

UDC 327.3

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS LEADERSHIP AMBITIONS AND THE UN:  
A MAIN CHALLENGE IN FRONT OF REFORMS****L.N.Mamedaliyeva**

(Presented by Academician of ANAS V.M.Mamedaliev)

*This article gives insight to several problems emerged in the international relations due to the leadership ambitions of world's big powers. The author indicates that the geopolitical processes creating the threats observed for the mankind at global level are connected to the ambitions of several countries to control the international relations to some extent. And, the reforms in UN are necessary for the creation of a stable security system and the formation of a geopolitical balance in the framework of new requirements. The main obstacles on this road are geopolitical claims of big powers. All of this result by complicated problems for international community which does not still has a remedy for that.*

**Keywords:** *the United Nations Organization, leadership ambitions, security paradigm, new world order, geopolitical problems*

Currently, specialists analyze the causes of several cases of a failing justice observed at global level and direct their attention to various factors. Each of such cases is important. However, due to unknown reasons, they forget to also mention one important moment characterized by a relentless grip of big powers on leadership ambitions. It glitters like a natural demand. The reality indeed shows that since the onset of the second half of last century, leadership ambitions of super powers have done nothing but led to the serious geopolitical problems where the UN remains unhelpful in its resolution. According to the theoretical research work, in general, in order to make effective the UN decisions in such cases, it is primarily important to put aside those leadership ambitions. Is there super power that would think it? What is being said by specialists?

**National Security: In the Context of Leadership Ambitions and Fair Position**

It is known that the change of an historical period is accompanied also by an update of security system. It means that the global security is not a notion with stable remaining contents and forms. At the same time, its structural and functional particulars get constantly new colors. If the security system gains an historical significance by its dynamism, then we can treat

it as an open and complicated system in the evolution. In such quality, one can conclude a close connection between the structural and functional details of the global security and its systemic functioning.

In that context, the appearance of new threats and challenges can cause serious structural, functional, value and modus operandi changes in the global security system. It is possible to perceive the importance of this idea in the framework of the contemporary period's challenges. Currently, the new threats and challenges are deemed as main causes that drive the update of the world's geopolitical order and drag the global security system into the playground of radical changes [1].

Then, it would be necessary to add the creation of new weaponry types. It is known that for the time being, big powers rush to make their arsenal of weapons more sophisticated. They broaden their capabilities of vengeance and mass termination. The Globe became "a simple village" due to the evolving military development and information technologies. All of these factors form a need to build a security system that would perceive the new security paradigm and apply it in practice. In the contemporary period, it constitutes a principal

theoretic challenge on global security in front of us. It should be noted that the leading analysts of the world underline constantly the need to renovate the security paradigm in the context of the new world order formation process. This is a main factor that makes necessary a research work in this case because so far, neither a suitable security paradigm, nor a ready-to-go security system applicable on its basis in practice are ready.

As an example, we can refer to the idea of Christopher Fettweis, US Professor. The Associate Professor of the Tulane University writes: "It is not only the media that have been unable to put the current era into proper perspective, however. The US strategic community has struggled for 25 years even to understand this new period, much less chart a logical course forward..." [2]. According to this author, such situation impedes the creation of a global strategy and brings the world closer to the chaos. Some scholars try to picture the general look in more dreadful colors. It means that if an alternative leader is being formed against the US with broadening of the area of geopolitical impact of several emerging powers, then the world could face the uncertainty (While there is a tendency to focus on historic differences, racial fears and geopolitical competition, the new Sino-Russian trend may be more of a marriage of convenience than anybody in the Washington foreign-policy elite will admit.) [3].

To make the general panorama clearer, we shall mention several problems existing theoretically. We mean the dilemma reflected in the security for people, societies, States, regions and the whole mankind. Its cause is linked to the ever changing values and ideals existing at various levels. The global security is mostly impacted on by the alteration of values in the internal and external environment of States and societies and some contradictions between them. Besides other factors, it is linked in political aspect to the specific values in the foreign policy of a concrete country and the priorities set. It directly influences the formation of the above mentioned paradox of a security strategy of big powers.

