

TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

School of Business and Governance

Department of Law

Dmitrii Stepanenko

FEATURES OF A NEW INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

Bachelor's thesis

Supervisor: Lecturer Vlad Vernygora

Tallinn 2017

I have written the bachelor's thesis independently.

All works and major viewpoints of the other authors, data from other sources of literature and elsewhere used for writing this paper have been referenced.

Dmitrii Stepanenko

(signature, date)

Student's Code: 113420

Student's e-mail address: tim41007@gmail.com

Supervisor Lecturer Vlad Vernygora:

The thesis conforms to the requirements set for the Bachelor's theses

.....

(signature, date)

Chairman of defence committee:

Permitted to defence

.....

(Title, name, signature, date)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
1. OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM.....	9
1.1. International system as of 1945.....	9
1.2. The UN Charter.....	11
1.3. International system as of 2017.....	13
1.4. Comparison of the two systems.....	14
2. FEATURES OF A NEW INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM.....	16
2.1. The Islamic state.....	16
2.2. Proxy wars.....	21
2.3. The EU as a new feature.....	27
2.4. NATO – towards political organisation.....	30
CONCLUSIONS.....	36
REFERENCES.....	39
SUMMARY.....	42

ABSTRACT

The current international system has drastically changed since its inception in 1945, with a number of important developments contributing to this change. The system's foundations were to comfortably 'reside' on the promised ability of the US-British-Soviet political elites to be or, whenever necessary, to become a cohesive power in terms of making the world a more secure place. The emergence of the Cold War had capitalised on sceptical expectations of the international system's sustainability. Furthermore, the emergence of the highly non-conventional EU and the so-called Islamic State, together with the conceptually re-designed for a new time phenomenon of 'proxy war', brought some distinctly nouvelle features to the old system. Finally, the North Atlantic Alliance – this planet's biggest collective defence-focused international framework – has started shifting towards becoming a globally-oriented political organisation, re-defining its role in the world. This paper argues that the aforementioned factors are among those that challenged the post-1945 international system and, to a certain extent, changed it fundamentally. The scarcity of academic resources on the subject hints that this topic has not been addressed by academia in a comprehensive way.

Keywords: *new international system, non-conventional actor, international scene, new feature, proxy war, NATO*

INTRODUCTION

The current international system is based on the principles of the United Nations (UN) and its Charter. Founded at the end of WWII, it gave a hope for creating a credible framework to achieve collective security. On paper, 51 countries formally participated in its establishment and since the Charter was signed by those countries, the UN has been growing steadily in its scope. These days, the organisation has 193 members, and all of them are to contribute towards maintaining global peace, keeping in mind that peaceful coexistence can only be maintained, if it was ever achieved in the first place. The relative success of this collaboration led to the formation of other international organisations and unions, and the international system's degree of complexity expanded beyond control.

Any system is highly dependent on changes within its scope or its actors, as they will inevitably affect all other members. For instance, the UK's call on voting out from the European Union (EU) has affected the whole framework, in which the more integrated part of Europe is existing. Another example is the United States' current negative attitude towards the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). While this bloc consists of three actors (US, Mexico and Canada), the USA is the undisputed hegemon, and its policy towards the framework makes immediate effect on the NAFTA's future. Finally, there is an example of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) that was supposed to assist a number of post-Soviet countries to ease the 'pain' felt after the crushing collapse of the Soviet Union. At the same time, Georgia left the organisation, Turkmenistan and Ukraine never formally joined it, Armenia and Azerbaijan never reconciled their disagreements, and the Russian Federation would not be stopped from any type of aggressive activity it was conducting. This has further destabilised the region and added extra pressure on the organisation.

With time, any system is prone to change, and that is self-evident in the current events, which this thesis will be covering. One interesting aspect of the contemporary international system are the changes that contradict its foundation. Those changes are spoken about, addressed, but then seemed to be ignored and left out of the system they have affected. The topic of the new international system is under-researched and only a small fraction of researches looked into those changes within the system. One of them is Nick Bisley (2012), who started addressing those changes in the world order in his *Great Powers in the Changing International Order*, arguing that the topic of changing international system has been avoided

in contemporary literature. This paper will look into these new features that the international system has been acquiring over the course of its existence.

Firstly, this work gives an overview of how the international system was created and the issues that were cemented into its foundations. These first complications can be viewed as the original cause of having to create a new system by 2017. Additionally, I shall give an overview of the original Charter that the UN agreed upon, and what the organisation's aims are. The purpose of reviewing these is by way of providing a comparison against the features that are present in the new system. The findings show how much they differ from one another. Having given a background of the international system, its Charter and issues that lay with its creation, I will also look at the international system as of 2017 and outline some features that have been embedded into it, thus forming a new system. All the features will be reviewed, analysed and their importance in the system detailed.

The second part will focus on both non-conventional and conventional actors, such as the Islamic State, and the EU. While the EU has been evolving over decades, changing its policies, rules, and adding new members, it can be argued that it has not had time to solidify its union to be granted a formal status by the UN. It is still in the phase of expanding and onboarding new members (such as Albania) and losing others (like the UK). The emergence of the EU as a global actor is in itself a new feature. The UN has never previously encountered a union of this kind. Before the EU in its present form was framed up in 1993, the UN did not provide any support for the union to be established, which is attributed to their scepticism of the union's perspectives. The second actor to change the course of the international system is the so-called Islamic State (ISIS), which is also an alternative form of a government that commits violent terrorist acts throughout the Middle East, also targeting the USA and Europe and rapidly growing to exert its influence in the Islamic world. The rise of ISIS has been characterised by the formation of an active military and religious group to defy Western powers and the world order, and to redraw the lines of the world political map. Defined as a feature in the new system, it has clearly become a menace to the world order.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), a military alliance formed after WWII, in 1949, has also had a significant impact on the international system. It was developed to balance power between the US and Western Europe against the former Soviet Union, and has struggled with defining itself ever since. In fact, NATO did not participate in

any military operations during the first 40 years of its existence. While its combined efforts were put towards defining the organisation militarily, it has swayed towards being more of a political entity over its lifetime. While this change has been obfuscated in NATO's recent affairs and engagements, it has brought about a subtle change to the system. The organisation has initiated a number of public diplomacy-related projects in the Asia-Pacific and the Mediterranean basin.

Fourthly, proxy wars have gained in significance and complexity in the contemporary international system. This poses a threat to the established world order and the system. The most important event that has happened and is still ongoing is the civil war in Syria. After the Arab Spring, relations between the government of Syria and its population had deteriorated. In addition to the number of involved actors within the conflict, more members joined in to participate. Each one of them took their place in this growing conflict for their own benefit. Broadly speaking, one stance supports the regime of Bashar Al-Assad and the other is against him. Each side consists of various member countries that are pursuing their interest in the conflict and fighting on the international stage for the sake of testing its waters. At its expense, Syria has been turned into a vast battlefield of both independent and government-backed fighting groups, representing multiple various factions.

Finally, I will summarise my findings and reflect on the features that have inevitably been absorbed into the international system. No acknowledgements or in-depth empirical research have been made to their effect on the system thus far. This further strengthens the importance of this thesis and adds to the significance of needed changes to be included in contemporary international relations and the system. Not only does the comparison of the international systems of 1945 and 2017 need to be brought to our attention, but also an understanding of how this may affect the course of history and future international relations. The consistency and conformity to the consensus Charter of the UN must not be left out from the dialogue within the international community. Hence, it will also be argued that this silent integration of features into the new international system is unseen and how this creates a lack of transparency between actors of international scope. In the upshot, the work will show my hypothesis of what could happen if the international system does not embrace new features in the long run and how international relations can be affected as a result.

Throughout the paper, the aforementioned events will be reviewed and analysed to add

to the weight of their involvement in bringing the international system to its new form as we see it. Methods to assist with the research will be based on studies of conflict and international relations. It is essential to focus on each of the preceding aspects to cover the background of every event and how they are correlated to one another. This paper serves as an academic research about each event, and changes of, an organisation and union. Then, I will further focus on the issues within each aspect. Therefore, the issues that have firmly or loosely been established within each of the examples are viewed as the new feature.

The range of the sources represents some prime and secondary types of materials: normative documents, academic books, articles and journals. In addition, the author's perspective will contribute towards the analysis based on the topic's goal. As this topic lacks empirical research, the number of specific materials is scarce. Every chapter will give a general historical overview, talk about events in the present and compare them to the international system of 1945. The way the paper is systematised is to cover most significant events in the international system that are most affecting. To add to the weight of importance of those events, the paper covers events' background, rational reasons for its appearance and the impact that it has made. Every sub-chapter in the second chapter has conclusion that summarises the findings and signifies the need in continuing research of the event. To make the next analysis about the topic richer, other materials and research will be suggested. Not only is further detailed research on the new international system required but also the importance towards it has to be justified both on a political and scholarly level. A new international system cannot be reversed, neither can the events be undone. Henceforth, this new world order needs to embrace those changes and act upon them, whether it requires amendments in the UN's Charter or collective interference of all countries into resolving the conflicts to balance out the system.

1. OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

1.1. The International system as of 1945

The birth of the UN was a complicated mission led by the 'Big Three' – the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the US. After WWII, and with Europe in ruins, the leaders of the Big Three met to discuss what was left of Europe. They focused on how to unite their forces to prevent the repetition of such a historical calamity. With the failure of the League of Nations (LON) to prevent WWII and other military conflicts, the three leaders could not afford to exclude one another in the new union, nor could they aim to follow the same structural organisation that the League once did. This dedication to establishing a new peace organisation by three world powers proved to be a complicated and strained mission.

Plokhy (2010) – in his book *Yalta: The Price of Peace* – outlines some instances of this elaborate relationship between the three leaders, and he also focuses on how their contrasting decisions led to the establishment of the UN. With Germany losing its conquered territories, the three leaders had to decide which part would belong to whom. 'Divide and conquer' was seen as the best strategy to avoid any future territorial conflicts at the time. Some conflicts of such nature had already created tensions back in the days of LON and so accumulating even more of these territorial disputes was the least desired contribution to the formation of the UN. However, when the Soviet Union was deciding on their power of influence over Poland, and having the country as a security zone along their Western borders – there "[...] was a clash of geopolitical vision, ideology, and culture that the Yalta Conference did little to resolve" (Plokhy 394). These brawls continued over the course of the conference, creating an invisible diplomatic barrier between the Big Three. All of them were aware of it, but had to ignore it for the sake of advancing peace negotiations. Tensions between the leaders magnified when Roosevelt made a secret deal with Stalin. One part of the deal regarded Asia, and not withholding his promise to Churchill to recover reparations from Poland's aftermath of WWII. This is only one of many examples of the complex nature of the allied relationship. Tensions that arose concerning determination of the status of Poland defined future relations between the US and the Soviet Union.

Another further area of conflict of interests was between Roosevelt and Churchill. Both leaders lacked unity due to having differing views on Stalin's decisions at the negotiating table and how questions were handled among them. While Roosevelt was focused on a global agenda, i.e. empowering the American's global presence and supremacy within the economical sphere over Britain's, Churchill wanted to avoid the Soviet Union becoming the European hegemon, which he saw it as a significant danger to Britain's security. Hence both remained in the "[...] opposite camps because of conflicting geopolitical goals" (Plokhy 396). Albeit the fact that Roosevelt was the most optimistic about the conference and its potential outcome, he said that none of the three in the alliance would have their influence or contribution to its full extent (Plokhy 336). Moreover, Roosevelt's idea was also to begin a war with Japan upon Stalin's agreement. This, however, took 90 days after the fall of the Hitler's Germany (History.com Staff 2009). Following establishment of this support from the Soviets, the US exercised their freedom of military power and dropped the nuclear bomb on Japan. These conflicting goals of the American leader demonstrate another realistic eagerness of the organisation despite it promoting and encouraging peace and resolution of conflicts.

During the conference, the three leaders agreed to make some compromises. This helped them sustain themselves together in alliance, at the time and afterwards. Churchill was overall disappointed with the conference, to the extent that he did not include any crucial piece of information about Yalta in his memoirs (Plokhy 397). The issue associated with this was that The Big Three had their vision of the outcome. Their demands and criteria, which they followed, were based on a real political approach, which served as a complication for each one of them to reach a common consensus. Rather than taking a liberal approach, each actor focused on what would be the best outcome for their own interests. For instance: Roosevelt wanted to bring out more from the conference, focusing on what could be achieved globally. This included bolstering out the US interests against Great Britain and what would be the best for the USA in the end. One of the priorities was to focus more on his relationship with Stalin. Churchill, fearful of the Soviet Union's expansion, was sceptical of the Soviet's involvement, but at the same time, he had to accept being next to the Soviet leader, and focus on the security of his country. The Soviet Union was as rational as the other two world leaders – their intention was to expand their sphere of influence within Europe, to try to take as much of the territory lost by Germany as possible.

Following the end of the conference, some scholars and political leaders have seen Yalta as the failure of three power-hungry leaders to negotiate agreement. Nixon mentions this failure to reaching those agreement in his memoirs and blaming the Soviets for not following the agreements. That further created more tensions between the two global leaders. The US and the Soviet Union had come to the beginning of the lengthy Cold War, which rendered the conference not very practical in the long run. With those realistic expectations and military strategy, China soon joined the P5 of the UN. The main reason for this was China's possession of nuclear weaponry. This, however, does not bode well for the UN's established Charter. After the conference and creating more prospects for future war like this, it can be concluded that "[...] Yalta was a stepping-stone to the insecure world of great-power tensions and the threat of nuclear annihilation" (Plokhy 402).

In short, these tensions between different superpowers, sharing different ideas, ideals and expectations, created a rather challenging and controversial ground for conversation. This alone can be observed in Plokhy's book about the Yalta conference – the place of birth of the UN. Yalta symbolised political failure and created a big gap in achievements left untouched by the Big Three. This ultimately led the Soviet Union and the US into the Cold War, and left many more tensions beside. The relationship between the three leaders was mainly based on misunderstandings, which were never resolved, even after the conference. Despite Stalin's hope to form a friendship between the three of them, the pragmatic view on each political leader's side overwhelmed the other, with little room left for negotiations that would, in the end, satisfy everyone. In the end, it is worth mentioning that "there will always be ideological and cultural differences not only between enemies but also between partners. This was the case at Yalta, and an appreciation of those differences is essential in making an alliance work and avoiding inflated expectations" (Plokhy 404).

1.2. The UN Charter

The Charter of the UN is the glue of its foundation, and what the first 51 countries of that organisation agreed to. This has been the guideline towards keeping world peace and maintaining friendly relations between one another, and a cornerstone of the world's rights and countries' obligations. The Charter has also served as the basis of international relations.

The first Charter talks about maintaining and promoting international peace, including economic and social goals. It further prohibits the use of armed force, respect for obligations, and keeping international law in place. The principles and aims of the Charter also mention the collaboration of all member states. Their goal is to assist one another, not only respecting but also fulfilling their commitment to the Charter. Threat and the use of force are likewise prohibited, international disputes are not to harm international peace, based on the Charter. The Charter also embodies the following six organs within itself, which are to follow the Charter. These are the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat. Each body of the UN is crucial within the international system it follows and is bound to maintain.

Each body is in charge of fulfilling the part of the Charter that it has been assigned. The General Assembly's responsibility is anything that involves peace, security and assisting the Security Council. It can recommend peaceful settlements to any security-related queries. The Security Council is responsible for maintaining security within member countries. It also identifies threats, and how issues may be resolved by peaceful means. It communicates with countries that are in conflict, and in cases of disobedience to the Charter; enacting verbal, economic, and military sanctions where necessary. Bisley also speaks about the flaws of the Charter and points out that the power of veto allows permanent members to override any decisions in the Security Council. This is one of the most complicated organisations within the UN and can be misused by five countries to exercise their rational goals out of the international conflicts. The Economic and Social Council are in charge of tasks that involve the economy and social-related aspects in member countries, as well as supporting involved organisations under the UN. They assist with strengthening the world economy and help fight poverty and social injustice alongside the UN's organisations. They are one of the most fundamental and crucial supporting bodies of the UN – the baseline of shaping and maintaining the international system is reliant on them.

Since the international system encompasses 193 countries, it is without a doubt a complicated task to maintain the Charter and articles which the countries have agreed upon to follow. The pitfall of the Charter is that it is not up-to-date with a current composition of the international system, which is continuously evolving. In addition, the Charter misses out anything that is related to non-conventional actors, such as the ISIS. Neither does it talk

about proxy wars, which have been happening ever since the creation of the UN. Although it can be concluded from the Charter that the UN is for maintaining peace, security, friendly relations between neighbours, and avoiding the use of arms, the Charter had been regularly breached. The UN's organisations could not prevent the international system from developing into what we know it as today.

Charter I, Article I states that one of the missions of the UN is the “[...] suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law” (UN Charter). Article II talks about member states abstaining from violence and threat and fighting over territory or political disagreements. Both of these Articles have been contested by recent events in the international system, and those examples of realism have shown inconsistency with the implications of the UN. While the UN commits to avert its members from disobeying the Charter, they have failed to do so.

As can be seen, there are inherent issues with the international system of the UN and as Bisley (2012, 65) confirms that “[...] the UN Charter was explicitly a product of the major powers and reflected their interests as well as their understanding of the requirements of international order”. These plot-holes within the UN's system of organisation gave ‘birth’ to many events that have a strong presence in 2017. Besides, some organisations fell under its uncertainty of keeping consistent in the international system. Due to this, the UN has been changing its infrastructure over the course of recent years. This change seems to be left unnoticed in international relations. Hence, the question remains: “Do we live in a new international system and does it contest the previous one that was established back in 1945?”

1.3. The International system as of 2017

Like any other system, the international one has drastically and quickly been modified by 2017 since half a century of its existence. The structure of this system is accredited to the way that “[...] diplomats, politicians and policymakers thought international order operated” (Bisley 64). Due to this out-dated structure, some features have distinguished their new appearance more and spawned a new international system. Just like the one before, the current system is based on rational aspects of the involved actors. It can be argued that their influence

on the course of events and behaviour has been its primary foundation. The expectations of this realism, however, have neither been foreseen by the UN nor admitted into the Charter. Actions that could have been taken to either combat those features, or else to adopt them into the system are also missing.

