

## INTERNATIONAL ORDER AND DISORDER

**Brigadier-general (ret) Professor Mircea UDRESCU, Ph.D\***  
(Academy of Romanian Scientists, 3 Ilfov, 050044, Bucharest, Romania,  
email: secretariat@aosr.ro)

**Colonel (ret) Professor Engineer Eugen SITEANU, Ph.D\*\***  
(Academy of Romanian Scientists, 3 Ilfov, 050044, Bucharest, Romania,  
email: secretariat@aosr.ro)

**Abstract:** *From the moment people began to socialize, there was a need to establish an order of behavior to which members of society could relate. Therefore, the social order in a state reflects the way in which individuals and minority groups coexist based on a set of norms, which form the legal order. It presupposes a state of stability that is consolidated by norms, beliefs and values defended by state and suprastate, as well as cultural institutions. Any essential defect in the state of order positions society in a state of disorder, a state in which the state can no longer impose compliance with the norms of coexistence or even generates such social manifestations. The rule of law implies, more or less visibly, the manifestation of the state as a political organization of society, implies the permanent activation of institutional means of exercising coercion, both in the private and public spheres of the person's "games", implies a permanent reference to the legal order, an existence that conditions the establishment of the rule of law. In turn, international law represents the legislative framework that regulates relations between states or between persons or entities of different nationalities. The defining texts for international law are treaties, conventions and governmental agreements. As a rule, international law consists of international agreements or conventions, as well as a set of generally recognized values, standards and principles. After the end of the Cold War, instead of consolidating the international behavior of states, based on the recognized principles of international law, some behaviors became evident that ignored these principles, imposed their own interests, even using force and violence. In relation to recognized international law, such behavioral aspects have constituted and constitute forms evidence of disorder, a consequence of disregard for behavioral norms of international law. A new world order does not imply globalization on the system of unipolar power, but reglobalization on a unitary system of institutions with an international vocation, which would defend principles of international law, not interests of power.*

**Keywords:** *order, disorder, law, justice, power, peace, war, interest, globalization, reglobalization, national, international.*

---

\* Entitled member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, email: udrescumircea@yahoo.com.

\*\* Corresponding member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, entitled member of the Romanian Committee for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology (CRIFST) of the Romanian Academy, email: esiteanu@yahoo.com.

**DOI 10.56082/annalsarscimit.2026.2.80**

**Generalities.**

For any state, the internal social order represents a syntagm of maximum generalization, of a sociological nature, which covers the way in which individuals and groups of individuals work together and coexist by virtue of a set of agreed rights and obligations. It presupposes a state of stability that is consolidated through norms, beliefs and values defended by state and cultural institutions. Any essential defect in the state of order positions society in a state of disorder, a state in which the state can no longer impose compliance with the norms of coexistence or even generates such social manifestations.

Social order and disorder are judged by the phrases rule of law and legal order. The rule of law expresses the awareness by individuals, either individually or collectively, of the prescriptive content of the command given by the authors who produce legal norms, but also the awareness of the fact that disregarding this norm or deviating from it falls under the coercive power of bodies established precisely for the purpose of exercising control and domination of state power over the individual and social groups. The concept of legal order is not identified with that of rule of law, being, in terms of scope and content, distinct. The rule of law implies, more or less visibly, the manifestation of the state as a political organization of society, implies the permanent activation of the institutional means of exercising coercion, both in the private and public spheres of the person's "games", implies the permanent reference to the legal order, an existence that conditions the existence of the legal order. Under certain socio-political determinations, the legal order can be overthrown, replaced, sometimes brutally, with another legal order, without the state ceasing its existence as a political organization of the given society. The legal order is a term similar to that of the normative order. Through its content, the concept of public order does not empower or allow or provide for a derogation, but effectively imposes a must, mediating the coercive relationship between the state and the person, especially with regard to repressive impunity. In turn, international law represents the legislative framework that regulates relations between states or between persons or entities of different nationalities. The defining texts for international law are treaties, conventions and governmental agreements. As a rule, international law consists of international agreements or conventions, as well as a set of generally recognized values, standards and principles, which do not have to be explicitly stated in an agreement. International agreements can be bilateral or multinational. Very often, international agreements are prepared

and negotiated within the framework of recognized international organizations, such as the United Nations, the Council of Europe, etc.<sup>1</sup>

