

ПОЛІТИЧНІ НАУКИ

УДК 321.011:351.861(045)

N. Gavrilova, K. Tryma

THE NEUTRALITY AS A NATIONAL SECURITY MODEL

The problems of various models of the national security as well as the factors which influence the national security are being analysed in the present article.

In the context of globalization and the collapse of the old world order the paradigm of security has fundamentally changed. The changes are related, on the one hand, with the emergence of new threats that are global in their nature, such as the problem of climate, international terrorism, drug trafficking and transnational crime. But, on the other hand, the degradation of the UNO and other international organizations provides some inadequacy to new threats, as well as to the international management.

The modern national security policy is closely linked to the strategy of sustainable democratic development and it is an integral part of it. The neutrality emerged and during its existence it used to be understood as an international legal institution, matched governing relations between states during the war. It was important in the concept of the neutrality, although it since the beginning of the «early stages of development of the international legal institution», included the relevant norms of behaviour the neutral state carried out during peace. In the history of international relations there are several forms of the neutrality, each of which has some differences.

The armed neutrality is a collective or individual action of neutral states which have to the use of force to achieve from warring states the respect to their interests. The positive neutrality is one of the names of the peaceful foreign policy course, successfully used in a number of the European countries. The permanent neutrality is an international agreement established by domestic law obligation of the State not to participate in any war, except the armed defence of its territory from attacks or attempts hold by the warring states or other war-bent states. The globalization has brought the most significant component: the integrity of security – a vital area for the main elements of the international system.

Thus, under the present conditions of ensuring the national security, each country cannot be considered separately from the security and stability of the international system as a whole. As the globalization processes being widened, such national security model as the policy of the neutrality almost has no any prospects. The core of the neutrality policy must constantly being transformed and got a new content.

Key words: national security, national security model, neutrality.

In the context of globalization and the collapse of the old world order the paradigm of security has fundamentally changed. The changes are related, on the one hand, with the emergence of new threats that are global in their nature, such as the problem of climate, international terrorism, drug trafficking and transnational crime. But, on the other hand, the degradation of the UNO and other international organizations provides some inadequacy to new threats, as well as to the international management.

All abovementioned led to the number of positions that has changed qualitatively: value hierarchy of international, regional and national security. The international element of

providing of the national security has extremely increased. Today, any country can alone ensure its own security. National security today has been increasingly determined by the level and degree of the international security. The globalization has made changes in the understanding of national security policy and mostly they bumped up against the following fact – that globalization blurs the line between the foreign policy and the domestic policy [5]. The merger of these two important directions of state activities in the field of the providing of the national security means in particular that any country – which claims to provide it – is considered not to allow to the other countries to carry out another policy within its borders, and fundamentally to carry another policy beyond its borders. Therefore, the national security policy today is understood to be more broad item than it used to be before. The national security policy is defined as a state activity within the whole society and each citizen individually, aimed at protecting national interests and values and their multiplication [5].

Today, the national security policy is closely linked to the strategy of sustainable democratic development and it is an integral part of it. Moreover, the national security policy is also the condition for the implementation of the democratic development [2]. The system of national security of the separate countries according to its nature is a kind of international brick in the constructing of the international security system. In the XXI century the separate country can not build its national security in a closed form or by the expense of another state or using the stable forms of the international security [2]. All abovementioned within the new environment has raised questions about fundamental changes in providing the security at all levels, including the national level, research and development new methodology of the national security policy, the creation of the new models of security which are adequate to security threats of the modern era.

At the present epoch in ensuring of the security, every state can rely on three types of the security systems enshrined in the international law. The first system – a system of universal global security, initiated by the adoption of the UN Charter in 1945. The UN Charter accumulated in itself such principles as non-use of force and threat of force; peaceful settlement of international disputes; and the maximum overall disarmament; respect and following the principles of the international law. The second system is based on a system of the regional security, the establishment of which is provided in Section VII of the UN Charter. The concept of the collective security allows long-term official commitments which are taken by the groups of states to ensure the safety of every member of the relevant groups within their overall space. The third security system – the complex of individual measures taken by the states. The right of States to ensure their security, which is the result of the basic principle of the international law, the principle of state sovereignty, is one of the manifestations of the state independence.

