seats. It is important to notice this call for reform of the UN Security Council, the body of the main international organization, whose decisions are binding on all members of the Organization and often became a decisive step in ending international conflicts at the beginning of our work. After all, it gives an understanding that the problems related to international organizations that we are facing today are the result of many years of ignoring the needs of reforms and a sober assessment of the role of international organizations in the globalized world.

The tendency to assess the activities of international organizations as ineffective also became obvious during the Covid-19 Pandemic, which the world faced at the beginning of 2020. Then scientists and scholars, such as the French political scientist, deputy director of the Foundation for Strategic Studies, Bruno Tetre [10], and Ivan Krastev [6], the Bulgarian strategic analyst, head of the Center for Liberal Strategies, began to note the trend of transition from the decrease of globalization and the growth of resistance to nation-states, accordingly it was emphasized and the ineffectiveness of global institutions in solving such an unprecedented challenge for the 21st century as the virus pandemic, which has created a significant threat to international security.

The war in Ukraine and its continuation for more than a year in the very center of Europe became the last point, which demonstrated the nominal role of organizations in solving issues of war and peace today. Our hypothesis is that the war in Ukraine can become a turning point in the vision of the role and activity of organizations and, in an optimistic scenario, give them an impetus for reformation in order to gain a real influence on the solution of the issues of war and world security. That is why in our article we will consider the activities of those organizations whose activities are significant in the context of the war in Ukraine

and have a direct impact on ensuring peace and security in Ukraine and Europe as a whole. Thus, we will focus on such organizations as the UN and its specialized agency IAEA, the International Criminal Court, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

The first thesis of our essay is that the war in Ukraine in 2022 clearly demonstrated that today's international organizations, despite the continuation of their activities, are of a nominal nature. That is, the decisions and steps taken by them are demonstrative in nature, but in fact and practical value they do not contribute to restoring peace and security. As an example, consider the activities of the main international organization, the United Nations. The United Nations has several powers aimed at stopping wars and promoting international peace and security. First of all, diplomatic interventions. The UN has a mandate to facilitate diplomatic interventions aimed at resolving conflicts peacefully. This can involve deploying envoys, mediators, and negotiators to engage with parties to a conflict and help find common ground. Then, UN also can authorize the deployment of peacekeeping forces to conflict zones to monitor ceasefires, provide security, and support political processes aimed at ending the conflict. UN Security Council can impose economic and other sanctions on countries or individuals deemed to be a threat to international peace and security. Moreover, in certain circumstances, the UN can authorize the use of military force to stop a conflict or protect civilians. This typically requires a Security Council resolution. And last, but not least, the UN has established several international criminal tribunals to prosecute individuals responsible for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide.

Thus, we have to testify that the UN has a number of means and mechanisms designed to resolve conflicts both by peaceful means and by forcing the aggressor to peace. However, it's important to note that the effectiveness of these powers depends on the

willingness of member states to cooperate and follow the UN's mandates. Ultimately, the UN's ability to stop wars depends on the support of its member states and the political will to take action.

So, which of these mechanisms did the main international organization use to end the war in Ukraine? First of all, let's turn to the first days of the beginning of the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine. On the night of February 24, on the initiative of the UN, an emergency meeting of the UN Security Council was convened at the UN headquarters in New York, during which the Secretary General of the Organization had the opportunity to speak and, referring to gossip about the beginning of a full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine, called on the President of the Russian Federation to prevent such a development events 20 minutes after the start of the meeting, the President of the Russian Federation announced the start of a "special military operation" [11]. The invasion had begun.

The next day after the start of the invasion, a meeting of the Security Council was convened, at which a resolution which condemned Russia's actions and called for an immediate end to the military operation against Ukraine was proposed for adoption, but Russia, as a permanent member of the UN Security Council, vetoed the adoption of the resolution. Thus, the only legal instrument of coercion for peace became ineffective against the aggressor, because he took a place among those who made decisions.