For instance, the main idea of the US national security strategy is to ensure America's leadership in the world. However, the global

US security remains unreachable without the economic and military might in relation to other nations. Therefore, the broadening of a public role in the US national security system is seen as a priority. It is clearly seen that the security is considered here in the context of "individual security – public security – international security". In this configuration, the individuals "trust the larger part of their security to the State" [4].

At the same time, this leads to more dependence of an individual freedom and security which are so important for the Western civilization, on the State which is quite odd to the liberal society values. The situation becomes more complicated with new types of information technologies and technical capabilities. Such factors substantiate finally a total control in the society which is in full contradiction to the people's freedom. People in mass are influenced by technological factors and feel the impact of uncontrolled information flows.

Against this background, we see the principal controversy standing right in the center of the US national security strategy is linked to the direct juncture between the global leadership claims of one specific country and the global security itself. In fact, these claims put primarily a limiting condition to the global security paradigm. This would ensure the supremacy of America. To some extent, it sounds in unison with the global security that serves to the domination of one country. Automatically, other big powers should have objections to this case. Due to which reasons the leadership of one country should play a leading role in the world's security? In other words, the global security in this case based not on objective criteria, but on subjective wishes of one specific State. Undoubtedly, the geopolitical realities of the XXI century, in general, do not coincide with one country's world leadership. This moment paves the way for contradictions when it comes to ensure the security as a whole. Here, we see its different faces. Likewise, the paradox situation is observed in the activities of international organizations due to the wish of global hegemony. To put it concretely, the global leadership

ambitions sets serious impediments to the adoption of fair decisions by international organizations and the full functioning of legal regulation mechanisms.

It is interesting to see that the specialists do not talk about this issue so much. In reality, unless the change will take place in the approach of big powers to international affairs, it is senseless to talk about real reforms in such international institutions as the United Nations Organization. In this regard, a first step should be to give up the world hegemony claims. This can be corroborated by several concrete examples. Why the geopolitical problems are not solved in Middle East, South Caucasus and Eastern Europe? Analysts and experts hint at numerous reasons. Each of such reasons has its place and role. However, much attention should be paid to the clash of interests of countries that have world's leadership ambitions. For instance, the responsibility on shoulders of the Security Council (SC) members for not fulfilling 4 resolutions adopted by the UN demanding the withdrawal of Armenia from the occupied Azerbaijani lands, is high.

This demand is primarily not respected because of unprincipled position of the US. Washington is insistent on the immediate realization of documents passed on Iraq, Libya or Syria. However, it acts quite softly in relation to Armenia, "gives counsel", invites "some persons to act responsibly" etc. France, Russia and China have the same behavior. It shows that corporate interests originating from leadership ambitions stand behind such actions.

Joseph Dresen, the US specialist and the program associate at the Woodrow Wilson Center's Kennan Institute notes in particular that "imposing of the sanctions is the State policy of US". They yield a big effect once are fulfilled in right way. However, "senseless sanctions" are put on table in some cases which have no effect and jeopardize more the geopolitical situation in the world [5]. According to the specialists, this is linked to special interests that dominate other factors.