Within the totality of the global processes affecting the modern world politics, it is the globalization of the security to be seen in the theory of international relations as the element which is most closely related to the emergence of the entirely new challenges and threats. Globalization undermines the concept of the national security, eroding the category of the foreign and the domestic policy, the soft and the hard security approaches, the cost and benefits of the specific international transactions. Therefore, the traditional paradigm of the national security has given the way to a new paradigm of the global security, the regional security and transregional security and to the others developed within the models that take into account the current dynamics of the global security.

Under the influence of globalization changing the ratio of three security systems – the level of the regional security comes in the fore and increasing of the national security of any state depends on its effective cooperation with other countries within the region to which the country belongs.

Ensuring of the national security has been always the main task of the state, but the concept itself was included into the theory and practice only in 1947. Americans did it by adopting a document entitled «National Security Strategy of the United States, defining referral mechanisms and ensuring national security». From this period the development of the strategy of the national security has become the practice of all states [2]. Lack of national security conception does not mean that the states since its inception were not looking for the effective measures to carry out their security. One of the first models was security treaty alliances, creating of the blocks of States directed against the society. The cration of the Westphalian system of international relations was one of the ways to find the security model based on a broader legal framework that observes the basic principles of the state and its foreign policy. From this time the search for security models has been carried out constantly at the level of the world and of the individual states. In the XXI century several such models were created: a model of balance of power, the model of military-political alliances and block model. The model of «collective security» was widespread in the XX century. Its development dates back to the 1930s.

The model provides for long-term collective security official duties, which are taken on by the group of the states to guarantee security of each member. The basis of this model are formed by the following principls: refusing to use force in the resolution of problems, collective response to aggression and peaceful settlements of the disputes on the the basis of the international law [7]. In the second half of the XX century the model of collective security has received an expanded distribution. It included a set of collective measures directed against the external enemy. The right to collective defense has found its reflection in the Charter of the UN. In the context of this model, NATO and the Warsaw Pact were being formed. This model has obtained the widest circulation. By the end of the 1990s and at the beginning of the XXI century as shown the international practice, this model had showed itself inadequate according to the nature of the threats that require a high level of the security in general. In late 1990s, new theoretical developments made by the American political analysts suggested a number of new models to provide both the national and the international securities.

The model of the cooperative security was developed by the staff of Bruklin University: L. Carter, D. Staynbruner in 1992 in their book «The new concept of cooperative security». For the first time the term cooperative security was used by O. Fulbright in his work «Overconfidence of force» which was published in 1967. But as a scientific concept that defines a new approach to security based on cooperation it was introduced as it was mentioned only in the early 1990s. The cooperative security through cooperation is based on the principle of total participation, in which the presence of formal institutions is optional, but rather they are supporting an informal dialogue, which is more effective and appropriate. The concept of security through cooperation focuses on the role of preventive diplomacy [2] and includes 5 items. They are: the establishment of control over nuclear forces, mode conversion of defense industry, joint agreements that regulate the number of troops, the formation of the concept of mutually effective and legitimate intervention by which it is possible to use forces as well as the existence of interdependence [7].

The model of cooperative security prefers peaceful political actions and at the same time it does not exclude the use of force, but only as a tool of preventive diplomats [5]. The cooperative security is based on the postulates of liberal-idealist paradigm and it has several varieties. The most common are two of them. The first one appeals to the international institutions and law and according to the terminology by M. White, to the «hrotsian» (or «rationalist») tradition. Another insists on the universality of moral norms and adhering to the law as the main criterion of the security and thus it corresponds to the «kantian» (or «revolyutional») tradition. The differences between them is so great that in the essence we are

talking about two different concepts. The first of them pays much attention to the necessity of creating of the widest public security, which can take part all the countries interested in it, so the types considered to be the concept of this school is also called «participative security» [7]. While talking about the second version of the security, the society is actually quite limited by the in-crowd quantity of its members.

The concept of neutrality has been known since the time there was a slave formation. Geographic, political, economic and other factors enabled the individual states remain outside military conflicts between warring nations. But there was no legally defined rights and duties of the neutral states. Greek and Roman historians have reported interesting data about neutrality, expressing this concept with the words: keep clear not to join the combatants, take the middle position. The neutrality emerged and during its existence it used to be understood as an international legal institution, matched governing relations between states during the war. It was important in the concept of the neutrality, although it since the beginning of the «early stages of development of the international legal institution», included the relevant norms of behavior the neutral state carried out during peace. The meaning of neutrality changed in every historical epoch under the influence of economic, social and political conditions of a certain period of time and, in particular, the nature of war. As reflected in the behavior of non-participation in the war and to support peaceful relations with both warring parties, neutrality was known in ancient times. However, if the practice of neutrality has not received extensive development, as there was no general and regular political and economic relations between states.