**Findings. Appreciations. Opinions.**

The recognized world order was possible from the moment when the main states of the world made efforts to find generally acceptable solutions. This is how international law was consolidated, having as its foundation the Charter of Nations, the Security Council and the UN.

Any state, regardless of its size and economic power, had its own interests which it protected on the basis of international law, its principles applied to international relations.

All other states, which did not have the privileges and responsibilities of those who were part of the Security Council, sought solutions to their own disputes under relevant international law. They relied on the international legal order, an order that all international actors respected. The recognized international law was a law specific to the bipolar world, and the behavioral order resulting from it guaranteed respect for the spheres of influence. Military actions outside the spheres of influence were carried out through the direct involvement of states within a sphere of influence, under the protection of countries that were part of the bipolar world, but also under the indirect influence of states in the other sphere of influence. Thus, the USA carried out direct military actions in Vietnam, Western countries favored those actions, while socialist countries indirectly supported Vietnam and accused the US media of violating international law. Similarly, the USSR acted militarily on Afghanistan, was supported by the community of socialist states, while the capitalist states led by the USA provided material and moral support to the opposing forces in Afghanistan. Everything that happened in the world was resolved with the blessing of the representative countries of the two political blocs, the USA and the USSR. But even these states could not alone modify international law in the direction of their own interests. When a state or a group of states pursued the realization of their own interests in an immoral or illegal manner, they automatically placed themselves outside the international legal order and did not have the power to change it.

After the end of the Cold War, instead of consolidating the international behavior of states, based on the recognized principles of international law, some behaviors became evident that ignored these principles, imposed their own interests, even using force and violence. In relation to recognized international law, such behavioral aspects constituted and constitute obvious forms of disorder, a consequence of disregarding certain behavioral norms of international law. The situation became

---

<sup>1</sup> Broadly on Wikipedia.

dramatic for the international environment in the conditions in which the disorder was and continues to be supported even by countries that were part of the Security Council, therefore they guaranteed a certain state of order. In the absence of regulations to restore international law, dangerous precedents are being created, which undermine international law, resulting in an increasingly dangerous deviation from the state of normality.

International order requires a relationship to clear norms. When these are not respected, conclusions are reached that deride even international law, as a practical instrument of ordering, in the manner: "It is a common opinion that international law has little effect on the behavior of states." According to this view, international law is just a tool in the diplomatic bag, which can be used to justify politically motivated actions. In other words, many do not view international law as a law at all. This statement about international law reflects the dominant approach in international politics, known as realism. Realists present the world as one dominated by states; it is anarchic in the sense that states, being sovereign actors, do not recognize a higher authority. Realists also show that states act in order to achieve their national interests, and the interaction between them is regulated by the exercise of power (and only as a last resort, by the use of military power)<sup>2</sup>. It seems to support an order that ignores regulation, with an anarchic political geography, in which power generates a pack and alpha male order.

The consequences of the first world war generated actions aimed at structuring the international community, generating the emergence of an organization with a universal vocation, the League of Nations. It established a collective security system within which the violation of the security of one of the members of society could be considered an act of war against all. As such, the League of Nations, in an idealistic way, acted in the direction of giving priority to the power of law in relation to the right of power. The main problem on which it focused consisted of eliminating war from relations between states, war being considered an illicit means of resolving international disputes and achieving the national interests of states. This conception took shape in 1928, through the signing of the Briand-Kellogg Pact, which outlawed war between signatory states. However, the League of Nations did not have the political support of the main countries of the world. The USA boycotted the League of Nations from the beginning, although it initially supported its establishment. Germany, a member state in 1926, left the organization in 1933. Japan did the same. In 1937, Italy withdrew, and the USSR in 1939. Since the states that remained in the organization had no political relevance on the international level, this organization with an

---

<sup>2</sup> Olivier Corten, *La securite colective, un reve contrarie*, study published in „le Monde Diplomatique”, september 2005, pp. 45-46.

international vocation became a kind of form without substance. Instead of world peace, plans of aggression were made, which accumulated in what humanity has known as World War II.