Firstly, the rise of the non-conventional actor, such as IS, has proven to be the toughest challenge to the UN. The goal of fighting against it has been overshadowed by proxy wars contested the actors of the international system. They have also proven that everyone seeks to gain what is best for them out of the conflicts into which they intervene. The rise of those tensions has worsened the political relationship between the countries involved. Furthermore, it has distracted them from focusing on issues of larger importance, such as poverty, hunger, economic complications and democratic promotion. These are the issues that the EU, for instance, has been focusing on within its borders. However, the creation of the Union has been frowned upon by the UN. The EU's role as a global actor has been questioned by the organisation and them emerging as a new feature in the system has been well embraced. Last but not least, from being a military organisation, NATO has increasingly grown to become a political entity. Its recent aspirations to global co-operative missions has been its priority after the end of the Cold War.

What the UN once implied, and wanted the international system to conform to, has not been fully realised since 1945. The events of 2017 serve as solid proof of this failed realisation, and add up to a new international system, which yet has to be embraced by the UN. Instead of looking to its older Charter, it must be rewritten by the present circumstances. As of now, it has failed to confirm its members to fully dedicate themselves to the established order. In the end, this might add up to even more controversy and confusion within a new international system.

1.4. Comparison of the two systems

Time has brought a critical mass of events that dismantle the 1945 consensus. The features of the current international system are not compatible with the ones established back in 1945. This can be credited to uncertainty in the UN-originated frameworks and that the UN was aiming for power to be more dominant than raw power, which “[...] meant that power

inequalities had to be incorporated into the system” (Bisley 3). What the UN had agreed in their Charter, and what the Big Three contributed to further international relations, is being contested in 2017. This is the test of time to merely show when the countries adapt to and embrace those new features. The international system is out-of-date compared to when it started and the rational aspect of the UN's members is making it more complicated: “not only do the great powers seek to shape the political and economic order in their own interest, in these settlements they have been accorded a kind of a managerial function in the broader system” (Bisley 5). This complicated chemistry of the permanent members of the UN and other countries believing that the UN might be yet another product of capitalist powers, has left the system questionable from the start. Neither has the 1945 system changed by 2017 nor brought any discussion on a political and empirical level to set the tone to discuss those changes.

Regarding the features of the international system, they have expanded both in size and scope. This inevitable change can be attributed to the intricate relationship between the three leaders in 1945 and the different events that followed. That left the two systems of 1945 and 2017 to drift from each other apart. The intentions of maintaining world peace and friendly relations among all countries became an out-of-date structure. For instance, the kind of the structure that the EU enjoys has never been even close to the known structure of the former Soviet Union. Used to the idea of the Soviet Union's existence was the sort of the cosmopolitan union the UN could foresee growing. NATO, established as a military organisation, was very different from becoming a politically involved organisation, let alone reaching to Asia and the Pacific. NATO, working on a global partnership with Australia, was considered nearly a myth. Furthermore, 1950s would never see non-conventional actors come into existence and assuming a global presence. Such dangers have been presented by the IS, and their intentions of contesting the international system, who did not exist in the 1950s. What nonetheless has remained to be a fixed feature is proxy war, which has continued to be a consistent feature of the international system. Despite this, its complexity, and dangerous outcomes for the long run, can be seen in the events of 2017.

2. FEATURES OF A NEW INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

2.1. The Islamic State

Although the Islamic State (ISIS) is a new phenomenon in the international system, its roots date all the way back to the fall of the Ottoman Empire. This is where “[...] violent formation of tribesmen [...] arrived on the scene to fill a vacuum left over after the Ottoman Caliphate collapsed [...]” (Kaplan & Costa 2015). The movement was also treated as neo-tribalism by some historical observers. That tribe established themselves in a new capital of Raqqa, Syria, and occupied vast territories of Iraq, where they are currently based. It was empowered with the idea of women raising children for the ISIS fighters with the sole focus spreading their religious ideals around the world. The young soldiers were raised in an atmosphere of war with a compulsion to fight for their state. The growing remorseless and oblivious of their families (Kaplan & Costa). After decades of their formation, the ISIS finally emerged in their full power after 2003.

What can be described as their onset, and origin of their rise to power, is the invasion by the US of Iraq in 2003. This was a direct challenge to the Western interests in the Middle East as well as of other countries. Middle Eastern countries that did not adhere to the ISIS' religion were at the highest danger. This was the time when the ISIS began actively reforming other nations to their view on the Muslim religion as well as their state. That reformation, however, was not always without a military intervention from the ISIS. The expansion and recruitment of militants from the Middle East also saw the light during 2003, with the assistance of Al-Zarqawi, who renamed his forces as jihads (Tziarras 2017). Following his death, a new leader, Al-Zarqawi, of the organisation called for the formation of the IS in 2016 in Iraq. The forces of the ISIS were put down later in the year of 2007 only to give them time to regroup. The ISIS also focused on reforming their forces to counter against Syria and Assad's regime, following the Arab Spring in 2011.

This rapid evolution of the organisation was inspired by many profound factors. One of them is the religion, which takes its roots from the Ottoman Empire – Sunni Islam. Unlike Sunnis that are known to be within Iran, Lebanon and parts of Syria, the ISIS sees it as “[...] a

very strict and literalist interpretation of Islamic scriptures, including Quran and the traditions of the Prophet Mohammed” (Tziarras). This can be viewed as the independent interpretation of Quran, engraved in lives of the ISIS, under which the quasi-state of Islam is based. Wiktorowicz (2005) defines three factions of Salafi – purists, politics and jihadists. First being the source of religious authority and the dominating body that oversees the religious control of the state. The second one takes into consideration the past when forming new doctrines. The last one, jihad, took shape by XX century, which has remained as a consistent and malicious factor of the ISIS. This claim of jihad is also supported by Costa and Kaplan (2015), who say that the logic of the ISIS is genocide.

Territorial gains are important to a lesser extent (they are also exercising their power over Iraq and Syria instead and opening a border from Iraq to Syria as well as establish their territory within those two countries), but ideological goals are most significant to the ISIS. Their primary purpose is to oppose Europe and the USA and “they pursue a fundamentally different regional and global order with political, social, economic, and religious structures” (Tziarras). Their secondary goal is to increase their sustainability, and be able to keep their military supplied with an abundance of natural resources. These include gas, oil, food provisions and their control over them (Pollard, Poplack & Casey 2015).

A vast proportion of their ideology is derived from the verses of the Quran. Coming from pre-Islamic Arabia and the “[...] misguided society dominated by tribalism and a blind obedience to custom” (Kaplan & Costa), authors argue towards the misinterpretation of the religious text of Islam. However, it is comprised of controversial verses in itself already, for instance, as Al-Mumtahanah 60:8 states - “Allah does not forbid you from those who do not fight you because of religion and do not expel you from your homes – from being righteous toward them and acting justly toward them” and Al-Ma'idah 5:92, which talks about preaching the message of Mohammed only. The other part although, Ali 'Imran 3:4 speaks of those who disbelieve in verses of Allah will be condemned to punishment.

Throughout the years of their active existence, their ideology can be argued to be borderless and reckless. Neither does their ideology seem to be prone to whatever the outcomes of any new event might happen within Syria or Iraq. Their deep roots in their interpretation of Islamic religion alone are very unlikely to alter. They see it “[...] as a perfect and timeless guide for all aspects of life” (Ingram 2016). The idea that their 'state' is trapped

in tribalism seems to be the most convincing explanation of their actions, as well as the ideological contradictions and goals that lie within it.

The ISIS, despite its self-definition as a 'state', does not have a physical state of its own and it is considered to be a quasi-state. Their territory has been changing its size over the course of their existence due to incessant combat but it has remained vast in size. While the ISIS maintains an ideological state rather than a territorial one, some leaked documents from the ISIS have been discovered, suggesting that they were working on building their own “[...] government departments, a treasury and an economic program for self-sufficiency” (Tziarras). Arguably, this is being done for the ISIS to strengthen their influence within their region and to be able to manage international relations to advance their military aims further. The ISIS is seen as an alternative form of a government by scholars, without trying to impose any order on their state or remove any confusion around it.

To give a solid definition to what the ISIS is, taking into consideration the modern definition of 'state', it is challenging and futile. This is because the ISIS does not conform to any model of a currently existing state in the XXI century. Currently, 'state', according to political scientists, can be defined as a body, comprised of a people's ascertained territory, established government, stable society, and autonomy from foreign authority (Dar 2016). Given the definition of the ISIS above, it lacks all of the following characteristics to be pronounced as a state in XXI century. The inspiration for the ISIS came out as a response toward European imperialism, and the desire for the reconstruction of the Muslim world to resemble the colonial West as little as possible (Dar). With religion behind the core of their state, it can, therefore, be argued to be self-reliant and lacking “[...] international recognition and access to legitimate economies” (Pollard, Poplack & Casey). Hence, it gives them isolation from everyone else's reach to reshape or modify their state.

While the ISIS could be commonly referred to a terrorist organisation, there are alternative views against this, bearing in mind that terrorism does not have a universal definition. Tziarras (2017) argues that since the organisation is neither willing to drastically change the regional status quo, nor do they fight against the combatants of Syria and Iraq (their homeland), the ISIS can be confirmed to be a terrorist organisation.