Only on 2<sup>nd</sup> of March, 2022 the General Assembly session regarding the war in Ukraine took place. During that emergency special session, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution demanding that "the Russian Federation immediately, completely and unconditionally withdraw all its armed forces from the territory of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders. It was supported by 141 UN members with 35 abstentions, and with five delegations – Russia, Belarus, North Korea, Syria, and Eritrea – voting against. Also that day the UN General

Assembly adopted the resolution "Humanitarian Consequences of Aggression against Ukraine", which contained a demand for Russia to immediately stop hostilities in Ukraine, and end attacks on the civilian population and civilian infrastructure. The General Assembly called for an end to the blockade of Ukrainian cities, in particular Mariupol. This resolution was supported by 140 states. Again five delegations – Russia, Belarus, North Korea, Syria, and Eritrea – opposed it and 38 abstained [11].

As we understand, despite the fact that the world community in the form of about 140 countries of the world condemned this aggression against Ukraine and called for its end, these resolutions, being non-binding, did not bring anything except the expression of support for Ukraine and the desire to show political weight. At the same time, the occupation of Ukrainian territories, war crimes, and the bombing of Ukrainian cities continued. And less than a month after the adoption of the resolution calling for peace, the whole world saw photos and reports of civilian killings in Bucha and other areas in the suburbs of Kyiv.

Despite the impossibility of preventing the terrible crimes against humanity that took place from the first days of the full-scale war in Ukraine, the UN, in the person of its Secretary General, continued to try to lead a diplomatic path to solving, if not the conflict, then at least acute humanitarian issues. The Secretary General, Mr. Guterres acted as an intermediary, visiting both Russian and Ukraine leaders at the end of April, 2022, visiting Moscow and Kyiv [11]. As a result of the agreements reached during the visits of Mr. Guterres to Moscow and Kyiv, the UN and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) managed to carry out two operations to evacuate civilians from the territory of the Azovstal steel plant, and from other areas of the city of Mariupol. According to the Office of the President of Ukraine, as of May 6, 2022, that is, about 2 months after the start of the war, about 500 people were

evacuated from the occupied city with the help of the UN and the Committee of the Red Cross [1]. At the same time, important to mention that according to information on the official website of the UN, at the beginning of March 2022, the organization already had data on the destruction of Mariupol, whose population before the war was about 500,000.

In the context of solving humanitarian issues, in particular, the evacuation of the population of civilians from the occupied territory or those where its actions were active, the question of where and how the citizens of Ukraine were forcibly taken to the Russian Federation remains relevant. More recently, on April 2 of this year, the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Reintegration of the Temporarily Occupied Territories, Iryna Vereshchuk, made a statement regarding the fact that Ukraine demands from the Russian Federation the return to Ukraine of 4,396 orphans who were illegally removed from the territory of Ukraine [12]. She also emphasized that Ukraine agrees to cooperate with international organizations to resolve this issue. Despite this, more than a year after the start of a full-scale war, this urgent humanitarian issue has not been resolved by international organizations whose main goal is the protection of human rights and freedoms, international security and peace.

Another diplomatic step taken by the UN Secretary General to ensure food security in the world was the Grain Initiative [4]. The "Grain Initiative" is most often mentioned as the main program created during the war, for the export of Ukrainian food through the headwaters of the Black Sea, past mined areas. As of January 2023, thanks to this agreement concluded in July 2022, about 17 tons of Ukrainian food was sent from the ports of Odesa to dozens of countries in Asia, Africa and Europe [4]. Also, the "Grain from Ukraine" program, initiated by the President of Ukraine Zelensky, together became the foundation of long-term global security, despite Russia's intention to create conditions for world hunger.

At the same time, even among the Ukrainian society, it is rarely said that on

July 22, 2022, simultaneously with the Grain Initiative, two agreements were signed in Istanbul: the Black Sea Grain Initiative between the Russian Federation, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Nations; and a Memorandum of Understanding between the Russian Federation and the United Nations to promote the unhindered export of food and fertilizers. According to the official website of the UN, the organization created a plan to ensure Russian food and fertilizer reach global markets [4]. Thus, at the same time, while on the one hand we see an initiative aimed at exporting grain from a country that does not have proper logistics and, accordingly, cannot ensure normal foreign economic relations due to the war on its territory, we also see the efforts of the main international organization in order to ensure access for the goods of the aggressor country to international markets. Is this a form of ensuring peace and stability that, from the point of view of idealism, international organizations should serve? It is difficult to answer this question in the affirmative; rather, we come to the conclusion that the activity is responsible for the realpolitik. When an organization as a mediator balances between satisfying the interests of several states at the same time.