Security and world order, both as derivatives of peace and as derivatives of power, have not reached the situation of theoretical, political and diplomatic compromise, but neither that of practical governance. In such contexts, security and world order appear as contextual states, the result of actions lacking coordination and predictability.

The unimaginable horrors specific to the second world war urged the main victorious countries to consider the creation and consolidation of a new organization of universal vocation, the UN, with a much more practical action than its predecessor, the League of Nations. The efforts of the main victorious states in the second world war materialized on June 25, 1945, in San Francisco, when the Charter of Nations was signed by 51 states.

The purpose of the UN was to save future generations from the scourge of war, which, twice in a generation, has caused humanity incredible suffering, and its principles were considered generally valid, the only aspects that fell outside the scope of the organization being the internal affairs of states<sup>3</sup>. The objectives of the UN, based on the common interest of the five victorious powers, consisted of: maintaining international peace and security through effective measures to prevent and eliminate threats, repressing any forms of aggression, developing friendly relations between nations based on the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, resolving international problems of a social, economic, cultural, humanitarian nature, etc. Thus, a world order was born that required compliance with the following principles, which the UN monitored, as follows: sovereign equality of member states, the right of peoples and nations to self-determination, the peaceful settlement of disputes, refraining from the threat of force and the use of force, non-intervention in the internal affairs of states, etc. The UN monitored international peace through the Security Council, composed of fifteen members, five of whom were permanent members, each of whom had the right of veto, the five countries being considered the most powerful victorious states.

The Security Council managed the world order after the Second World War and is considered to have expressed the essence of that world order on the occasion of the first Gulf War, in connection with which an aggressor was nominated who was condemned by the international community, was threatened by it, and the actions to restore the situations before the aggression were triggered involved the Security Council. From this moment on, the UN also entered into dissolution, the world order

---

<sup>3</sup> Serge Bernstein, Pierre Mitza, *Istoria secolului XX*, vol. II, 1945-1973. Lumea între război și pace, All Publishing House, Bucharest, 1998, pp.140-142.

specific to the Cold War starting to be defied. Thus, also in 1990 the UN abandoned Somalia in a state of anarchy, the blue helmets sent to Bosnia-Herzegovina are accused of partiality, the US actions in Kosovo (1999) and the Second Gulf War are actions that no longer had the involvement of the Security Council, but the unilateral will of the US. In turn, Russia carried out actions of a war nature, ignoring the international community. That is why increasingly frequent conclusions appear like: "Conceived as a means of achieving international balance, the UN is rather transformed into an instrument of the great powers and allows the justification of selective military actions, while in other situations passivity prevails... rather the organization is paralyzed by the opposition between the great powers... which does not prevent the latter from acting without a mandate... The institutional weakness of the UN only partly explains its relative failure"<sup>4</sup>.

In recent times, especially at the UN, but also in other international bodies, there has been an emphasis on phrases such as individual security, human security, security of conscience, etc. Even the UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, has shaped his speeches in the following manner: "...a new understanding of the concept of security is required. Once synonymous with the defense of territory against external attacks, today security requirements have come to embrace the protection of communities and individuals from internal violence. The need for an approach to security more focused on the human being is reinforced by the danger that weapons of mass destruction represent for humanity..."<sup>5</sup> or "We must also update our approach to what peace and security mean. Peace means more than the absence of war. Human security can no longer be understood exclusively in military terms. Rather, it must encompass economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law"<sup>6</sup>. This is an approach that paves the way for undermining the basic principles of international law of non-threat with force, non-interference in the internal affairs of another state, peaceful coexistence of states, mutual respect of states as agents of international life, and leaves the way open to arguing for military intervention by some states, from the standpoint of humanitarian rights, beyond the rights of states that are forced to endure military aggression.