Their strategy is to divide America into two and destroy the infidels in Europe, to put it in the simplest of terms. One of the missions that the organisation has been pursuing this far is

terrorism within Europe. Considering refugees in the EU at the moment, a huge number of them are coming from Syria and Iraq. Syria has been known as the “primary recruiting arena” (Kaplan & Costa) of the ISIS, which in itself presents a potential danger. The sheer number of refugees created (potentially including members of the terrorist state) are overwhelming the EU. The Union, however, struggles to sustain and re-balance them across other states, putting the EU in a fragile place. The EU cannot go against human rights and not accept people, fleeing from a country that poses a danger to them and their families, but neither can the Union foresee who could potentially turn out to be an ISIS supporter.

Within the Civil War in Syria, ISIS' preoccupation is with their current affairs in Raqqa, fighting against three big camps – Assad, the US and Russia. The ISIS might be holding their plans back before unleashing strikes against the EU, which is vulnerable to terrorist attacks. The terrorist organisation also imposes a significant threat to the bordering Middle Eastern countries. Their “[...] genocidal violence aimed at all who do not share their messianic vision, are doing more than their share to illustrate what takes place behind the gates of hell” (Kaplan & Costa). These security threats that the ISIS imposes, these can be divided into conventional-regional and asymmetrical-global, according to Tziarras (2017). Regarding the former threat, sources suggest that an estimated number of 80,000 ISIS soldiers are militarily skilled. With the ISIS' established threatening influence in the Middle East, they have been able to acquire a significant amount of weapons of mass destruction. Although their possession of weapons of mass destruction has not been confirmed, the possibility cannot be excluded. Considering their conventional military knowledge, the jihadists are a force to be reckoned with. The resisting Middle Eastern countries are forced to reconsider their military strategy as well or otherwise risk being exposed to a significant threat from the IS, if unprepared. That being said, the ISIS has undoubtedly been the biggest factor in fostering an influx of refugees to be displaced within both Iraq and Syria. The rest are seeking asylum in Europe and other continents. It can be argued that since the ISIS and their rise to power, the world has seen the highest peak of refugees since WWII.

As for the latter – the security threat that the ISIS poses – asymmetrical-global jihad fighters do not have one style of leading warfare. This is where the greatest threat lies, as well as the difficulty for their opposition to attack, since it can never be predicted how the ISIS will respond back at the battlefield. Asymmetrical threats engulf usage of nuclear/chemical

and biological weapons. Alternative concepts of warfare and terrorism are also used – this is mainly done to produce an intense and psychological impact on the enemy (Tziarras). Attacks of this character can be seen on the ground of the EU – terrorist attacks in Paris and Germany as of 2015 and 2016, as well as in other Middle Eastern countries Asia. There still exists a possibility of the group acquiring chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. This all depends on the outcome of their further operations and the reaction of the Western powers. In spite of the ISIS' growing and fearful presence, their combat strategy is thoughtful and slow-paced.

According to Pollard (2015), the ISIS was able to acquire an estimate of \$ 2,9bn back in 2014 and accommodate an army, reaching the assets of \$2tn. With such economic resources, the state was also able to gain vast amounts of natural resources, including oil, natural gas and various other products. The intense growth of their developing state also brings some tax revenue from the population. Donations also serve as a reasonable means of sustaining other expenses, even though the ISIS does not want to be dependent on any other actors outside of its circle. If this support for them were to be cut off, they would become vulnerable.

A menace to any conventional forms and ideologies, fighting for the establishment of their goals and ideals despite any external or internal threats. They expand with the power of fear, and spread propagandas on Shia government within Sunni Muslims. Their domination in social media is ever growing as well. Such messages of rising terror spread yet further, attracting more people to join the IS's ranks to pursue ideological goals. That being said, it is estimated that approximately 20,000 – 30,000 fighters are travelling to Syria and Iraq from the Western nations to fight for the ISIS and the number of these fighters had double since 2014 (Ingram). Their motivations are uncertain, and vary – some are monetary. Others are supporting other Muslims as well as following Sharia law and declaring a jihad. The ISIS has been persistent at recruitment, generous with salaries, structured logistics and providing professionalised training to the forces (Pollard, Poplack & Casey).

The ISIS has had a profound effect on the international system and got to their pedestal within it. It can be argued that “[...] history may see IS as the bastard child of the American predilection for democratic state building in a region where there is no history of democracy and a wretched recent history of nations” (Kaplan & Costa). Indeed, such violent, persistent actions and aggressive territorial expansions cannot be left unnoticed. The jihads

know no remorse. They kill Iraqi's Shia and Kurdish Muslims. They show limitless hatred towards all non-believers (infidels), as per their interpretation of Quran. The ISIS is creating an invisible state between Syria and Iraq, thus separating themselves from everyone else. From this realistic offensive point of view, the ISIS has shaped their voice in the international system, and this is not a surge of mere terrorists. This is strategic and armed force. They fight with strong ideals and motivations and spread devastation across the Middle East, Europe and other continents. While such plans might seem ambitious, their rapid expansion and the amount of terror caused should not be underestimated.

With the beginning of the refugee flood from Iraq and Syria into the EU, the ISIS has a wider scope within which they can operate, in order to spread their influence and coordinate their terrorist attacks. With this advancement, one can conclude that they are here to stay and even after the downfall of their capital in Syria, their insurgency will not cease. With the growing quasi-state, the ISIS owns a substantial budget, and an expandable scope of support both within the Middle East and rest of the world. With “pursuit of a monopoly on violence” (Pollard, Poplack & Casey) that bends to no negotiations, the ISIS seeks independence and greater sustainability. It can be concluded that their aim is straightforward and their will is unbreakable. While social media represents them as the unquenched terrorists that ruthlessly spread horror among Europe and the Middle East, there is surely much more than meets the eye. The complexity surrounding this terrorist organisation and their strategy remains to be a vast topic of study. To put this into perspective, ISIS has been confirmed to the second deadliest group according to Global Terrorist Index, Syrian Network for Human Rights and Middle East Monitor (Tziarras).

2.2. Proxy Wars

Proxy wars have assumed a significant place in the sphere of international relations. Evolving from the conflicts after WWII, they have acquired a significant presence in XXI century and are here to stay. President D. Eisenhower once called the proxy war “the cheapest insurance in the world”, while former president of Pakistan referred to it as the essence of maintaining the conflict within the zone (Mumford 2013). This cheap way of conducting warfare is characterised by indirect intervention of a third party into a conflict, with the intention of

gaining benefits for itself and its party that is surrounded in the battle zone.

The list of proxy wars is extensive, and they have seen an increase since the second half of XX century. Some instances include the Spanish Civil War between Republicans and Nationalists, the former supported by the Soviet Union, the French Third Republic and Mexico, the latter by Nazi Germany, Italy and Portugal. This war saw its end with nearly half a million people killed and the victory of the Republicans. The rise of Zionism and Arab nationalism was largely took place through another proxy war, that being the Arab-Israeli conflict, which later on shifted into the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and has been ongoing since the 1950s. Due to this dispute, Palestine has remained only an observer state in the UN due to it not having a recognised statehood. Another ongoing conflict is between Iran and Saudi Arabia. It also involves the West and the Middle East, supporting Saudi Arabia. The Middle East stands for Iran's vision on the outcome of the conflict and the sake of regional influence. Further East, North Vietnam backed by the Soviet Union, and South Vietnam backed by the US, fought to regain control of the country.

The Cold War inspired many other proxy wars to break out from 1944 all the way to 2017, and a significant number of them are still ongoing. Not only was it a time of constraint for both of the two world powers, the US and the Soviet Union, but it was also a time for other countries to fight for the maintenance of their power of influence over their own and others' regions. While this clearly serves as the breaking point for international relations and the system, it contradicts their essentials. With the frequency and continuing existence of proxy wars, it is vital to explore some of the reasons that for their occurrence. Needless to say, all of the following reasons stem from the realistic approach:

Firstly, it is cheaper in the long run, and one can repay the supporting party later on. One US constitutional theorist argues that “in the future, the use of local proxy armies can offer [...] an economic alternative to more expensive standing armies ... and could provide the indispensable element of ground control [...]” (Mumford). Due to this, the country at war does not need to struggle with their economic status quo and *freezing* of their economy. The supporting country does not need to go through any of those struggles either. Secondly, other supporting parties can also avoid direct contact with the enemy, they can provide support remotely and not let the damage be inflicted within their own borders. It also allows the supporters to focus on organising their military support and avoid multitasking for their ally.

Thirdly, proxy intervention allows the supporting party to reap military benefits. The supporting country can test out their military forces and the scope of their influence within the country they support. This will help both sides fight more effectively against the enemy. Furthermore, this allows the supporting country to test its strategic aspirations to conduct further wars in a smarter and more efficient way. With these benefits comes the possibility for the supporting party to improve their weaponry, and their military strategies. This alliance also allows engaged countries to share knowledge among each other, including military training and operations. Fourthly, a proxy's interference helps their ally at war to display their strengthened interests in what they fight for, and in their ideology.