The same situation can be seen in relation to Azerbaijan, Georgia and Ukraine. In the con-

text of the conflicts in the territory of Georgia, they rush to defend the territorial integrity of that country. And, this is quite fair. All aids are extended to protect Tbilisi from Russian threats. All such efforts are led by America. The US takes bold steps to boost the Georgian Statehood by demonstrating a principal position. The same determination of Washington is also seen in the Ukrainian issue. Officially, Barack Obama has declared that the Crimea should be back to Ukraine. For this reason, Washington spares no military aid to Kiev. However, when it comes to Azerbaijan, the US behavior seems different. The idea of "bringing Nagorno Karabakh back to Azerbaijan" is not being said openly by the US leadership. The support for territorial integrity expressed in general, is immediately followed by a threat – there is no military solution of the issue! It means that America does not object the withdrawal of Armenians from the occupied territories. At the same time, Washington would rest satisfied once Azerbaijan and Armenia could reach an agreement about the withdrawal of the occupational forces from those territories. Indirectly, as other big powers, US support the Armenian separatism and sacrifice the fair resolution of the problem to its own interests.

#### **Awkward Situation: Lack of an Innovative Opportunity due to Pressure**

With a view to such cases, the issue of lacking reforms within the UN becomes clearer to some extent. Professor Ramesh Thakur, the former Senior Adviser on Reforms and Principal Writer of the United Nations Secretary-General expressed interesting ideas about the impact of global policy to the UN activities. In his article entitled "the United Nations and the United States", he writes: "What the United Nations cannot do is to manufacture and fabricate international consensus where none exists. It cannot be the center for harmonizing national interests – and mediating or reconciling them into the international interest – when the divisions are too deep to be papered over by diplomacy, when the disputes are too intractable to be resolved around the negotiating table" [6].

These are very important and attractive ideas in the aspect of a problem that we de-

scribed above. First of all, the UN is incapable to create an international consensus within all terms because it necessitates deeper and principal factors. Secondly, the diplomatic strength of the UN is fenced by some legal and moral frontiers. And, in the third place, once the divergence of ideas between national interests of the countries is deeper, no organization would have ability or a mechanism to reconcile them. These three aspects of Thakur's idea given above are then detailed in his analysis more concretely.

Starting from the 1970-1980-ies of the past century, he characterizes the rising dramatic nature of international relations. The professor writes: "The Cold War was a global struggle centered on and dominated by two superpowers which were able to structure the pattern of international relationships because of a qualitative discrepancy in military capacity and resources between them, on the one hand, and everyone else, on the other. One axis of the Cold War consisted of the mutual hostility between the United States and the former Soviet Union as superpowers; the second axis was a transcendental and irreconcilable conflict of ideologies: the existence of a strong Marxist and capitalist state that could not accept permanent relations with each other, believing instead in the eventual destruction of the other".

Let us underline the ideas of Ramesh Thakur about defining the contents of international affairs during the Cold War. The processes are not determined by a fair position and international law norms, but by interests of Washington and Moscow. The absolute incompatibility of their ideological concepts stands in the center! The hegemonic strides of two superpowers are explained by the abundance of resources and military might. Such amenities of those countries are projected to the contents of international affairs. To put it more concretely, the relations between nations at global arena are not based on the justice and the rules accepted by all countries, but by the principle of two superpowers saying "my weapons are more powerful" and "I have richer resources (human, natural, technical, economic etc)" and thinking that "therefore, I will define the nature of international relations, The agenda

of global policy is also formed at the same level.

The fully contradictory ideological positions of two superpowers are further complicating the situation in this case. Due to the fact that an ideology reflects a preference of the specific country to some political, moral, strategic, military and other values, we can presume that the world is divided, in fact, into two non reconciling camps. And, how we can talk about the objective contents of international relations in this long lasting situation? To what extent the UN can adopt fair and objective decisions in general? This was not possible because either the US or USSR stood behind any principal global process.