The process of degradation of the UN was also accelerated by the efforts of some regional security bodies. Thus, the OSCE, an organization that operated in Europe under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, in the context of the political situation in the former Yugoslavia, tried to recognize

---

<sup>4</sup> Olivier Corten, *La securite collective, un reve contraire*, study published in „le Monde Diplomatique”, september 2005.

<sup>5</sup> United Nations Secretary – General Kofi Annan. *Milenium Report*, Chapter 3, pp.43-44.

<sup>6</sup> Kofi Annan, *Towards a Culture of Peace*, available at <http://www.unesco.org/op2/letress>, accessed on 30.05.2026.

at the political level the fact that the situation of ethnic minorities is an international problem and not one that is the exclusive responsibility of national states. The UN did not react to the fact that this violated a basic principle of its functioning, non-interference in the internal affairs of a member state. It was not long before the OSCE began to be accused of political partisanship, of treating minorities unequally, especially after it was unable to limit the tragedies in the Yugoslav space.

The ineffectiveness of the OSCE was also proven when the Russian Federation ignored the OSCE requirements regarding the situation in Moldova and Georgia, so that Russia could defy world public opinion regarding the situation in Ukraine, citing as an example the military interventions of the US and some NATO states in Libya and Syria. The UN and regional organizations established on the basis of the UN Charter can no longer answer questions like: How can these organizations ensure the territorial integrity and inviolability of the borders of a member state? What confidence can small and medium-sized states have in the guarantees assumed by organizations of universal vocation, since powerful states impose their national policy by force? Since these organizations demonstrate that they have become non-functional, it is indubitable that the world order established on their basis is also outdated.

NATO emerged as a political-military organization under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which enshrines the right of states to individual or collective self-defense. Since 1991, the year the Warsaw Pact was officially dissolved, world public opinion expected NATO to suffer the same fate. But this did not happen, NATO expanding to the vicinity of the borders of the Russian Federation. Becoming a military instrument at the disposal of the USA, through its discretionary involvement in different areas of the world, political controversies began to arise within the organization. As such, the EU is no longer willing to follow without political discernment the military actions generated by the US, although ideas for transforming NATO are being heard such as: "...in a world characterized by globalization, we must not only review our approach to the economy, technology, energy or culture. We must also review our approach to security... Because, in turn, threats to security have become globalized.

September 11 is a case in point. This truth also holds true for failed states – states that, lacking strong governance, collapse into disorder and violence... For we have seen that failed states can quickly become a threat to international security, either by exporting drugs or by harboring terrorists. Last but not least, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction... What should an effective security strategy look like? First of all, any security strategy today must be a strategy of engagement. ..Second, today we must look at security in a holistic manner... In an era where security challenges have become multidimensional, our responses must also be

multidimensional.... any viable security strategy today must be a strategy of teamwork, institutionally. No single institution, no single nation, possesses all the means necessary for effective security management. Only through inter-institutional cooperation will the full range of instruments be available. ..Fourthly, an engagement strategy requires not only a variety of instruments, but also patience in their application. If we want to change things for the better, we must do more than provide military security...a truly effective engagement strategy, one that has a lasting impact, must be a strategy firmly grounded in values. Democracy and freedom, human rights and religious tolerance are basic principles, which we must never compromise....One thing is clear: to ensure our security today, we must engage..”<sup>7</sup> but such strategies fundamentally transform NATO from a defensive organization into an offensive, aggressor organization, by violating all the principles of UN international law. Who can appeal to international law, since NATO acted without a UN mandate in Kosovo, Afghanistan, Libya and Syria.