If Syrians were the only one to fight for Assad's regime, the scope of this idea would be diminished, and the conflict would have ended sooner. However, with allies by his side, Assad's idea of his regime stands out as something that other political leaders find worth fighting for. This motivation thus encourages others to stand for Assad. Furthermore, the proxy country can avoid direct conflict with another country that their ally is fighting against. This gives it protection at the international arena, such as the UN. For instance, Russia and the US, despite both participating in the Syrian Civil War, can still both discuss its future. They can negotiate what is to be done about it, while not being directly at war with each other. Last but not least, it all comes down to historical ties. If one country shares history with the other one, then the alliance in helping resolve conflicts for its ally are seen as justified. For instance, Syria was helping Iran to fight off Iraq and has since remained its strategic ally. In addition to that, both Assad and Iranian population are Sunni Muslims, which strengthens their ties yet more. Those ties and shared/common interests of countries cannot help but promote merging to fight opponents.

A Tunisian fruit seller set himself on fire as a form of a protest against the life that he could not live in his country. The overwhelming poverty cornered him into desperation, and he saw no other way out. This cry for the reformation of one's life in Tunisia provoked many other Tunisian citizens to continue the revolt. Not being able to bear the weight of it, their dictator, Ben Ali, had to flee the country to seek refuge in Saudi Arabia. Shortly later, Egypt, Libya and Yemen followed the same suit and uprisings of similar nature sprang. Other leaders, not being able to handle the pressure had to flee their country likewise.

Egypt has been a ground for frequent acts of “stalemate, stagnation, corruption and

authoritarianism” (Cleveland & Bunton 525) by their long-time president. Throughout the decades, the frustration of people with the government they have lived under exploded into the Arab Spring. On the other side, Yemen's citizens grew sceptical towards their government implementing no reforms. Then, with the protests spreading across the Middle East, their patience was run out. The anti-government strikes reached Libia as well. The country broke into a civil war as well and brought the death of their political leader, Qaddafi. A larger surge of violence had afterwards entered into Syria.

Following the accession of Hafez al-Assad's son, Bashar Al-Assad, the Syrian population grew to like him over the years of his reign. Unlike his father, Al-Assad pursued more reforms and swayed from the American and Israeli foreign policies. Those reformation periods were short and came to be known as *Damascus Spring*. This 'Spring' withered away, leaving people unhappy with their new leader and Syria found itself amid “[...] widespread poverty, human rights violations, and the lack of representation that came with inherited presidencies” (Cleveland & Bunton 531). Syria, in the rule of Hafez al-Assad, managed to avoid civil wars back in 1982 and 1983 when citizens saw their unhappiness towards their leader extend. Following the Arab Spring, groups formed in Damascus with the sole and peaceful intention of the government to resign for a new leader to re-establish and re-evaluate the current status quo of Syria. The peaceful protests were subdued by force from the government. The conflict then erupted, splitting Syria into camps of rebels and supporters of the regime.

Rebels took hold in the north around Aleppo, Syria. While civilians applied for refuge in Europe and other Middle Eastern countries, this created a fighting arena for people to stand for their interests, leaving little hope for any diplomatic solutions or compromises as the conflict evolved. This meant that millions of people resorted to seeking refuge in Europe and even more ended up being displaced in the country. As Bashar Al-Assad lacked assistance from his side to return things back to his rule, Russia, Iran and Hezbollah, from Lebanon, came to his assistance. Other countries such as the US, France, Turkey, UK and other Middle Eastern countries stood against Assad's position and supported his demise. Each country sought their ground of interests and took their full advantage out of the conflict.

Russia shares a common ground of interest and portion of history with Syria and its government. Syria's ex-president used to study at the University during the Soviet Union.

Some Russians used to migrate to Syria, and overall, both countries managed to keep friendly relations with one another. Iran shares a common religion with Al-Assad and his supporters as well as being thankful for his support during Iran-Iraq war. They could not deny their participation for obvious reasons. Hezbollah, on the other hand, mainly shared religious affection towards Al-Assad's government. They have been their historical and religious allies and their participation was expected. Considering Assad's forces at that time, he would not have been able to hold onto his throne for long without the support that he currently receives.

In my previous research paper, I looked at the how Syria's waters were being tested at their expense. The study on Syrian president's allies showed their ties to him and the extent of their support. While Russia sells its military weapons and soldiers to Assad, the magnitude of their forces is the biggest out of all other supporters. However, bearing in mind the variety of those forces, it can be considered that Russia is testing their military presence and puts its status as a superpower on display. Russia has a vast battlefield all for itself, and they have an option for using it to their advantage. They can be carrying the mission still – to help Al-Assad stay alive and continue being in charge of Syria. While Iran's physical presence is diminishing, their financial support is still intact and their support is still given to Syrian's government. Hezbollah, on the other hand, has engaged in some battles alongside Assad's forces to fight off the rebels and IS. They have focused on the south of Syria to avoid the IS' emergence in Lebanon. Their struggling forces also provided training to other fellow militants to help the forces fight more strategically and cautiously on the battleground.

After the fall of the Ottoman Empire in the 1920s, Britain and France wanted to divide the Arabic Middle East into zones of their influence, as did the USA as well. Britain and France's engagement with Syria are rooted in the history of the country and the impact that they have made there. The country was shaping its statehood while under the influence of France back in the 1920s. This is the main reason that brings France to come back to fight against al-Assad's form of current government in Syria. These historical ties do not leave France indifferent to the Civil War, and they find a ground to extract the benefits from the conflict. Britain, as well as France, having a significant presence in the Middle East cannot deny their participation either and to add their resources to fight off the Syrian government. It is said that both of the countries “[...] devoted their energies to promoting arms transfers to rebels” (Glass 2016 37). British are in charge of anti-Syrian operations based in Lebanon and

French doing the same, while located in Turkey and Lebanon.

The US, one of the biggest contributors to the opposition camp is there - “[...] to examine the potential of American policies to redirect established historical patterns of Middle Eastern politics and society in new and troubling directions” (Cleveland & Bunton, 505). Their continued presence in the Middle East is unlikely to be reduced, and their feet are rooted in the sand ever since the terrorist attacks of 9/11. The US's continued attacks on Iraq have kept them engaged from 2001. Considering their relationship with Russia at the moment of the conflict, the US was obliged to take the opposition side and help the rebels fight off Syrian's president into exile. It has been said that the US' “[...] CIA-trained rebels in Jordan and Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Qatar provided arms, and Turkey opened its new borders to jihadis from around the world to wreak havoc in Syria” (Glass 139).

Turkey is fighting against al-Assad. Their resources are being put towards forces that fight against him, also while being enemies of Turkey (al-Qaeda for instance). When the author was in Northern Syria, he reports, he was told that Turkey was bringing Islamic fighters through Armenia to fight in Kessab (Glass 60). This serves as yet another controversial turn for Turkey. Furthermore, Turkey is supporting the Syrian Free Army, who are mainly Lebanese and Qatari. Represented by their military interests within the country of conflict, Turkey also has the potential of obtaining important regions of Syria. These are namely its Northern parts, that are currently being controlled by the Kurds, IS and partially, Assad. The Northern part of Syria is rich with natural resources which are of interest to Turkey, and their strategy is aiming towards collecting that area for themselves. They can, therefore, accomplish two tasks at once: bring down Kurdistan and eliminate ISIS.

From a realistic point of view, proxy wars come at a more affordable price for the states involved, leading to the progression of these practices. With their popularity in the international system, the future may well see more of them. Proxy war represents a more convenient way of competing for regional power and resources, and it gives one country a policy option where one wants “to wound and yet afraid to strike” (Hughes 2014). Recent history has seen a significant number of them, and a few have remained unsolved up until today. While this clearly was not the intention of the international system created after WWII, this repeated phenomenon of proxy war is not looking at leaving the history books for a long time. Taking into consideration the benefits of proxy intervention, more countries might be

applying the same principle towards future conflicts. More might be willing to take part for their gain from it.

Admittedly, one of the most recent and grievous proxy wars is the Syrian Civil War. Without a doubt, the Arab Spring has been the largest contributor to the inflated civil war in Syria, and has provoked people to raise their voices louder than before against the government. Overall, the casualties of this proxy warfare in Syria are extreme. Around 320,000 people have been reported dead, and out of the whole Syrian population of 22 million, 4 million of them have escaped the country, and 7.6 million have been displaced (Glass 137). Once a country abundant with religious groups and nationalities from Kurds, Arabs, Sunni and Shia Muslims, Armenians, and Christians, it is now divided into two camps – those for and against the regime. The drastic differences and calamities that proxy war can create cannot be left out. “This in turn has sent innocent refugees and guilty suicide bombers to every corner of the world” (Glass 154). From the outcomes of the Cold War, where dozens of millions of people perished, it can be observed that the more weapons the countries possess, the more casualties there will be. While proxy supporters struggle to conclude the same from past historical events related to proxy wars, the Syrian war is getting more out of hand with every day. The limits of military support from other countries to Syria can see no limits, and it only prevents Syria from searching for a diplomatic route out of its current stalemate.

2.3. The EU as a new feature

The EU took shape following the end of the Cold War and demise of the Soviet Union. Its entrance into the international system can be described as a new feature. It has been evolving over the course of decades – from the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), changing to the Economic Community (EC), following the Maastricht Treaty. With a primary focus on the current and shared economy, the Union attracted some countries to join the young and ambitious circle. It has later on become more monolithic as its members intended to. This formation of like-minded states has been unlike anything else, a step towards a new order – something, that 1945 would never foresee.