Another significant case of the work of international organizations in the context of the war in Ukraine is the crisis on the Zaporizhzhya nuclear power plant. Therefore, at the beginning of the war, in March 2022, in connection with the seizure of the Zaporizhzhya NPP and nearby territories by Russian troops, one of the biggest crises in the field of nuclear security arose since the time of the Chernobyl disaster. This nuclear power plant is one of the largest in Europe and accounted for 20% of Ukrainian electricity. On the second day of the invasion, Energoatom, the plant operator, shut down two of the six operating power units for security reasons. In the future, against the backdrop of hostilities and damage to high-voltage power lines, power units were

repeatedly taken out of working order. On September 11, ZNPP was completely shut down [7]. The precedent of the capture of a nuclear power plant by military groups, who used it in turn to shell the Ukrainian defense forces, thus excluding the possibility of a retaliatory strike against them and, accordingly, at the plant, as well as numerous damage to the plant's equipment, the capture of Ukrainian specialists, employees of the facility and the lack of proper security the operation of a nuclear facility set a precedent for the intervention of the appropriate international body.

Among the international organizations in the field of nuclear safety, there is International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which was founded in 1957 as the UN specialized agency. The agency's goal is to promote the safe, reliable, and peaceful use of nuclear technology. Since the moment of ratification of the treaty on the non-disruption of nuclear weapons in 1968, the IAEA is also engaged in re-verification by the powers of their crops, and they signed the agreement. Among the members of the organization, today are Ukraine and Russia. On 24 February 2022, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), through its Incident and Emergency Centre (IEC), was notified by the State Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate of Ukraine (SNRIU), in its capacity as a national competent authority under the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident, of the imposition of martial law on the territory of Ukraine and of an alert at the Chornobyl nuclear power plant (ChNPP) which was lately also occupied by Russian forces. Since 24 February, when the IEC was activated, it has remained in regular contact with Ukrainian authorities, and closely monitors the situation at nuclear facilities as well as activities involving radioactive sources and nuclear material in Ukraine, focusing on the implications for nuclear safety, security and safeguards. According to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Summary Report of the Director General of the IAEA on 3 March, the IAEA Board of Governors adopted a resolution on the safety, security, and

safeguards implications of the situation in Ukraine, which “deplores the Russian Federation’s actions in Ukraine”, expresses “grave concern that the Russian Federation’s aggression is impeding the Agency from fully and safely conducting safeguards verification activities”, and “requests that the Director General and the Secretariat continue to closely monitor the situation, with a special focus on the safety and security of Ukraine’s nuclear facilities and report to the Board on these elements, as required” [7]. Thus, we can judge that from the first days of the war in Ukraine, the relevant Ukrainian authorities and the IAEA have been in close contact to properly control the situation at Ukraine's nuclear facilities. However, to a greater extent, the functions of the agency at that time were reduced to monitoring, rather than to taking any radical practical steps and actions. In turn, the threat to nuclear security remained just as relevant.

At the end of August 2022, The Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Rafael Mariano Grossi, made a visit to Ukraine's Zaporizhzhya Nuclear Power Plant. After meeting with the President of Ukraine, he went on a mission to inspect the seized power plant, on the basis of which the Agency published a corresponding report. Thus, according to the final report of the IAEA dated September 6, 2022, all “seven integral pillars of nuclear safety” were violated at the plant: the physical integrity of the plant, the operability of safety systems, appropriate conditions for personnel, the supply of electricity from external sources, the supply system, planned radiation monitoring and performance emergency measures, as well as communication with regulators [7]. The commission concluded that the shelling of the station threatened its physical integrity, the violation of which could lead to the risk of a "nuclear incident", the consequences of which would be felt both in Ukraine and abroad. Since an important feature of the work of the agency's inspectors is their inability to give political assessments,

their activities are focused exclusively on collecting data regarding the situation at a nuclear facility. The report does not specify who exactly fires at the station, but emphasizes the "need for the consent of all parties" to cease fire. Until a ceasefire is possible, the IAEA maintains surveillance over the station and calls on the parties to come to an agreement on the creation of a demilitarized zone near the nuclear power plant [7]. Objectively, it is worth saying that the IAEA mission headed by Grossi marked the beginning of a new round of negotiations between representatives of Russia and Ukraine on ensuring nuclear security in the context of the ongoing military conflict of the side. Until recently, negotiations between the parties, with the assistance of the IAEA, continued. At the moment, due to disagreements between the parties, the negotiations on the status of the Zaporizhzhya NPP have reached an impasse.