To the question: What has been chosen from the known world order?, most answers are categorical: Almost nothing. Appealing to the principles of world order, it is easily seen that: the principle of renouncing force and the threat of force in international relations has become a chimera, since the USA and other important countries take into account the need for preventive war against terrorism and in cases of serious violations of democracy and human rights; the peaceful settlement of international disputes, a principle organically linked to that of renouncing force, since some states consecrate the use of force in defense of national interests; non-intervention in matters within the national competence of a state has become a principle contested by states that consecrate their right to surgically intervene in the internal affairs of another state, since human and minority rights are being attempted to become international rights, under the jurisdiction of privileged states; the equality of rights of states has become anachronistic, since one state considers itself more equal than all others, and other states consider themselves more equal than other zonal and regional ones; the right of peoples to decide their own destinies, sovereignty and independence are principles that are closely correlated with all the others before, which, being ignored, mean that they too no longer have legal substance.

Given that international security is considered to be subject to threats in the following areas: political - internal political instability, state bankruptcy, terrorism and human rights abuses, economic - impoverishment, the growing gap between rich and poor states, piracy, the

---

<sup>7</sup> Secretary General, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, Speech by NATO „Addressing Global Insecurity”, at the Diplomatic Academy in Vienna, 2005.

impact of an economically unstable neighboring state, social - minority/majority conflicts, organized crime, illegal trade, uncontrolled migration, diseases, etc.<sup>8</sup>, anyone who considers themselves called to defend it, without reference to binding international law.

After the collapse of the USSR, it was believed that the bipolar world would transition into a unipolar world, in which international law would be defended predominantly by the USA. However, the USA and other NATO countries have moved to solving international problems ignoring the principles of international law. The USA has declared that it is entitled to support its global interests, for which it also has the appropriate military forces. However, the USA has manifested itself as a hegemonic power, not as a country that watches over international law from the position of a leading country. As such, some EU countries have begun to consider the actions of the USA as exceeding generally acceptable political provisions. Moreover, the political authorities of Russia have declared that Russia is also adapting its military strategy to the principles of preventive attacks<sup>9</sup>, and the consequences have already been seen in the actions in Ukraine.

In turn, China has also declared that its economic system obliges it to declare that it will promote certain global interests, just like the other great powers of the world. From such declarations and actions, it seems that the new world order is being shaped, an order that is to divide the countries of the world into political-military alliances, which call into question world peace. A world order in which it seems that "the multitude of changes and trends...indicate that an accelerated, segmented and unequal process of globalization is taking place...a fractured global order."<sup>10</sup>, which resembles a game in disarray, in which some players no longer follow the rules by which they started, everything seems confused. Precisely for these reasons, some authors consider that "At the beginning of the 21st century, we seem to be returning to the liberal international order, in which the powers had mixed motivations... In 2001, the largest rich economies are a number of seven, the G7, with Russia on the waiting list to form the G8. The difference? In 1914, Austria-Hungary, Great Britain, Canada, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia and the USA were the Great Powers. And in 2001, the G8 includes Great Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the United States plus Russia. Canada has taken the place of the defunct Austro-Hungarian Empire. The United States is much stronger, both economically and militarily, than Britain was, as the declining hegemon of the international

---

<sup>8</sup> Parliamentary oversight of the security sector. Principles, mechanisms and practices, Inter-Parliamentary Union, Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Lausanne, 2004, p.16.

<sup>9</sup>Rusia amenință cu atacuri preventive, article, Ziuia Newspaper, no. 2985, april 9 2004.

<sup>10</sup> Martin Sorrell, Branding the New Era, Foreign policy, summer 2000, pp. 61-62.

order, in 1914”<sup>11</sup>. But now the world order must take into account China, which seems to have surpassed the US in terms of economic development.