Even before the EU had become what it is in XXI century – a spectrum of countries,

united to share their economies, borders, and to promote democracy, the UN had not been in favour of it from the very start of this idea. These tensions arose back in the 1950s, where ECSC tried making an agreement with ILO (UN's agency), which did not come into force in the next 20 or so years. Despite the fact that Germany got into the UN in 1973, the EC did not get into the organisation as per UN's Article 4 that “[...] stipulates that only states can become full members of the organisation” (Bouchard 22). Following this, the EC eventually became the observer community with limited abilities in 1974.

More public to the UN, the Soviet Union, was a very different form of union than the EC in 1957. With the existing complexities presented by allowing the Soviets to enter the UN and become a permanent member, it can be argued that Roosevelt, Churchill and their successors felt unwilling to be dealing with another union such as the EU. Having the UN already comprised of 193 countries, the involvement of the EU might have seemed a difficult decision to deal with, and with this complexity behind the EU, it can also be argued that it “[...] is neither a state nor a typical intergovernmental organisation” (Bouchard 39). That structure of the EU explains previous mistrust and reluctance to grant the EC any status by the UN. Furthermore, unlike the Soviet Union, the EU is still reliant on other countries and organisations outside of its borders as well. Particularly, it relies on involvement from NATO as well as economic organisations. Overall, the EU is a unique body that had never existed in or before 1945, and the qualities of the EU are the features of the international system.

Over time, the EU was allowed to participate in the UN's General Assembly as well - however they could only provide their help in consulting, but not making decisions. One of the reasons for this is attributed to the fact that all members of the Union need to agree to the decision. That inevitably creates another level of complexity for the General Assembly. That being said, the EU does not have a single voice or representative and relies on multilevel decision-making.

As for the UN Security Council, some of the members of the EU are already its permanent members, for instance: France and the UK. While each member of the Union has its place there, the EU itself does not have any particular status. This is also because there is no dedicated state member, responsible for EU's decisions in the Council either. The EU is not a military organisation and neither does it require its members to have their own army. Despite that, the EU's involvement and coordination within the UN are seen only as

“satisfactory” (Bouchard 29). In addition to that, the EC was granted full membership in other agencies of the UN (FAO, UN ECOSOC) and acquired partnerships with other UN's organisations (UNDP and UNHCR).

For that matter, the EU, in the UN's perspective, might be seen as weak and incomplete. Their heavy reliance on other actors regarding security and economy are the shortcomings seen by the UN. It can be argued that the EU is not regarded as a compelling actor by the UN, or as an outcome. Its complexity has also added up to the scepticism of the international organisation, such as the EU's “[...] unique and multidimensional characteristics [...] as an international actor continues to be a complex riddle for political analysts and theorists” (Bouchard 39). The Union is not viewed as a unitary body, and it does not strive for cosmopolitanism like the Soviet Union did.

This complexity can be observed in the course of recent events that have happened in 2016 and are ongoing in 2017. The first one would be the instance of Brexit, where one member of the Union was able to leave it by referendum of the people of that country. The UK leaving the EU has done damage to its reputation. It has provoked some nationalists across the Europe to follow suit, and to consider moving/changing the Union by outlining its flaws. While the EU does not have a single representative, each of its members has it in their power to make the decision of staying within the Union, or of leaving it. Neither is joining the Union an easy task. Potentially, losing more members, the EU might end up with either few countries in it or inviting other, less developed countries to join in. This, yet, may bring the EU to a halt because of its members not keeping up with the expectations of the Union.

France, just like the UK, is considered to be Union's other prominent representative. Without it, the EU would not play the same role in international affairs, as it highly depends on France's political and economic position. Recent elections between the left and right wing may further put the EU at risk. Not only does the candidate Le Pen (from the right wing party) support both Putin and Trump, she looks forward to lifting sanctions on Russia. The presidential candidate furthermore aims at changing France's status within the Union. According to Obeidallah (2017), the French candidate aims at leaving the Euro currency as well as NATO. That in turn will end up breaking up this formed bloc, within which France has settled. It can be argued that in doing so, Le Pen will be able to bring Russia closer to exercising its power within Europe and becoming a greater power of influence.

The EU is an elaborate actor in international relations, and its structure in itself comprises a feature of the new international system. Initially, the Union was based on the interests of European countries, who established the EC to be able to let their economies thrive within the community. Through treaties and some years of expansion, the EC has become the EU, with common economic goals and shared borders. However, the integration of the EU into the international system has proven to be a slow-paced process, and its future cannot yet be determined. The EU is still an evolving organism, and it has an undefined position and status in the UN.

It can be summarised that “in contemporary Europe we have overlapping authority and multiple loyalties, fuzzy borders, and a duality of competing universal claims” (Zielonka 2012). Also, the EU can be argued to be in a complicated position – while not being autonomous, and heavily relying on its members, it is in danger of being hit by the realistic expectations of other countries (like with the example of the UK and France). These two international actors are completely separate from one another, and the UN's view is rather sceptical, and has remained so from the beginning of the idea of the EU's emergence. However, according to Bouchard (2008, 20), an insufficient number of political scientists have written academic works on the topic. This brings a lack to the amount of input that can be contributed to studying the UN's relationship with, and attitudes towards, the EU in further detail. Having a richer scope of analysis on the topic would help to determine the exact reasons for the UN's scepticism and lack of support.

The Union, comprised of independent states taking on the role of European leadership was something unforeseen by the UN. With the scarcity of the resources available online, it is hard to research the relationship between the EU and the UN – the development of the Union towards its current form as of 2017 and how the UN reacted to its expansion, and what actions it took to decelerate the Union from growing. Possibly the UN had foreseen this complicated feature of the EU, and abstained from supporting it initially. However, what can be confirmed is the fact that the EU is yet another feature of the international system and the UN's approach towards it only proves it so.

2.4. NATO – towards political organisation

NATO was established after the end of WWII. Its intention was to assist destabilised

governments with the use of military peacekeeping missions. Its main focus was the Soviet Union, which the organisation wanted to hold back, to prevent communism from spreading across Europe. Additionally, NATO wanted to keep the Germans out, and their territory to remain separated, to ensure that there would not be any further aggressions from the German side. Furthermore, the US sought its way into the organisation and their alliance was important to holding it up. Based on this *motto*, NATO's structure was focussed on the military protection and sustainability of its members.

Throughout the years of its existence, NATO has been evolving, and its number of members has been expanding. After the fall of the Warsaw Pact, NATO moved from being a collective security organisation towards more selective security, i.e. it has a few allies but no enemies (Sørensen 2007). Without any tensions from other countries, and having no foes, the military organisation had taken on some missions to exercise and cement its purpose along the way. Those tasks include peacekeeping and military operations in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan. These missions are a crucial factor that laid a path to determining the future of the organisation.

Before looking further into its missions and the impact they have had on the organisation, it is important to look deeper into spheres of the organisation's responsibility. As Wolff (2009) identifies them, they are as follows: 1) security guarantor; 2) democracy promoter; and 3) global interventionist. According to the first sphere, NATO's primary aim was to focus on providing protection to its member states, and collective defence. With the release of Article V, its member states were granted the promise of mutual protection, should there be any external threat (such as for Baltic states against Russia). The post-Cold War period had brought more changes to NATO, and the second and third spheres have been changing NATO's structure fundamentally.

The second sphere is where NATO's primary objective has been put to the test. It has been said that the organisation started military and political dialogues with other countries to promote democracy (Wolff). This invitation for other nations to be a part of this promotion indicates that NATO is taking a more political approach to tackling future conflicts. An additional key aspect of this changing role of NATO is due to the “[...] European Union's emergence as an independent military actor” (Rühle). According to the same author, 19 out of 26 member countries (before 2009) also fall under the framework that constitutes the security.

In turn, this lifts this responsibility off NATO's shoulders, giving it more space to focus on democracy promotion. Professor Frédéric Bozo (Eide and Bozo) also argues for growing distance away from participating in military affairs. With the US being a part of the organisation, it “[...] no longer sees NATO as the institution of choice for conducting military operations, even under US command” (Eide and Bozo). This further pushes the UN to reconsider its mission and engage itself yet more in the sphere of being a democratic promoter, which puts the organisation in a different light from its intentions and tasks in 1949.

In addition to, NATO has also been involved in creating the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme, which mainly focuses on enhancing and developing democracy, and involves no armed missions. For the past two or three decades, the organisation has also revolved around creating more NGOs that would concentrate on conducting enhanced dialogues between its member countries, security, and other projects that are of a non-military nature. While it can be seen that NATO aims at helping to sustain peace within Europe, its intentions and methods of doing so revolve around using less of a military approach and mindset.