As more or less formed as a legal institution that defines full mutual rights and obligations of warring states and those not involved in the war, neutrality has developed during the Modern era. In the XVII century the term «neutrality» began to be used in the practice of international relations.

The neutrality in international law is traditionally understood as a foreign policy carried out by the country, characterized by non-participation of this country in a war between other states, by refusing to provide military assistance to the parties that are in conflict, and not joining the military units in the course of the peacetime [3]. The neutrality is a political and legal position of the state, which does not participate in a war between other states and does not provide any military aid to any part of the conflict.

The UN Charter defines neutrality as one of the institutions of the international law, based on the recognition of the rights of neutral states:

- the territorial integrity and the unity of the country;
- the right to have its own armed forces, whose number does not exceed the needs of self-defense;
- asylum to the refugees and the victims of conflicts;
- economic aid to other countries if it does not violate its neutrality;

And also legal obligations of the neutral state include:

- carry out peaceful foreign policy to develop friendly relations with all countries, without exception, reinforce universal peace and security;
- prove willingness in practice to carry out international cooperation to solve the economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems, to facilitate and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without exception, people, regardless of race, sex, language or religion;
- solve their international disputes by peaceful means, aimed at strengthening peace, security and justice, abstain in international relations from the threat and the use of it [3].

Thus, neutrality as a model of providing of the national security has international legal basis, which in its turn guarantees the efficiency of this model.

In the history of international relations there are several forms of the neutrality, each of which has some differences.

The armed neutrality is a collective or individual action of neutral states which have to the use of force to achieve from warring states the respect to their interests. The content of the concept of armed neutrality is that in the difficult conditions, when the military conflicts emerging, the states are able to carry out their national interests, acting alone or together with other countries, but without entering into formal alliances or coalitions and avoiding personal involvement in hostilities [7].

The positive neutrality is one of the names of the peaceful foreign policy course, successfully used in a number of the European countries. In the same context such terms as «neutralism», «policy of non-participation in the blocks», «policy of freedom from alliances», «active neutrality» are used. In contrast to the state of the neutrality, existing during the war, the positive neutrality is carried out during peacetime, which means that the state has chosen positive neutrality as its foreign policy course, not being a part of the new military alliances with great powers. Such state prohibits the provision of the territory under foreign military base and tries to establish friendly relations with other countries. Since the countries that are on the way to carry out the positive neutrality, do not join any aggressive blocks, for example: NATO or SEATO, their policy is called «neutral». The main feature of this neutrality is seen to actively participate in the struggle for peace. In modern terms the positive neutrality is rightly considered to be a form of struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence [2].

The permanent neutrality is an international agreement established by domestic law obligation of the State not to participate in any war, except the armed defense of its territory from attacks or attempts hold by the warring states or other war-bent states. Permanently the neutral state is not only involved into the war, but it has also an obligation not to engage in the war. But it is also required to refrain from exercising in peacetime such actions in case of the war can pull it into a military conflict. Because the permanent neutrality implies non-participation in military blocs, refusal of granting land for foreign military base, and refusal to equip the with the nuclear weapon. The key feature of the permanent neutrality is an obligation to fix the said policy or special international agreements in the domestic legislation. The permanent neutrality is not limited by time and not linked to a specific war. The permanently neutral state usually has the right to have own armed forces, defensive constructions (strengthening border). That is the permanent neutrality does not exclude the right of self-defense as it is provided in Art. 51 of the Charter. But in case of war between other states the permanently neutral state must always follow the strict neutrality [2].

The neutrality, either the country takes it temporarily or only during the war, is the eventual neutrality. According to this view of the neutrality, a country that has proclaimed it shall achieve immediate withdrawal of troops from its territory, if they were to date on its territory, because the fact of any military bases in the territory can be regarded by one of the warring parties as a legal basis for other belligerents to consider the territory of the State as a theater of war with all the negative, perhaps even catastrophic consequences for the state which has proclaimed the eventual neutrality [7].