The United Nations (UN) Millennium Declaration, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its 54th session, reaffirmed the fundamental principles that should underlie the international legal order, principles also supported by the OSCE Summit in Istanbul in 2000, but which, unfortunately, have begun to be ignored, making it impossible for the states of the world to have any reference points for managing relations between them. As such, assessments such as: "Despite these positions adopted by the UN and the OSCE, in recent years there has been an attempt to diminish, even deny, the importance of respecting the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of states; moreover, it is argued that, in the current historical conditions, another principle could be imposed, namely that of the right to interfere in these internal affairs. Specifically, such a right could refer to the protection of human rights, which, in the current conditions, would go beyond the jurisdiction of states and would come under international responsibility; hence, the postulation of a right to interfere in humanitarian issues"<sup>12</sup>.

When the most important countries in the world, the USA and Russia, disregard the Charter of the United Nations, when the UN is ignored even by the countries that should defend and involve it, other countries can ask themselves questions about the relevance of the principles of international law. Noting deviations from a deeply regulated conduct, countries can ask themselves: "can such a fundamental norm, such as the prohibition of the use of force, be modified by the type of practice of states shown, for example, by the United States over the last two decades? In order to be able to state that it is possible, we must demonstrate that a large and representative majority of states agree with the American practice of these last years. As a general assessment, it is clear that there is no consensus within the international community to follow the Americans in abolishing the prohibition of the use of force as a practice or policy."<sup>13</sup> NATO's armed intervention in Kosovo, the armed interventions in Iraq, Libya, Syria and Ukraine were carried out without the express authorization of the Security Council which, internationally, is the one that holds the "monopoly of force", just as domestically "only the state holds the monopoly of force". With such examples, the assertions of increasing disorder internationally become true. The Kosovo case shocked the world order, but it did not

---

<sup>11</sup> Paul Hirst, *Război și putere în secolul 21. Statul, conflictul militar și sistemul internațional*, Antet Publishing House, Bucharest, 2001, p. 57, 60 and 121.

<sup>12</sup> Constantin Vlad, *Relații internaționale politico-diplomatice contemporane*, Fundația României de Măine Publishing House, Bucharest, 2001, p. 89.

<sup>13</sup> Marcelo G. Kohen, *Is the US practice of use of force changing international law*, articles published in *World Editorial and International Law*, January 2003, vol. II, no.1, p. 9.

prevent separatist regions such as South Ossetia and Abkhazia from invoking it as a precedent, nor did it prevent Russia from recognizing their independence and it is not too far from justifying the Russian-Georgian conflict of August 2008.

All these examples demonstrate the enormous risks to European and global security, since "The new American doctrine of preventive self-defense undoubtedly constitutes an attempt to overturn the discipline of the use of force contained in the United Nations Charter, in particular in Article 2, paragraph 4 thereof. Given the imperative and truly fundamental nature of this last norm, on which the entire international system is based, its observance should mean either the transition to a new historical phase, marked by the re-legitimization of war as an instrument of international relations and the collapse of the principle of sovereign equality of states, or constitute an international crime"<sup>14</sup>. Inspired by a phrase of the US President "We will cooperate with other nations to challenge, control and block the efforts of our enemies to acquire dangerous technologies. And, as a matter of common sense and self-defense, America will act against any such threats that arise, before they are fully established" the strategy of preventive war resulting from the US National Security Strategy, 2002, enshrines the following important directions of action on the international level "direct and continuous action, with all means of state power; the immediate target is transnational terrorism; the threat must be destroyed before it reaches the US; if necessary the US will act alone; the US will act preemptively, in self-defense; the US will compel states to cease sponsoring, supporting or harboring terrorists."<sup>15</sup>

Distrust in the recognized world order is increasingly evident. The states of the world consider the current situation to be worrying, since the USA and Russia publicly declare their acceptance of preventive war, when they consider that their global interests are endangered. If the USA and Russia declare and act in this direction, the same states wonder whether preventive war, in certain conflict situations, cannot become a legitimate war for other states, and how such a phenomenon is reconciled with the principles of state sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs, renunciation of the threat and use of force in international relations, etc. Any state can become vulnerable in conditions in which another state can justify its aggressive actions for reasons of self-defense against a state considered a sponsor of terrorism or that has deficiencies in terms of human and minority rights. As a consequence, the radicalization of the demands of some minorities towards the state order, radicalization

---

<sup>14</sup> Fabio Marcelli, *Gli contro il diritto internazionale liceita della guerra preventive*, „Giano, Pace, ambiente, problemi globali” Magazine, no. 42/2002.