What happened during next stages? The situation here remains unclear, if not unfair. World's interests are not respected objectively by bringing even new claims to the arena and the situation becomes more uncertain. The dangerous moment in ensuring a global security in this case is the violation of a geopolitical balance. For the time being, the discussions are centered around the one question: what's more important - a balanced policy or a set of legal mechanisms? Several specialists think that such debates are useless. Rein Mullerson, President of the Law Academy of of the Tallinn University writes the following about the balance: "Of course, the political principle and the order are above all and they should be strengthened by legal norms to be stable and transparent" [7]. However, the reality is more conspicuous in the writing of Ramesh Thakur: "Lord Ismay, NATO's first Secretary-General, reportedly said that its goal was to keep the Americans in, the Russians out, and the Germans down. After the Cold War, Russians might ruefully wonder if NATO's purpose is not to keep the Americans in, the United Nations out, and the Russians down" [6]. And, this is not the end of story. From now on, China, India and Brazil claim to be the part of "heavyweights" group in global policy. This broadens the scope of leadership claiming nations. Now, the US and China compete for a direct leadership. Russian and the EU are trying to be an important voice in the global policy. Countries such as India

and Brazil attempt also to have a place in “the first quartet”. It is not excluded to see other countries having the same goal.

But, the professor thinks that still any problem in the world cannot be solved against the will of Washington. He writes: “It is still the guarantor of trans-Atlantic, trans-Pacific and trans-American security orders” [6].

Now, let us look at the logical connection between these two stages in the geopolitical aspect. The domination course based on military capabilities and resources seen in the years of “cold war” is replaced by a notion called “the soft power” that would ensure the reign over the world again. Though the Communists were taken out of ranks, the liberalism failed to become an effective concept by leaving the emptiness again. In such circumstances, the system of international relations had to be altered seriously. The activities of international institutions had to be fully updated. None of these changes has occurred. What were the reasons? Again, as it was under the Cold War times, the attempts to reign, dominate, to ensure own interests and to impose forcefully or voluntarily own values to others remain as the principle of main activities.

Due to this reason, such a big country as Germany recognizes an event not happened in the history “as a genocide” while Armenia being itself an aggressor and keeping the Azerbaijani lands under the occupation takes the courage to label the victim of aggression as “the aggressor”. The blood is shed in Syria while refugees are not treated as humans in Europe. They stir the religious sectarianism and the ethnic separatism in Muslim nations by calling it as a service to democracy and human rights. In general, the world is in fire while the US and Europe still keep presenting it as a renovation, democratization and freedom of speech. In such conditions, what kind of reforms can be imagined within the UN? This remains unclear.

In a word, superpowers attempt to manage the world from one center to avoid the dark pictures of the past and evaluate the global status from a new prism in general. In fact, following some period after the collapse of USSR, the West has succeeded in this mission. However,

the Almighty reveals the appalling reality hidden behind the preliminary illusion. And there, one can clearly see how the organizations such as the UN are in desperate situation which hints at the creation of a very sad picture.

### Conclusion

The analysis above shows that there is a serious need to form the new world order in the contemporary period. For this goal, big powers should make some adjustment to their relations. Above all, the fundamental principles of international law should be unconditionally respected. To realize it, international organizations led by the UN should demonstrate more effective activities.

However, the UN current opportunities and action mechanisms are not sufficient to fulfill that mission fully. This is proved in practice. Due to that reason, there is a serious need to reform the UN. The paradoxical situation is explained by the fact that the main impediment in implementing these reforms is the existence of different geopolitical goals between super powers. The reality says that though the US is not today the only leader, but its position is decisive.

At the same time, differently from previous periods, there are several big powers that claim a leadership in front of Washington. The specialists are of opinion that the UN will not be able to play a decisive role in creating the international consensus. They tend to indicate super powers that will be important in the resolution of all principal global geopolitical issues. At the same time, it is also said that the situation is uncertain in this elite part of the global geopolitical environment. As a result, “the new hegemons” of the world are not making the steps for justice and thus, not letting the UN to undertake this function. We can conclude that the process of complicating further the situation at two levels is under way in the system of the contemporary international relations. At the first level, there are an increasing number of countries that struggle for global leadership. The relations between such States are quite controversial and sensitive. The second level is the persistence of open and invis-

ble obstacles on the way of the UN initiatives.