It should be noted that state who wishes to be neutral, should draw its neutral status legally. Legal registration of the neutral status is done by passing a law on neutrality, the adoption of the relevant resolution of the UN General Assembly, by signing the neutrality of the States concerned. During the conflict to acquire the status of a neutral state it enough to declare the neutrality in the war and bringing this statement to the warring parties. But if the

neutrality is self-declared, as the history shows, it is never recognized and maintained by the aggressor countries.

Within all the types in the world Swiss neutrality is the longest and the most consistent one. Today Switzerland is not part of any single military alliance as well as it is not a part of the EU. In recent years, due to changes in Europe and the world the government and public opinion mood takes effect in favor of greater integration with the EU and a more flexible interpretation of the principle of the neutrality [10]. This is especially true in the participation of Switzerland in the process of European integration. If during the early stages of development of integration processes in Europe Geneva almost clearly revealed in its refusal, during the 1990s its position was changing. Switzerland is looking for mechanisms and ways of participation in the EU to implement its economic interest in correlation with the positions of a neutral state. As the researchers note, Geneva successfully completed this task by signing bilateral agreements with the EU (the so-called «bilateralism»).

Switzerland managed to build a system of relations with the EU, which allowed minimizing the economic losses of the state. A kind of motto of this type of cooperation was «to be able to integrate in order to not have the need for membership» [10]. The main aim of concluding bilateral agreements for Switzerland was to guarantee for the nation the best possible access to the EU internal market. During negotiations 1994-1999 drafted package of seven sectoral agreements (called «Bilateral agreements») were concluded, finally they were signed in June 1999, backed by a referendum by a majority of 67.2% of the vote in May 2000, and entered into force in June 1, 2002.

In October 2004 the second package of sectoral agreements (Bilateral Agreements II) was initiated, most provisions of which did not require approval on a referendum. This package envisaged accession of Switzerland to the Schengen and Dublin agreements based on the model of association (which are used for Iceland and Norway) [10].

But the most interesting in terms of the transformation phenomenon neutrality of Switzerland was the process of gaining membership in the UN. Long reluctance of the population to join this organization was due the fear to make harm to the traditional neutrality of the country. This conservative attitude led to the fail of the first attempt of the state to join the UN: the referendum in 1986 according to a proposal to join the UN was clearly rejected by a majority of the population (75% against) and all without exception cantons. Entry was made possible as a result of the approval of the people's initiative «For Switzerland's membership in the United Nations» launched in September 1998 and submitted to the executive in March 2000 to universal referendum in March 3, 2002 when 54.6% of the Swiss cantons and the majority (12 out of 23) voted for it.

Switzerland became a member of the United Nations in September 10, 2002. Until that date, since 1948, she had an observer status at the United Nations principal organs, and it was a member of all specialized UN organizations, many funds, programs and institutions of the Organization. In the framework of the Confederation the country actively advocated the implementation of UN goals that meet the main priorities of its foreign policy. The decision to join the UN has become, literally, a pivotal event in the development of the international cooperation of the country and showed some rethinking of the traditional population of the principle of the neutrality.

Full membership in the United Nations considered neutral Switzerland as an important additional tool for the implementation of foreign policy goals. It gave the country the right to vote and opened up new opportunities to participate in the UN activities and increasing influence within the organization. At the same time, the policy of the confederation is quite cautious. In particular, we talk about the need to respect the principle of neutrality [10].

In terms of the security, in Switzerland dominates a positive attitude to the process of deepening of the European integration and enlargement of the EU and NATO, which carries the strengthening of the security on the continent. However, the actual commitment to the neutrality policy held by the integration of the data structure, while allowing to develop bilateral cooperation, both in the military (peacekeeping, disarmament, military training) and not the military (the fight against international crime and illegal migration, drug trafficking, etc.) areas. The cooperation with NATO takes place in the framework of «Partnership for Peace», they participate in the form of a dialogue on security issues in the Euro-Atlantic area, supporting projects to modernize the structures of security in the South-Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia. The EU cooperation is a part of the accession: «Switzerland in the Schengen and Dublin agreements» and the associated constant contact law enforcement hectares migration authorities on matters of mutual interest [10]. According to the transformed politics of the country to participate in international sanctions regimes in the course of the 1990s, country joined the UN sanctions on Iraq, which was a significant change of foreign policy carried out by the country. For the first time since the Second World War, Switzerland openly and fully joined the international sanctions regime. Earlier it was considered incompatible with the status of the permanent neutrality. As the Bundesrat argued at the request of international solidarity and Swiss interest in preserving fundamental norms and principles of the international law, believing that the sanctions arising from the economic obligations do not contradict the neutrality and, in addition, the compliance will not lead to direct involvement in military action by the country. This policy would be reflected in the future. In 1992, Switzerland joined the sanctions regime against Yugoslavia and Libya, in 1993 – against Haiti, in 1997 – against Sierra Leone, in 1998 – against Angola and, finally, in 2001 – against the movement «Taliban».