The third sphere of a global interventionist can be regarded as its most recent one and yet most impactful on defining its new role in XXI century. The Global Partnerships (perceptions) project is aimed at reaching to “[...] non-European nations such as Australia, Japan, South Korea, and New Zealand” (Wolff 2009). The purpose of this partnership is to increase the military arsenal of one's nation, assist states that struggle with their independence or affirmation of being one state and prevention of terrorism through combined efforts. This is a serious step for NATO to make. The organisation drifts further away from its mission. It is looking at inviting yet more countries to join, and considers that security through political negotiations is a goal. Whatever the case, this is not a decision that only the US pushed NATO to make. It was a rather commonly voiced decision - “At Lisbon, Allied leaders declared their intention, as part of a focused effort to reform NATO's partnerships policy, to better engage with global partners, contributing significantly to international security” (“Relations with partners across the globe” 2015). The call for cooperation on a political level is something that Australia would never see coming in the 1950s – or, in fact, anyone else outside of Europe and the US. Although NATO was intended to be viewed as an active military link between the US and Europe, it is a dangerous path of “[...] becoming an empty shell because

it no longer matches the emerging structure of the transatlantic relationship, which is the result of US detachment from Europe and of Europe's new politico-strategic assertiveness” (Eide and Bozo).

One of NATO's co-operations, specifically with Japan, has been on-going since 90s and included a range of areas for negotiations, such as support missions, cyber security, terrorist defence, military operations, etc. (“Relations with Japan” 2016). During Afghanistan conflict, Japan assisted NATO monetarily and has had pro-actively remained supportive in ending the battle. Apart from that, their contributions to NATO continued and over the course of their partnership, Japan's involvement in global peacekeeping and military missions increased profoundly. Likewise, Australia had also participated in the partnership programme and joined Afghanistan military operations and their commitment to tackling global issues was strengthened. Despite having reached and established its political presence in Asia and the South Pacific, NATO may find itself struggling in either to remain as a stable organisation. Being between military and political spheres of influence, it might develop an identity crisis. Consequently, NATO might present itself as the cornerstone of peace in the Mediterranean, but it conflicts with the intentions of the UN, which already has a focus on Mediterranean and its security.

NATO's missions carried out in Afghanistan, Kosovo and Bosnia are arguably successful. Dilemmas revolving around those operations have provoked some arguments questioning NATO's intervention and its original mission. For instance, NATO has been engaged in military action in Afghanistan, and its contribution to the war has been of a conflicting nature. It has been said that the organisation has been involved in military operations as well as trying to rebuild and promote democracy (Wolff). Being engaged in dynamic military combat compromises the humanitarian aid that NATO has been trying to provide. This behaviour spread confusion among civilians and other members involved in the conflict. Inevitably, NATO found itself in an awkward position – while drug sales and corruption spread in the area, it was outside of its scope of responsibility. The organisation, with a military focus, was unable to resolve civilian government's problems. Neither did it have the tools to do so, nor to help it with reformation.

Another mission that NATO undertook was in the Balkans. This serves as another example of an elaborate and complicated step, of NATO's mix of political and military

organisation, and of the challenges that it took on in being a security guarantor.

Kosovo, having declared its independence in 2008, had been undergoing conflicts between ethnic Serbians and Albanians. The Serbian government was against the proclaimed independence. Its potential intentions of occupying parts of Kosovo, where a majority of Serbs resided, was yet another complication for NATO. NATO's forces were stationed in Kosovo, and still, the organisation was aiding the country in “[...] promoting democratic norms and economic development” (Wolff). However, the country required more than just the support of a military organisation at that moment. The Republic of Srpska in Bosnia is also another example of the Kosovo conflict. The dilemma comes from the fact that while the Republic wants to gain independence in the same way as Kosovo did, NATO cannot go against its democracy promotion. The organisation cannot let the Serbs not proclaim independence. Neither can the organisation not allow Srpska to strive for freedom as it might inflame more conflicts within the region.

All of the three missions mentioned above that NATO has been involved are mainly concerned with conflicts of a political, rather than a military, nature. Surely, NATO's forces could and did come in useful, but not from the long-term perspective of all the three countries. This turn of events has served as the primary incentive for NATO to shift its interests towards exercising its power in a political way. Not only has the organisation begun global collaborations but also it is actively promoting democracy. As demonstrated with the nature and examples of the conflicts and how they have remained unresolved on a political level, NATO is clearly aiming “[...] to have a voice in the political processes that are aimed at ensuring self-sustaining peace, and not be relegated to the role of a mere troop provider” (Rühle). The same is applied to the expansion of the organisation. NATO has to develop a robust political strategy to attract more countries to join in. It also wants to be flexible as well as confident in using its political and military approach at the same time. When it comes to similar missions such as in Kosovo, Bosnia, and Afghanistan, the mix between military and political assistance has been blurred. NATO brought confusion and left people and countries puzzled about the necessity of their involvement.

After recent events, NATO has revisited its strategic military contribution towards peace, and the safeguarding of its members. The organisation has been questioning its aims and mission. It has been working on modifying its status, and identifying the scope of the

responsibilities onto which it needs to put more focus. Possibly there is a fear that a switch to become a political organisation entirely will lead to a loss of military focus, or that they might ultimately hurt their global reception. This may be why NATO has not made any official claims to the status of political organisation just yet. Otherwise, it might just be finding the middle ground of being an organisation that specialises both in military security, and international politics. Nevertheless, onboarding new members requires NATO to focus more on its political influence. Consequently, the organisation has created a cluster of personnel responsible for political affairs. Hence, NATO's political growth and perseverance are undeniable, but how it will evolve in the future is a question that only time can answer.

In conclusion, it can be argued that NATO has changed throughout the course of its existence, and particularly compared to what it was in the 1990s. After the end of the Cold War, it can further be concluded that NATO faces a challenge to redefine its mission. It is in search of way to stay afloat in the XXI century, and to remain a valuable organisation as imagined. The range of problems with which NATO needs to deal with has also been diminishing. It no longer needs to address European issues as much as it used to, with the existence of the EU. It will, however, remain largely dependent on the outcomes of future political and global partnerships with other countries. Last but not least, it will most likely continue working towards becoming an independent political organisation with global recognition.

CONCLUSIONS

A course of history made a crucial impact on the UN-bound post-WWII international system. Back in 1945, the Yalta conference-visualised framework was on offer for the international community to enjoy in years to come, believing that the US-British-Soviet (with some input from China and France) arc of geopolitical cohesiveness would be managing the work on global collective security. Arguably, it did not happen. The Cold War had emerged, placing the US-USSR room for communication far outside of the UN diplomatic 'umbrella' and leaving a clear message for other countries – the UN was created for the secondary actors, as the main decision-makers almost never used the framework for solving the issues between them. Moreover, as time went by, a number of uniquely non-conventional actors had emerged and practically all of them had started demanding the international system-wide recognition. On top of that, a significantly re-designed phenomenon of 'proxy war' built plenty of barriers for the post WWII international system on its road to survive. XXI century has defined it as a more sophisticated and affordable solution to resolving disputes between weaker countries or the ones that rely on external influence to strengthen its interests against the opposing actor.

The year of 2017 has cemented the ascension of more obstacles to the international system of 1945. The rise of the ISIS, the menacing non-conventional actor has put the international system to the test as well as its member countries. Their threat and extremism have not only spread across the Middle East but also the Western countries. The sole intention of this actor in the system is to destabilise it and defy the Western borders and their prevalence in the world. The spread of the Islam had started in Iraq and spread out to Syria over the time. More external actors (such as missionaries, volunteers, etc.) are joining the ISIS to assist with its advancement. While the ISIS does not have any particular intentions in solidifying its state, their current organisation is reminiscent of a quasi-state. Neither does their quasi-state conform to any other known structure of a state in XXI century. Furthermore, fuzzy borders of Syria and Kurdistan only give them the incentive of continuing to expand themselves using military forces. The ISIS' aggression and their realistic approach of resolving any dispute or confrontation using the power has been described as their primary attitude that has put that as the main world's threat.

NATO's more political role has been justified by some missions that it has been carrying out global co-operations in the Mediterranean. The organisation has not publicly

addressed their changing role in their military structure but their involvement in negotiations with Australia, Japan and other countries across the globe as well as promoting democracy is the proof of the change in organisation's structure. Considering the outcome of their military organisation, the NATO must have found itself at a point where the military operations are not as efficient. The organisation found itself swinging towards political approach to contribute to the issues of a country.

There has been a significant lack of the resources, talking about the relationship between the EU and the UN at the beginning of the 90s. Also, it is important to study in more depth how the EC was assisted by the UN and why the UN, consequently, did not accept the idea of the EU. In addition to that “[...] most theories that have attempted to theorise the EU as global actor do not offer convincing explanations of the EU's behaviour as an actor in the UN” (Bouchard 39). Following the research made, the international system reluctantly accepted the EU as a global player within Europe but it did not grant it any status.

Considering the above, this paper's main argument was that the aforementioned factors challenged the UN-bound international system and, even perhaps, managed to change it in the most fundamental way. As the research of the UN Charter has shown, the current international system, as we know it, is out-of-date. Little attention has been paid to that in the political community of scholars. Practically, very few papers have addressed firstly how the international system has changed. Secondly, the recent events that contradict the established international system have not been studied in that regard and been analysed as to what influence they may have in the long run for the system. Thirdly, more researchers need to address the importance of the events happening nowadays and how they can inspire growth of events of similar nature.

The Charter of the UN lacked solutions and actions to be taken against a violent rise of non-conventional actors, such as the ISIS. Furthermore, more research needs to be carried out on how member countries and P5 are to react against the rise of the terrorist state. They need to decide what practical goals they aim to achieve in order to prevent this non-conventional actor's influence and how they will act towards recognising and identifying ISIS terrorists within the influx of the refugees in Europe. The UN needs to seek approach towards finding common ground within the Middle East and unification of military alliance to combat the ISIS.