<sup>15</sup> Paul Hirst, *Război și putere în secolul 21. Statul, conflictul militar și sistemul internațional*, Antet Publishing House, Bucharest, 2001, pp.14-16.

suggested and supported by state or non-state actors, can constitute legitimizations of the use of force by other interested states. The military conflicts in Iraq, Libya, even in Ukraine, were justified by the need to protect vulnerable minorities, but minorities that used sophisticated weaponry in imposing their demands in relations with the institutions of a national state, internationally recognized, but considered by the states that became aggressors as a state necessarily led by a tyrant. But such scenarios can become viral, since there are no states that do not contain recognized national minorities, which can at any time become dissatisfied. Such wars become at the same time just and unjust. Just, from the point of view of the states that defend the interests of some minorities, and unjust, from the point of view of the state subjected to aggression and of the states that relate the state of affairs to the world legal order. From the point of view of the international legal order, a war is just if it is waged for self-defense and has as an adjacent purpose the restoration of international order, but in all situations the current international legal order does not recognize war as a means of settling disputes between states, regardless of the motivation. Consequently, since wars are multiplying, they constitute a means worthy of condemnation in accordance with the UN Charter, but on which the Security Council does not pronounce, it means that the states of the world hardly relate to the established principles of justice, law and legitimacy in interstate relations.

The UN General Assembly Resolutions, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Internal Affairs of States and on the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty (1965) and the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States (1970) enshrine the principles of state sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, the defense of independence and sovereignty, the strengthening of friendship and cooperation among states and condemn actions such as: interference of a coercive nature or threat to the sovereignty of a state or to its political, economic or cultural components, the organization, support, financing or tolerance of subversive or terrorist activities with the aim of overthrowing the political regime in a state, the use of force with the aim of preventing peoples fighting for national liberation from realizing their right to political self-determination, the use or encouragement of the use of direct or indirect coercive means, including economic or political, actions that endanger basic principles of international order. international.

### **Conclusions**

The post-Cold War world is characterized by two trends: increasing insecurity and the ineffectiveness of the international legal system. The increasing insecurity is due to the freedom assumed by some states to use

military force to impose their own interests, and the ineffectiveness of the international legal system is due to the defiant manner in which the countries responsible for the functioning of this system use the right of veto. Humanity feels the need not for globalization with a unipolar organization, but for a reglobalization, in which new international institutions bear the responsibility of watching over international law. Now it is not communism and capitalism that are at the origin of international disorder, but states that disregard the principles of international law. Beyond any state interests, there is a need for principles of international law to be promoted and defended.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- VLAD C., *Relații internaționale politico-diplomatice contemporane*, Fundația României de Măine Publishing House, Bucharest, 2001;
- MARCELLI F., *Gli contro il diritto internazionale illiceita della guerra preventive*, in „Giano. Pace, ambiente, problemi globali” Magazine, no. 42/2002;
- CORTEN O., *La securite colective, un reve contrarie*, study published in *le Monde Diplomatique*, september 2005;
- KOHEN M. G., *Is the US practice of use of force changing international law*, article published in *World Editorial and International Law*, January 2003, vol. II, no.1;
- SORRELL M., *Branding the New Era, Foreign policy*, summer 2000;
- HIRST P., *Război și putere în secolul 21. Statul, conflictul militar și sistemul internațional*, Antet Publishing House, Bucharest, 2001;
- BERNSTEIN S., MITZA P., *Istoria secolului XX, vol. II, 1945-1973. Lumea între război și pace*, All Publishing House, Bucharest, 1998;
- Ziua NewsPaper*, no. 2985, april 09, 2024.