In addition, Switzerland has supported and joined the European Union sanctions on regimes imposed without the appropriate UN resolutions (on Yugoslavia – in 1998 and Myanmar – 2000).

In 1998 Switzerland as a result of direct interest in resolving military conflicts there was no consensus on the neutrality as the basis of the foreign policy, although the rulers of the country found an evidence in the new Constitution adopted in 2000. But supporters of positions of the neutrality, association «Movement for an independent and neutral Switzerland» were rather strong enough in their majority, because residents used to support this course. At the same time the country should be stressed that Swiss neutrality had to be transformed adapting to the new realities of the XXI century.

The problem in the Balkans acceding not only to the respect the UN sanctions regime in Belgrade to stage weapons, but also to the comprehensive sanctions taken by the EU (diplomatic and economic). Thus the country first joined the economic sanctions without the UN Security Council decision. This feature provides a report on the country's foreign policy in 1993 under which Switzerland could join the economic sanctions imposed outside the UN if they are made by a group of states on a region of the state, gives peace and security, in that case it was Yugoslavia [10].

Sweden has the most extensive experience in implementing the policy of the neutrality. For the first time, Sweden's neutrality was officially proclaimed by King Gustav XIV in 1834 due to the conversion of a real threat to the Baltic theater of the war. Since 1814, the country has not participated in the wars and not entered into any international alliances. Proclaimed policy of the neutrality, Sweden has consistently affirmed this status, when there were similar situations or war began.

Unilateral official declaration of the neutrality as Sweden did in 1853 (during the Crimean War) and in 1914 when it was the First World War. In 1939 when the Second World

War was taking place, Sweden claimed to have the the status of «no hostility» («non belligerency»). During the war between the USSR and Finland (1939-1940 gg.), Sweden declared itself as a «non-warring party», but it was involved into Finland military supplies, accepted Finnish evacuees and let Swedish volunteers in the Finnish army to shift through its territory [8].

However, the neutrality of Sweden, in contrast to that of Austria and Switzerland, is not enshrined in any national or international official act. It is not mentioned in the Swedish Constitution and not officially recognized by any state or international associations. But every year, according to the tradition, the neutrality is invariably mentioned in the Government's foreign policy declarations, which is adopted by the Parliament and it is declared by the Minister for External Affairs, who can be considered an official confirmator of the neutral status.

Thus Sweden's neutrality is based solely on its own self in the world. The result is that the country has no formal international guarantees of its sovereignty and, therefore – has to provide its own, including creating and maintaining powerful defense capabilities [4].

Swedish line of the traditional neutrality is based on the three main provisions: political course of equidistance from major countries; large support of the society (in the public consciousness entrenched neutrality as a genuine national trait); system of national defense with an autonomous military industry [4]. All these components have been adjusted in certain historical periods. Thus, in 1921 Sweden entered the League of Nations and proclaimed course of «well armed neutrality».

After the Second World War, Sweden replaces is with the concept of «peaceful neutrality». In the context of the «peaceful neutrality» Sweden is worth recalling that it was the Swedish diplomat D. Hammarskjold, who was elected after the Second World War, as the UN Secretary General and initiated one of the first uses of international peacekeeping forces in crisis management in different regions of the world.

This idea worked out by D. Hammarskjold was one of the components of foreign policy doctrine of Stockholm. Sweden traditionally involved in many peacekeeping missions under the UN auspices and a number of Swedish politicians (Alexander Palme, R. Ekeus, X. Blix, J. Eliasson, C. Bildt) played a significant role in establishing peace and security in different countries within the respective missions of this and other international organizations.