Speaking objectively, within the framework of existing competence, the Agency has done a difficult job in unprecedented conditions. But in fact, under the current conditions, simple monitoring and observing missions are not enough to eliminate practical nuclear threats; practical steps and solutions are needed. Since the agency itself cannot give political assessments, the UN General Assembly and the Security Council are guided by the agency's reports in assessing the situation and making appropriate decisions. However, we continue to be witnesses to the fact that the main organization that ensures security and peace is not in a position to take concrete steps in response to existing threats. The UN Security Council was acquainted by Mr. Grossi with the report of the mission in Zaporozhye, but no further steps were taken due to the lack of political will of all actors involved.

And the last case that I would like to consider in our essay is the activities of the International Criminal Court. Despite the fact that the International Criminal Court cannot be called an international organization in the full sense, it is nevertheless an international body

whose powers informally include ensuring security, peace and justice. Therefore, in my opinion, it is important to pay attention to its activities in the context of the war in Ukraine.

Namely let's consider issuing warrants of arrest for two individuals in the context of the situation in Ukraine: president of Russia, Putin and Commissioner for Children's Rights in the Office of the President of the Russian Federation, Ms Maria Lvova-Belova. Due to ICC both individuals are allegedly responsible for the war crime of unlawful deportation of population (children) and that of unlawful transfer of population (children) from occupied areas of Ukraine to the Russian federation. Pre-Trial Chamber of ICC considered that there are reasonable grounds to believe that each suspect bears responsibility for the war crime of unlawful deportation of population and that of unlawful transfer of population from occupied areas of Ukraine to the Russian Federation, in prejudice of Ukrainian children [8]. Accordingly, the Court issued warrants for the arrest of the two above persons.

According to this decision, all countries that are guided by the Rome Statute, namely, ratified it, and these are 123 countries, are obliged to arrest these persons and hand them over to ICC. The issuance of the arrest warrant has indeed set a significant precedent as Putin has become the third sitting head of state and the first head of state of a member of the UN Security Council to be indicted by the International Criminal Court. In terms of a moral blow to the remnants of the political weight of the head of the Russian Federation and the attitude towards Russia as an international actor, this case really became a turning point. At the same time, the practical implementation of the arrest remains in question in the near future due to the legal nuances of implementation. Since countries that ratify the Rome Statute cannot arrest Putin as head of state because of his personal immunity, which he, in turn, does not have before the International Criminal Court. Thus, the arrest of Putin today is lagging behind an

unlikely scenario, depending on many external factors. If we rely on previous cases of issuing warrants for the arrest of heads of state, it is far from always that war criminals who led countries were ultimately punished for their crimes. Moreover, at the moment, the International Criminal Court has no methods for forcing countries to extradite Putin if he is on their territory. As was the case, for example, with Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir, who, after being accused of assassination, attended international events abroad and was not arrested despite the existence of a warrant of arrest [8]. Which also, in turn, testifies to the lack of a proper legal mechanism in the modern system of international relations that would ensure fair punishment of state criminals of this level.

Thus, having considered the activities of such international bodies as the UN, the IAEA, the International Criminal Court, the International Red Cross Movement in the context of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, we can conclude that indeed the organizations did not always fully, more and more often partially used the powers given to them with an attempt to resolve issues of the conflict within their competence. However, today, more than a year after the invasion of Russian troops into Ukraine, the war continues, and the international community still has no mechanism to force the aggressor into peace. As well as there is no settlement of humanitarian issues, problems related to nuclear security and nuclear blackmail of the Russian Federation, the elimination of which is the ultimate goal of the activities of the above-mentioned international bodies. In accordance with this, in terms of consideration of the second thesis, it is important to pay attention to the reasons for such inefficiency of international organizations. The second thesis of our work is that today's main international organizations are a vestige of the Cold War, created then in response to the threats and challenges that were appropriate at that time. In recent decades, the post-Cold War world order has undergone significant changes, which in

turn has made international organizations nominal, in fact a showcase for democracy demonstrating unrealized basic principles of international relations.