Further studies need to address concrete reasons behind NATO's change in their goals. To bring more transparency into international relations, the organisation must assume its form in the system. Whether it is a political or military organisation is something for NATO to decide. But mixing both might damage their credibility. Future research also must address potential consequences that NATO can experience when fully switching to a political organisation or if it decides to remain semi-political. It however can be at risk at losing its relevance within the UN.

The main method of this work has been the research and analysis of researches done on every topic, covering the creation of the international system in 1945, ascension of the ISIS and their impact in the contemporary relations, proxy wars, NATO's changing role and the EU as the non-conventional actor in the UN's view. The structure of the paper is comprised of an introduction to the international system and the issues laid within its foundation during Yalta Conference. The thesis then compares both of the systems of 1945 and 2017 and the extent to which they differ from each other. To add to the weight to the argument of the changes in the system, a number of events are given and their impact is analysed. A conclusion is added to summarise the findings for each mini-chapter in the second chapter.

The value of the paper is to represent the need for studying a new international system and its impact on contemporary international relations. Further academic researches, such as of Nick Bisley ought to be addressed as the proof of out-dated perception of the international system, along with this thesis. Amid the debate of the international system functioning the way it is intended and that it is up-to-date with the current events happening in 2017, the paper proves it to be wrong with a number of concrete examples. All in all, the changes within the international system need to be stressed by the researches. They need to address the fact of the system changing and what impact it can bring to its member countries and international relations. Events of 2017 have confirmed that the international system has changed but this has not been addressed in the academic papers enough. Neither has the system adapted to the new challenges and revised its Charter. The UN needs to be prepared to alter the system they commonly agreed to and keep it up-to-date.

REFERENCES

- Bisley, N. (2012). *Great Powers in the Changing International Order*. The UK: London
- Bono, G. (2007). The EU's military doctrine: an assessment. – *The EU, Crisis Management and Peace Support Operations*. Volume 11, 2004 – Issue 3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1353331042000249037> pp. 439-456
- Blavoukos, S., Bourantonis, D. (2011). The EU's Performance in the United Nations Security Council. – *The Performance of the EU in International Institutions*. Volume 33, 2011 – Issue 6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2011.606697> pp. 731-742
- Bouchard, C. (2008). *Managing Expectations: the European Union and Human Security at the United Nations* (Doctoral thesis, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland). Retrieved from <https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/3261>
- Brown, S. (2016). Purposes and pitfalls of war by proxy: A systemic analysis. – *Proxy Actors, Militias and Irregular Forces: The New Frontier of War?* Volume 27, 2016 - Issue 2 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2015.1134047> pp. 243-257
- Cleveland, W. L., Bunton, M. (2013). *A History of the Modern Middle East*. 5th ed. USA: Westview Press
- Costa, P. C. and Kaplan, J. (2015). The Islamic State and the New Tribalism. Volume 27, 2015 – Issue 5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2015.1094306> pp. 926-969
- Dar, S. A. (2016). Contemporary discourses on the possibility of an 'Islamic state': an overview. Volume 9, 2016 – Issue 3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17550912.2016.1204681> pp. 421-427
- Eide, E. B., Bozo, F., *Espen Barth Eide VERSUS Frédéric Bozo*, <http://www.nato.int/docu/Review/2005/NATO-Transformation/NATO-more-political-role/EN/index.htm>
- Glass, C. (2016). *Syria Burning: A Short History of a Catastrophe*. London, New York: Verso
- Guzansky, Y., Berti B. (2015). Saudi Arabia's Foreign Policy on Iran and the Proxy War in Syria: Toward a New Chapter? Volume 8, 2014 – Issue 3 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23739770.2014.11446600> p. 25-34
- Halliday, D.J. (2007), *The United Nations: The embarrassment of international law*. Volume 18, 2002 – Issue 4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13623690208409644> pp. 346-354

- Hendrickson, R. C. (2007). The enlargement of NATO: The theory and politics of alliance expansion. Volume 8, 1999 – Issue 4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09662839908407428> pp. 84-99
- History.com Staff, *Yalta Conference foreshadows the Cold War*, <http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/yalta-conference-foreshadows-the-cold-war> (2009)
- Hughes, G. A. (2014). Syria and the perils of proxy warfare. – *Influence without power? Reframing British concepts of military intervention after ten years of counterinsurgency*. Volume 25, 2014 – Issue 3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2014.913542> pp. 522-538
- Ingram, J. H. (2016). An analysis of Islamic State’s Dabiq magazine. Volume 51, 2016 – Issue 3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10361146.2016.1174188> pp. 458-477
- Ingram, J. H. (2015). The strategic logic of Islamic State information operations. Volume 69, 2015 – Issue 6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2015.1059799> pp. 729-752
- Ismail, R. (2007). The United Nations in the twenty-first century: Prospects for reform. Volume 14, 1998 – Issue 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13623699808409381> pp. 97-105
- Lucas, C. (2007). Crisis in the United Nations, Nato and the European Union. Volume 19, 2003 – Issue 4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13623690308409702> pp. 275-284
- Mumford, A. (2013). Proxy Warfare and the Future of Conflict. Volume 158, 2013 – Issue 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2013.787733> pp.40-46
- NATO, *Relations with partners across the globe*, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49188.htm (07.09.2015)
- NATO, *Relations with Japan*, http://www.nato.int/cps/es/natohq/topics_50336.htm (07.04.2016)
- Naumann, G. K. (2008). The reshaping of NATO from a military perspective. Volume 142, 1997 – Issue 3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03071849708446140> pp. 7-11
- Obeidallah, D., *Why Putin and Trump both like Le Pen*, <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/04/23/opinions/trump-support-le-pen-opinion-obeidallah/> (23.04.2017)
- Plokhy, S.M., (2010). *Yalta: The price of peace*. USA: Viking Penguin.
- Pollard, S. E., Poplack D. A. and Casey K. C. (2015). Understanding the Islamic State’s competitive advantages: Remaking state and nationhood in the Middle East and North Africa. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2015.1108310> pp. 1-21

The Quran

Rühle, M., A more political NATO, <http://www.nato.int/docu/Review/2005/Middle-East/More-Political-NATO/EN/index.htm>

Rühle, M., Williams, N. (2007). Why NATO will survive. – *New perspectives in Asian security*. Volume 16, 1997 – Issue 1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01495939708403093> pp. 109-115

Shah, P. (2011). Reforming the United Nations. – *Focus on the United Nations*. Volume 35, 2011 – Issue 6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09700161.2011.608827> pp. 910-914

Stavridis, S. (2008). “Militarising” the EU: The concept of civilian power Europe revisited. Volume 36, 2001 – Issue 4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03932720108456945> pp. 43-50

Stepanenko, D. (2017), *Testing the waters at the expense of Syria* (Unpublished research paper). Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia.

Sørensen, H. (2007). NATO and Its new military security position. - *Henning Sørensen (1998) NATO and Its new military security position, European Security*, 19 October 2007. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09662839808407350> pp. 74-79.

Thakur, R. (2008), Reforming the United Nations: Changing with and for the Times. Volume 10, 2003 – Issue 4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13533310308559347> pp. 40-61

Tziarras, Z. (2017). Islamic Caliphate: A Quasi-State, a Global Security Threat. – *Borderland Security and Migration: Crisis Preparedness & Emergency Management –Social and Cultural Challenges to Homeland Security*. Volume 12, 2017 – Issue 1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19361610.2017.1228038> pp. 96-116

United Nations Department of Public Information (2008). *The United Nations Today*. New York: Publishing Section/DGACM.

United Nations, *UN Charter (full text)*, <http://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/un-charter-full-text/>

Vernygora, V., *NATO and Asia-Pacific co-operation: studying media and elites' perceptions*, <http://www.maailmavaade.ee/nr23-en/nato-and-asia-pacific-co-operation-studying-media-and-elites-perceptions> (2014)

Wolff, A. T. (2009). The structural and political crisis of NATO transformation. Volume 7, 2009 – Issue 4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14794010903286318> pp. 476-492

Wiktorowicz, Q., Anatomy of the Salafi Movement, http://archives.cerium.ca/IMG/pdf/WIKTOROWICZ_2006_Anatomy_of_the_Salafi_Movement.pdf (12.04.2005)

SUMMARY

This paper gives an overview and analysis of the international system. It furthermore gives an analysis of how the system was created during Yalta Conference in 1945 and the shortcomings that dominated it. A comparison of the international system based off at that time is given against the new one as of 2017. To strengthen the argument about the difference of those systems and the importance of this analysis, a number of recent events are described. These events include the rise of the non-conventional actor, the IS and their influence they have had on the system and its actors. Secondly, Proxy Wars are examined and a number of examples are given to prove their existence throughout the existence of the UN. A particular example of the Syrian Civil War is given to study the complexity of the Proxy War in XXI century. Thirdly, the EU is presented as a feature in itself within the scope of international system and how their difference from any other known form of union has been credited to a lack or recognition by the UN. As a fourth feature of the international system, NATO is presented as a dual actor. Once a military organisation, the NATO has been working to attain a status as a political organisation. All of the four aforementioned features are argued to be the comprising features of the new international system, supported by empirical studies and researches.