The report submitted by T. Stoltenberg is positive enough. The report contained proposals aimed to consolidate the security in the region. Finland has fully supported these proposals, including assumed the responsibilities of the participation in the control of airspace, as well as strengthening sub-regional military-political and defense cooperation based on the quality processing of proposals of the review report made by the Norwegian Ministry of defense referred to Sweden and Finland's security policy in 2008, «which tells about the security policy which in small countries has very limited capacity for self-adaptation to very expensive modern military technologies. These countries in conditions of limited defense budgets and fierce competition in the military-technical sphere are forced to cut their fighting force units, in order to ensure the necessary level of procurement of the modern weapons. Therefore the subregional military cooperation is most appropriate for them, and perhaps the only way to optimize defense spending [9].

Finland supported the initiative to create the Northern forces to prevent conflicts and to preserve the sub-regional stability. In a joint declaration adopted on the results of the meeting, the officials approved the establishment of the rapid reaction force, which is already available in the form of military and civil units, but their structure and subordination must be elaborated in the nearest future. Following this in Helsinki in November 5, 2009 at the meeting of the ministers of defense of five Nordic countries, the officials founded a new organization

(Nordic Defense Cooperation), which was aimed to reduce defense spending and increase the efficiency of the military forces of these countries [6].

Thus we see that legally staying in the status of non-aligned state, Finland transformed its integration policy within the EU in January 1995, having changed its status de facto. It was after an official farewell to the «Finlandisation» – rethinking the nature of the neutrality, denial of official documents affirmed during the period, replacing it with non-alignment, as well as the official statement that received in the foreign policy doctrine as a possibility of «options». The country clearly demonstrates its commitment to build a new security model, participated with the EU under its creation as well as cooperated with NATO and finally participated in the creation of the regional security system. Thus the experience of this country clearly shows that with the reference to the classic sense of the neutrality it does not match the system of international relations that prevailed at the end of XX – beginning of the XXI century.

The globalization increases the interdependence of states in the sphere of security and the economy, leading to profound changes priorities of their course in the world and changing the concept of «state power». When saving a significant share of host-power component, more and more significant impact on the partners and opponents are laid by the economic, financial, intellectual and information resources [2].

The globalization has brought the most significant component: the integrity of security – a vital area for the main elements of the international system.

In terms of network threats when, for example, the degradation of a number of «third world» is not only a humanitarian issue, but also a challenge to the national security of other countries, no matter how they are powerful and influential, and the financial crisis in one region by causing chain reactions and wrapped worldwide recession of the world economy, it is impossible to speak of the international system as some chaotic elements [7].

Thus, under the present conditions of ensuring the national security of each country can not be considered separately from the security and stability of the international system as a whole. If a security previously defined «security» of many individual, today it is complemented by the fact that the security of each individual is largely determined by the common security.

Terrorist attacks as economic crisis confirmed the integrity of the international system. However, the degree of stability and security decreased. Furthermore, a series of events was emerging and that threaten to destabilize the region such as the situation in the Middle East. If this region disappears from the world system, it violates its integrity. Another example – the tactics of a terrorist attack using the weapon of mass destruction. In this case, in a moment basic rules and norms of international behavior will be changed. It may cause the whole countries and regions disappear, which would mean the death of the current system and its integrity and a creation of a new international system and its integrity, and the creation of a new international system on the principle of collective solidarity.

We understand that the process of the globalization that spreads rapidly, the policy of neutrality in its present form fails to address the problem of the national security. In principle there are two possible solutions to these problems in the era of globalization. The first one is the path of unilateral action. Proponents of this choice reflect the mood of the Western nations. The essence of their thinking is: the scale of the problems caused by the globalization, so that even the total resources of developed countries is not enough to solve them. And if so, it is correct to «get out alone». Thus they start using protectionist actions, often – unilateral or method of force, creating certain centers of economic and political stability. As for us, such answer to the challenges of our time is not acceptable either for

ethical or by purely pragmatic considerations. The temptation of unilateral action in order to maximize the benefits of the globalization and to protect it from negative effects provokes the growth of rivalry, contempt of the international law and multilateral institutions. This way can give a short-lived advantage, but the damage will be long term, increasing the danger of undermining the foundations of the international law, decreasing of the manageability in the sphere of the world politics etc.