In this case, another moment is also attractive – if the UN can be seriously influenced by US, Russia, China, France and the United Kingdom, then how this international organization can implement real reforms? How it can neutralize the will of several super powers? In our opinion, this still seems impossible and the theoretical talk about the renovation of UN remains as mere words. And, the international community is offered “this geopolitical fairy tale”! Unfortunately, this reality still cannot be changed.

#### REFERENCES

1. *Zbigniew Brzezinski*. Toward a Global Realignment / "The American Interest", July/August 2016.

2. *Christopher J. Fettweis*. Threatlessness and US Grand Strategy / Survival: Global Politics and Strategy, October-November 2014, Volume 56, Numbers 1-6, Pages 43-68.

3. *Mathew Burrows Robert A. Manning*. America's Worst Nightmare: Russia and China Are Getting Closer / "The National Interest", August 2015.

4. *Николай Баранов*. Международная безопасность и механизмы ее обеспечения. URL.: [http://nicbar.ru/m\\_bez\\_lekziazial.htm](http://nicbar.ru/m_bez_lekziazial.htm).

5. *F. Joseph Dresen*. Sanctions Emerge as the Indispensable Tool of American Statecraft / "Kennan Cable" №9, June 2015.

6. *Рамеш Такур*. Объединенные нации и Соединенные Штаты / "Россия в глобальной политике", том 9, №6, ноябрь-декабрь, 2011, с.157-167.

7. *Рейн Мюллерсон*. Нет права без баланса / "Россия в глобальной политике", №4, июль/август, 2016, с. 94-105.

*Institute of Philosophy of ANAS*  
*lmammadova@hotmail.com*

### LİDERLİK İDDİALARI VƏ BMT: İSLAHATLAR QARŞISINDAKI ƏSAS ƏNGƏL

L.N.Məmmədəliyeva

Məqalədə dünyanın böyük güclərinin liderlik iddiasının beynəlxalq münasibətlərdə meydana gətirdiyi bir sıra problemlərin təhlili verilir. Müəllif göstərir ki, qlobal miqyasda müşahidə edilən və bəşəriyyət üçün təhlükələr əmələ gətirən geosiyasi proseslər müəyyən dərəcədə bir sıra dövlətlərin beynəlxalq münasibətlərə nəzarət istəyi ilə bağlıdır. Stabil təhlükəsizlik sisteminin yaradılması və geosiyasi balansın yeni tələblər çərçivəsində formalaşdırılması üçün isə BMT-də islahatlar aparılmalıdır. Bunun da qarşısında əsas maneə, yenə böyük dövlətlərin geosiyasi iddialarıdır. Bütün bunlar yekunda bəşəriyyət üçün mürəkkəb problemlər yaradır və onların həlli hələlik yoxdur.

*Açar sözlər:* Birləşmiş Millətlər Təşkilatı, liderlik iddiaları, təhlükəsizlik paradigması, yeni dünya nizamı, geosiyasi problemlər

### ЛИДЕРСКИЕ АМБИЦИИ И ООН: ГЛАВНОЕ ПРЕПЯТСТВИЕ НА ПУТИ РЕФОРМ

Л.Н.Мамедалиева

В статье анализируется ряд вопросов, порождаемых в международных отношениях лидерскими амбициями мировых суперсил. Автор показывает, что наблюдаемые в глобальном масштабе геополитические процессы, представляющие угрозу для человечества, в определенной степени связаны со стремлением ряда государств взять под контроль международные отношения. Для создания стабильной системы безопасности и формирования геополитического баланса в рамках новых требований необходимо проведение реформ в ООН. А главным препятствием на пути этого являются геополитические амбиции мировых держав. Все это, в конечном итоге, вызывает сложные проблемы, которые пока не нашли своего разрешения.

*Ключевые слова:* Организация Объединенных Наций, лидерские амбиции, парадигма безопасности, новый миропорядок, геополитические проблемы