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Abstract. The report analyzes the modern international system and the factors that influence its development. The impact of the Great Powers, the development of information technology and the impact of social media on the dynamics of international relations are considered. The imbalance of the system, provoked by the fundamentally different views of the main actors - the United States and Russia on the main issues, has increased over the years due to the lack of dialogue aimed at finding mutually acceptable conditions for its existence. There is an aspiration for multi-regionalization of the international system and the emergence of new "players" - China, India, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia and the Republic of Türkiye, which seeks to acquire the role of a regional balancer, including through existing regional conflicts, and in the Balkans to be a regional leader. The mosaic of modern international relations is characterized by the restructuring of connections within existing subsystems, which inevitably affects the degree of entropy of the entire system and its individual elements.
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I. Introduction

The dynamics of the processes affecting the architecture of the modern system of international relations are unprecedented in historical terms. Digitalization, globalization, growing status in the field of technology and production (the approaching "cyber wave" of the scientific and technological revolution), the highly active phase of the rise of several civilizations provoke multi-level rivalries between states that rightly view "periods of crises as a time of opportunity". The limited possibility of long-term planning under these conditions affects the stability of alliances, which means high instability in the problems of determining the "balance of forces" and the "balance of threats". And as a normal development is the aspiration for multi-regionalization of the international system and the emergence of new "players" - China, India, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, the South African Republic and, to some extent, Turkey.

China, a country that in recent years has established itself as one of the world's economic powers, seeks to be a leading factor in both the UN and global political and economic alliances - BRICS, SCO and G20.

India, which has recently sought to catch up with China in terms of economic growth, has become an informal leader among the countries of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC).

The United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia, following the change in generations governing the countries, became the informal leaders of the countries of the League of Arab States (Arab League) and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (Islamic Conference).

Türkiye, which aspires to play the role of a balancer in regional conflicts and a regional leader in the Balkans and among Turkish-speaking countries, but due to the ambivalent and controversial policies of the country's president, RT. Erdogan is not perceived positively by both the West (the European Union) and Arab countries.

The mosaic of modern international relations is characterized by the restructuring of connections within existing subsystems, which inevitably affects the degree of entropy of the entire system and its individual elements - the struggle for leadership and supremacy, the growing
importance of nation states, the struggle for control over natural and energy resources, the struggle for influence over postcolonial states in Africa and Latin America, the rise of the “power factor” in international relations, hybrid and information wars, the decrease in the importance of the UN Security Council, etc.

The modern system of international relations is still in the process of conceptualization and given the complex mosaic, the crisis component can hardly be defined at the moment

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Reducing the role of the UN in the system of international relations

With its establishment after World War II, the United Nations (UN) was called upon to become not only a universally recognized regulator of international relations but also to establish itself as an international institution that could unite the efforts of all countries to build a just and free world, assisting in solving the most important political and socio-economic problems of humanity and being adequate to the new geopolitical realities.

In the first years, however, the world was divided into two warring 'camps,' with the leaders of these countries—the United States and then the Soviet Union (now Russia)—being veto-wielding countries in the UN Security Council, the body empowered to make adequate decisions to quell these conflicts. The fact is that most conflicts violate the interests of some of the leading states in the Council. [1]

In line with the global opposition imposed after World War II, it can be pointed out that international law takes on a special role. The establishment of certain rules of conduct of the blocs, both vis-à-vis each other and vis-à-vis third countries and regions, the interpretation of international law, and, above all, it’s generally recognized norms, allow for the strategic initiative to be taken (and withdrawn) and for rules of conduct to be dictated on the world stage in a peaceful manner, even playing a rather substantial propaganda role.

Within the framework of modern conflicts, the presence and active development of international law allows entry into the foreign information space and erosion of the basic values of the enemy camp – imposing or attracting in its rank’s supporters of “respect for human rights” or, respectively, opponents of “world imperialism”. As a result of these trends, a set of fundamental principles of international relations has formed in the UN system. As a result, after the end of the era of bloc opposition, today only the World Organization has the necessary legal basis and generally recognized legitimacy that allows it to act on the international stage as an expression of the interests of all countries and people. In this context, it can be noted that interpretations of international law as the primary regulator of relations between states are somewhat exaggerated. This is especially evident in the analysis of the contemporary processes of the major world communities, which are less and less inclined to absolutize international law and, accordingly, the UN as a major international institution guaranteeing the inviolability of the basic principles and norms of the global international system.