Another way is the collective search for solutions of two interrelated problems. First one is urgent – to prevent the danger of threats which are multiplying as well as to minimize the risks of political, economic, criminal-terrorist character. Second one must be solved in the long term. The strategy of the globalization management is to be developed to expand its positive impact on all people, not just on a limited number of «those who are selected» [7].

The key to finding effective solutions to the problems of the security is seen in the creation of a global system to counter modern threats and challenges. Such a system should be designed to solve real problems in the national security, meet the interests of each state, to ensure international stability and sustainable development in the worldwide long term, but this violates the neutrality policy.

Thus, in the modern system of international relations in the context of the globalization, a policy of the neutrality gradually loses its ability to address effectively the issues of the national security in the countries which have such strategy of the national security protection. This affects the self-proclaimed neutrality. Some researchers believed that the effectiveness of the policy of the neutrality is possible only if it has a clear legal justification in the international law, including the UN and it is marked as the neutrality policy of the country enshrined in the documents of the organization

Ukrainian researcher M. Sungurovskiy considered using the neutrality as a model of security in the context of the globalization in the absence of confrontation between the block and large-scale armed conflict. Because the status of the military neutrality is meaningless by reason of the international terrorism has become one of the most important threats of the modern world security. The threat of the international terrorism can not be overcome via the policy of the permanent neutrality. And it is not clear regarding whom it is introduced? In modern conditions when there are fundamental changes in geopolitics, even successful European neutral countries (Austria, Finland and Sweden) were faced with a difficult choice of means of preserving national security and gradually «drifting» to the collective security systems [1]. Thus the scientist concludes the inability to ensure the national security policy based on the neutrality. The same conclusion is also shared by other researchers [2; 7].

Along with the policy of the neutrality, the concept of non-alignment widespread during the 1960-70s. The emergence of this concept is associated with the period of the Cold War when the world was divided into two political camps, and the ascent of the national movement of the colonial system of capitalism began as well as the formation of the structure of the bipolar system of international relations – the Non-Aligned Movement. The states which were out of the blocks NATO and the Warsaw Pact join that movement. After the collapse of the bipolar system, the concept of non-alignment acquires new quality and it is taken as a specific policy of the national security. Several countries elect non-alignment as a model of the implementation of their national security. These countries including Ukraine have identified non-alignment as the basis of their foreign policy. Some researchers believe that there are no significant differences in policy of the neutrality and non-alignment policy. A. Zlenko believes that the current interpretation of the neutrality and non-alignment is referred to ensure the participation in the security institutions being not contrary to the neutrality/non-aligned status until it does not mean the involvement into collective actions related to collective defense.

Ukrainian researcher M. Sungurovskiy, having examined non-alignment, believes that it is – the refusal to join the military alliance without any warranty or international recognition of its status by the other states [1] and non-alignment can be seen as a kind of the neutrality.

As the globalization processes being widened, such national security model as the policy of the neutrality almost has no any prospects. The core of the neutrality policy must constantly being transformed and got a new content. In the XXI century for the national security to be carried out, it is necessary to cooperate within the system of the pan-regional security with huge number of actors including all structures that establish security on all levels.

References

1. Сунгуровский Н. Срочно нужна новая модель безопасности государства [Электронный ресурс] / Н. Сунгуровский. – Режим доступа : <http://tyzhden.ua/Society/119439>.
2. Cha D. V. Globalization and the study of international security [Electronic resource] / D. V. Cha. – Mode of access : <http://faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/rdenever/PPA-730-27/Cha.pdf>.
3. Charter of the UN [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter1.shtml>.
4. Gotkowska J. The future of Sweden's security and defence policy after the Russian-Ukrainian crisis [Electronic resource] / J. Gotkowska. – Mode of access : <http://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/2014-05-28/future-swedens-security-and-defence-policy-after-russian-ukrainian>
5. Ivanov I. International Security in the Age of Globalization [Electronic resource] / I. Ivanov. – Mode of access : http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/number/n_627
6. Marton A. Changes in the security and defence policy of Finland in the 21st. Century [Electronic resource] / A. Marton. – Mode of access : http://uninke.hu/downloads/kutatas/folyoiratok/hadtudomanyi_szemle/szamok/2012/2012_1/2012_1_br_marton_andrea_angol_111_116.pdf.
7. Sean K. Globalization, Power, and Security [Electronic resource] / K. Sean. – Mode of access : <http://www.comw.org/pda/fulltext/0403kay.pdf>.
8. Sweden Proposes Aggressive Nordic Defense [Electronic resource] . – Mode of access : <http://www.defensenews.com/story/defense/policy-budget/warfare/2015/02/10/sweden-nordic-cooperation-russia-nordefco-cooperation-nbg--sreide-battlegroup/22865811/>
9. The Stoltenberg Report: New Life for Nordic Cooperation? [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://www.diplomaatia.ee/en/article/the-stoltenberg-report-new-life-for-nordic-cooperation/>
10. The Swiss security policy report: key points and debates [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://www.css.ethz.ch/publications/pdfs/CSS-Analyses-50.pdf>.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 19.04.2015 р.