Earlier, I mentioned that the large-scale war in Ukraine was the last straw that clearly confirmed the total failure of the established institutions to respond to security challenges. In fact, the issue of the activities of these structures was put on the agenda soon after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union. It happened because the end of the Cold War marked a significant turning point in global politics and has significantly changed the geopolitical landscape of the world. For example, the main organization responsible for peace and security of the United Nations was the first to demand reforms. Suggestions for reform included changes to the Security Council, where the five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) have veto power, to make it more representative of the current geopolitical realities. Namely, it was proposed to include in the Security Council, such countries as Japan, Germany, India and Brazil. Another initiative to expand the UN Security Council to 24 states was proposed even by the UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan [5]. This proposal generated a significant discussion among the international community, but was not successful. There were also calls for the UN to be more effective in its peacekeeping operations and to address issues such as human rights abuses. Actually the same existential crisis in terms of activity befell other international organizations after the confrontation between the USSR, the USA and their allies. In my opinion, it is important to pay attention to why, soon after the end of the confrontation of the two political blocs, international organizations, instead of becoming the conductors of liberal reforms, changes for the benefit of strengthening the security and stability of the world, turned into nominal structures. There are a number of reasons for this.

First of all, this is because during the Cold War, the Soviet Union and its allies were a common enemy for Western countries and their allies, and vice versa, respectively. This led to a common understanding of the purpose and a greater willingness to cooperate within the framework of international organizations. However, after the Cold War, there was no longer a clear and real danger that could unite people in the same way to solve global problems. Another reason is the polarization of interests. The end of the Cold War also led to a more fragmented international system, with countries pursuing their own interests rather than working towards a common goal [3]. This polarization of interests made it difficult for international organizations to reach a consensus on effective policies. It is important to mention that this trend has become especially noticeable during the Covid-19 Pandemic. Scientists have noted that a feature of international relations against the background of the previous decline in the level of globalization has become a tendency toward the growth of nationalism [10]. Because there was a need on the part of the state to provide security, safety, and order for its citizens, while no one else could perform this function [6]. This has been coupled with the inability of organizations such as the WHO, the UN and others to meet the challenge of protecting the health of people around the world. In the same way, in 2022, against the backdrop of the war in Ukraine, we see that the leading role in resolving the conflict is taken by national actors, taking on the role of mediators in the negotiations. The example of that is the mediation of the Republic of Türkiye and the holding of negotiations in Istanbul, or the involvement of Saudi Arabia in the release of the Ukrainian military from the Azovstal plant and Russian captivity.

**Conclusions.** The international organizations, and for the most part those that were created after the end of World War II, served the interests of the existing world order during the Cold War. With its collapse, these institutions have lost their significance and

effectiveness in addressing global security challenges due to a number of reasons such as the polarization of the system of international relations, the inefficiency of their structures, the lack of a unified political will in finding consensus on issues of prime importance.

In that way, the hypothesis of our essay was that in 2022 the war in Ukraine clearly showed the failure of international organizations, due to the fact that they were created during the nascent Cold War and today, due to a number of factors, cannot solve the current challenges of international security. Having examined in detail the activities of key international institutions, such as the UN, and its specialized agencies, the International Red Cross Movement, and the International Criminal Court, we came to the conclusion that these bodies, having a number of powers in the field of ensuring peace and security, due to limited political will, problems in their structures, the growing general trends for nationalism in international relations, perform a nominal function. Since the steps they took did not bring peace, or even a draft solution to the war in Ukraine and new challenges in the international security system, including those critical and related to nuclear security.

The collapse of the Cold War world order left the world in the absence of a world arbiter capable of bringing order and clarity to international relations. Moreover, it has created a new geopolitical landscape, a new configuration of relations and the challenges behind it. Attempts to reform organizations in the early 2000s due to the lack of full political will of the actors. That's why, upon the outcome of the war in Ukraine, the entire world community will face the need for a comprehensive reformation of the system of international relations, its institutions, and cornerstone international organizations designed to resolve issues of war and peace. In my opinion, the change in international organizations after the events of 2022 is inevitable, whether they will lead to a strengthening of the role and functions of

international bodies remains an open question. It is obvious that the position of international organizations is undergoing a significant crisis, comparable in impact to those that occurred after the two world wars. So the war in Ukraine can become an opportunity to create a new global configuration of international relations.