If we assess the international situation since 1946, more than 90 wars have been fought in the world, and the total number of conflicts, including internal ones (Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Israel) is about 400. This leads to the conclusion that this trend objectively reflects the existing political and socio-economic contradictions of different communities, from local to national (ethnic) and religious to regional. In this regard, international law, as a system for regulating international relations on the one hand, and the UN as the only and global institution ensuring its implementation, are derivatives of various factors (military, political and socio-economic). It can therefore be said that international law and the UN are not stand-alone and self-sufficient factors in international policy regarding conflict resolution. In modern conditions, interpretations of international law and the establishment of the UN are the result of post-war regulation and reflect specific historical conditions. In accordance with the already imposed and necessary changes in the world order, need a very substantial transformation of the modern system of international relations, which requires a revision of the basic norms in international law and the regulations on the status and activities of the United Nations.

If we illustrate the UN with a large corporation, then there are always complex vertical and horizontal links between the individual structural units, and as a result, vertical integration, i.e. the construction of a link between the individual units, remains incomplete. The main office (for the UNSC case) has too many functions and responsibilities and in this regard has too much information to be able to take operational and adequate decisions in a particular situation. At the same time, the governing body of the corporation is not aware of what is happening in the structural units located below it and in this regard is not able to exercise control over the decisions already taken. This leads to a management crisis that leads to the removal of the corporation and the conquest of markets by its competition. In order to overcome such a situation, there are no other solutions in management practice, except to transfer some of the functions and the main responsibilities for their implementation.

2.2. Economic organizations in the world

In the Americas, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was established, replaced as of July 1, 2020 by the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), Caricom, Caribbean Community, Parlacen, Central American Parliament, Andean Community, Andean Community, Mercosur, Mercosur, Trade and Economic Bloc of South America.

The European Union (EU) and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) have been established in Europe
In Africa, Arab Maghreb Union, Union of the Arab Maghreb, Economic Community of West African States (ECOWS), Economic Community of West African States, Central African Economic and Monetary Community (CEMAC), Central African Economic Community, Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), Intergovernmental Development Authority, Development Community for Southern African Development Community (SADC), Community for the Development of Southern African States were established.

In Asia there are Commonwealth Independent States, Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), Association for Regional Cooperation in South Asia.

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Association of Southeast Asian Nations and Pacific Islands Forum, Pacific Islands Forum are structured in the Pacific region.

The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), the Gulf Cooperation Council, operates in the Middle East.

2.3. Political alliances in the world

Part of the Economic Intergovernmental Authority for Development, Southern African Development Community (SADC), the Southern African Development Community, The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Parlacen, the Central American Parliament, Mercosur, Mercosur, the trade and economic and political bloc of South America, Europe and the United States are represented by the North Atlantic Alliance NATO, the Arab countries of the Arab League, the Arab League, some of the Asian countries and Russia are in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, Shanghai Cooperation Organization. The latter is gaining more and more popularity after the crisis in Ukraine and could become one of the leading mediation organizations in its attempt to resolve regional conflicts.

BRICS, whose abbreviation is made up of the five founding countries – Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa, is also becoming a leading political and economic union. At its last meeting in South Africa, the organization decided to be joined by six more countries – Saudi Arabia, Iran, the United Arab Emirates, Argentina, Egypt and Ethiopia.

Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), established as Organisation of Islamic Conference and renamed in 2011. It includes 57 countries from the Middle East, Africa, Central Asia, the Caucasus, the Balkan Peninsula, Southeast Asia, South Asia and South America.


2.4. The struggle for leadership and the modern world order

The dynamics of the processes affecting the architecture of the modern system of international relations are unprecedented in historical terms. Digitalization, globalization, the development of scientific technologies and new industries (the approaching "cyber wave" of the scientific-technological revolution and the advent of artificial intelligence technology), the highly active phase of the rise of several countries, such as China, India and to some extent Türkiye, provoke multi-level rivalries between the great powers and the new "players". The limited possibility of long-term planning under these conditions affects the stability of alliances, which means high instability in the problems of determining the "balance of forces" and the "balance of threats". The mosaic of modern international relations is characterized by the restructuring of connections within existing subsystems, which inevitably affects the degree of entropy of the entire system and its individual elements.