Н.В. Гаврилова, К.А. Трима

НЕЙТРАЛІТЕТ ЯК МОДЕЛЬ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ БЕЗПЕКИ

В статті проаналізовано сучасні підходи до забезпечення національної безпеки та фактори, які впливають на динаміку розвитку моделей безпеки. Надано характеристику основним моделям національної безпеки, таким як модель колективної безпеки та модель кооперативної безпеки. Перша модель передбачає довгострокові цілі колективної безпеки, які забезпечуються групою держав, для того, щоб гарантувати безпеку кожного члена. Основою цієї моделі є такі принципи: відмова використовувати силу для вирішення проблем, колективне реагування на агресію і

застосування базових норм міжнародного права. Ця модель отримала широке поширення у другій половині ХХ - на початку ХХІ століття.

Кооперативна безпека ґрунтується на постулатах ліберально-ідеалістичної парадигми. Дана модель формується на основі принципу загальної участі, наявність формалізованих інститутів є не обов'язковою; більш ефективним та гнучким є підтримка неформального діалогу. Модель має кілька різновидів. Найбільш поширеними є дві з них. Перший апелює до міжнародних інститутів і права, а другий пов'язаний з універсальністю моральних норм і дотриманням закону в якості основного критерію безпеки.

В статті також розглянуто історію та специфіку нейтралітету як форми забезпечення національної безпеки. Надано розгорнуту характеристику таким формам нейтралітету як: збройний, позитивний чи постійний нейтралітети. Охарактеризовано системи національної безпеки, в основу яких покладено нейтралітет. Серед них, моделі національної безпеки Швейцарії, Швеції та Фінляндії. Надано характеристику еволюціонування моделі нейтралітету у вищевказаних країнах.

Ключові слова: національна безпека, модель національної безпеки, нейтралітет.

РЕЦЕНЗЕНТИ: Трофименко М.В., к.політ.н, доц.; Хома Н.М., д.політ.н, проф.

УДК 327.88:316.776.23(470+571)

К.О. Гмирянська

ДОКТРИНАЛЬНЕ ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ ІНФОРМАЦІЙНО-ПСИХОЛОГІЧНОЇ АГРЕСІЇ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ФЕДЕРАЦІЇ ЩОДО УКРАЇНИ

Сучасна геополітика диктує нові виклики та загрози світовій спільноті, а відповідно змінюються інструменти реалізації політичних місій країн-опонентів. Інформаційно-пропагандистські інструменти маніпулювання масовою свідомістю є невід'ємною складовою політичного життя. Однією з характерних рис сучасного суспільства є, за словами Мануеля Кастельса, віртуалізація політики [1].

Боротьба за владу, анексування сфер впливу на геополітичній мапі відбувається здебільшого в інформаційному просторі. Саме інформаційний простір являється основним плацдармом протидії країн-конкурентів. І це наше сьогодення. Політичні лідери, держави-опоненти використовують широкий арсенал інформаційної зброї з метою впливу на думку світової спільноти та формування сприятливого, позитивного іміджу своїй політиці задля здобуття підтримки як всередині своєї держави, так і за її межами.

Ключові слова: Доктрина інформаційної безпеки, Україна, РФ, інформаційна зброя, дезінформаційно-психологічна операція, інформаційно-психологічна агресія (інформаційна експансія), медійний простір, пропаганда.

Метою статті є визначення ефективності доктринального забезпечення інформаційно-пропагандистської агресії Російської Федерації в практичній площині (на прикладі агресії щодо України).

На сьогоднішній день проблема інформаційної безпеки набула глобального значення і саме тому вона широко висвітлюється у працях як вітчизняних, так і