#### References:

1. Almost 500 more people evacuated from Mariupol – Head of President's Office Yermak. *Hromadske: webpage*. URL: <https://hromadske.ua/en/posts/almost-500-more-people-evacuated-from-mariupol-head-of-presidents-office-yermak>. (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
2. Colombatto E. The future of international organizations. *Geopolitical Intelligence Services AG: webpage*. URL: <https://www.gisreportsonline.com/r/> (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
3. Debre M., Dijkstra H. Are international organisations in decline? An absolute and relative perspective on institutional change. *Wiley Online Library: webpage*. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/> (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
4. Initiative on the Safe Transportation of Grain and Foodstuffs from Ukrainian Ports. *The United Nations: webpage*. URL: [https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/black\\_sea\\_grain\\_initiative\\_full\\_text.pdf](https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/black_sea_grain_initiative_full_text.pdf) (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
5. Kofi A. We the Peoples : the role of the United Nations, 21st century. *The United Nations: webpage*. URL: [We\\_The\\_Peoples%2520\(1\).pdf](#). (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
6. Krastev I. Seven early lessons from the coronavirus. *European Council on Foreign Relations: webpage*. URL: [https://ecfr.eu/article/commentary\\_seven\\_early\\_lessons\\_from\\_the\\_coronavirus/](https://ecfr.eu/article/commentary_seven_early_lessons_from_the_coronavirus/). (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
7. Nuclear safety, security and safeguards in Ukraine: 2nd Summary Report by the Director General. *IAEA: webpage*. URL: <https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/22/>. (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
8. Ogirenko V., El Yaakoubi A. Russia, Ukraine announce major surprise prisoner swap. *Reuters: webpage*. URL: <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/russia-releases-10-foreigners-captured-ukraine-after-saudi-mediation-riyadh-2022-09-21/>. (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
9. Ten Challenges for the UN in 2022-2023. *International crisis group: webpage*. URL: <https://www.crisisgroup.org/b8-united-states/ten-challenges-un-2022-2023>. (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
10. Tertrais B. Year of the Rat. The Strategic Consequences of the Coronavirus Crisis. *Note de la FRS, No17: webpage*. URL: <https://www.frstrategie.org/en/publications/coronavirus-crisis-2020>. (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
11. The UN and Ukraine: year-long war spreads global fallout. *The United Nations: webpage*. URL: <https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/03/1134122#:~:text=On%20%20its%20internationally%20recognized%20borders.%22%202>. (дата звернення: 09.05.2023).
12. Ukraine insists that 4,396 orphans deported by Russia be returned. *Ukrinform: webpage*. URL: <https://www.ukrinform.net/rubric-orphans-deported-by-russia-be-returned.html>.

**Marchuk S. P.** – Student of the Faculty of International Relations, Political Science, and Sociology of the Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University

### **РОЛЬ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙ У ПІДТРИМЦІ МИРУ ТА БЕЗПЕКИ ПІСЛЯ 2022 РОКУ: ПРОБЛЕМИ ТА ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ**

У статті проаналізовано ефективність міжнародних організацій у забезпеченні міжнародної безпеки та миру на тлі широкомасштабного вторгнення Російської Федерації в Україну. Значну увагу приділено основним міжнародним інституціям, які активно діють під час війни в Україні, таким як ООН, МАГАТЕ, Міжнародне товариство Червоного Хреста і Червоного Півмісяця, Міжнародний кримінальний суд. Автором розглядається проблема ефективності організацій як акторів міжнародних відносин після краху біполярної системи світу та краху світового порядку періоду «холодної війни». Зокрема, у статті висвітлено можливі причини зниження впливу міжнародних інституцій протягом останніх десятиліть на прийняття важливих політичних рішень, а також на вирішення важливих гуманітарних питань, питань війни, миру, безпеки. Для оцінки діяльності організацій наведено приклади їх реагування на головні виклики системі міжнародної безпеки в останні роки: пандемію Covid-19 та повномасштабну війну в Україні.

**Ключові слова:** міжнародні організації, війна в Україні, міжнародна система безпеки, ООН, світовий порядок.

*Рекомендовано до друку –  
к. політ. н., доцент Сіновець П. А.*

*Стаття надійшла 24.04.2023*