For example, one of the characteristic features of such a process is problems that are ‘old’ in form but have acquired ‘new’ content in the current context, among which religious and ideological conflicts stand out. The modern system of international relations is still in the process of conceptualization, but its crisis component can be identified now. After the fall of the "Berlin Wall" and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union, which led to the end of the bipolar system: The balance of power has changed, there has been a transformation of the principles, the principles of interaction, but the common ground, the spirit and the institutions of the Cold War continue to exist today. The concept, which is also often characterized as multipolar, presupposes the evolutionary development of existing institutions of global political stability, while preserving the specifics of the structure and functioning of sovereign nation-states. On the one hand, the United States and Western European countries insist on the unification of the world order on the basis of their own model of civilizational development, demanding reforms from partners in the economic, political and social spheres as a prerequisite for cooperation. To achieve their goals, in some cases they even demonstrate a willingness to ignore the existing international legal norms and institutions of global governance, but the practice of international processes at the moment shows the impossibility of forming uniformity for longer than "momentary" time. At the same time, Russia, the United States, China, India and the developed Arab countries are expressing positions for the formation of different forms of polarity, even for the formation of a lack of such polarity. This theory does not seem completely devoid of meaning in the context of the growing chaos and anarchism in the international arena over the last few years. Even among the "great powers", there is a decrease in the desire to expand their area of responsibility beyond the obvious boundary spaces and consolidate tendencies to concentrate on one's own problems in various forms of isolationism.

The imbalance of the system, provoked by fundamentally different views of its key elements of the basic actors - China, Russia, the United States, has deepened over the years due to the lack of dialogue aimed at finding mutually acceptable conditions of existence. The confrontation went from direct to propaganda campaigns supported by levers from a broad toolbox of 'soft power' and to theostutilitarian adoption of this concept, including the use of elements of the extremist and terrorist spectrum, which, according to some authors, have become 'legitimate means of policy-making'. In such circumstances, one of the mostpressing issues of modern
foreign policy is the problem of 'proportionate response'. On this basis, discussions on modern concepts of war have arisen in expert circles. As a result, today such concepts as "proxy war", "hybrid war" are only a reflection of reality, where the main actors seek to lower the threshold for the use of weapons, avoiding a direct clash between nuclear powers. [2]

Contrary to hopes, the collapse of the bipolar system (the dissolution of the Soviet Union) did not lead to a decrease in global conflict. The dynamic change in global transformations is forcing global players to develop new supranational platforms and decision-making mechanisms whose procedural functionality is adequate to the changed realities of the international scene. Through their projects, the Eurasian Economic Union, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the BRICS, the Gulf Cooperation Council, etc. in certain regions where their activities correspond to the relevant international subsystems. In this way, the regionalization of international relations is being updated to some extent, and the importance of the elements of the global system is increasing due to more stable and reliable connections in the distributed spaces. Additional homogeneity of the subsystems is given by the conflicting interaction in the periphery, in the area of their "contact", where individual subjects of world politics are objects in the game for markets and zones of influence between different centers of power. The most stable subsystems are characterized by the presence of a "leader" around which the consolidation and integration of the region takes place. By building their own inclusive security system in the region, including imposing border restrictions and establishing economic cooperation with neighbouring countries, such leaders may in the future achieve the level of a 'great power'. The formation of new power centers is a natural consequence of filling the vacuum created after the breakdown of the system by two equivalent poles regulating the space around them. One of the most significant aspects today is the opportunity to offer the world new ideas and ways of development. In this regard, for example, China's ideological and economic path is attractive; but Western democracies are becoming vulnerable as a result of huge migrant pressure, weakening the social system and creating risks of a new wave of terrorism. Regional 'powers' such as Turkey and India are also emerging, seeking to become a key factor for security and, in general, for the international system. Russia, which has relied on state interests throughout the post-Soviet years, faces the need to develop micro- and macro-ideas aimed at both developing its own nation and achieving peace, which implies at least strengthening humanitarian cooperation, mainly with the former Soviet republics and the "Russian world" (part of the former socialist republics, including Bulgaria).

Following the decision of the last BRICS meeting held in 2023 in South Africa to join six more countries, the organisation will represent around 46% of the world's population and generate 37% of the world's gross domestic product (GDP) [3]. With its current composition, BRICS generates 24% of global GDP and represents 42% of the world's population.

The intensification of the ideological factor in the world system influences the frequency and scale of the spread of radical concepts based on fundamentalist aspirations appealing to the idealized past, which are generally based on the ideas of intolerance and the definition of an "external enemy". The fight against fundamentalism consumes too many resources and causes a spillover from one radical group to another. Such is the case with the formation of the Islamic State terrorist group, Kurdish separatist movements, Hamas, etc. The strengthening of this trend is facilitated by the policy of the United States, which, testing its own foreign policy development (the concept of controlled chaos), as well as due to a misunderstanding of the specifics of the political process in the East, provoke the collapse of regional systems. On the other hand, Russia, in order to counter these American aspirations and to divert conflict points from its own territory, is controlled to support "anti-terrorist groups", whether legitimate or opposition governments. The determining factor in this case is the socio-economic situation of the population, which due to a serious demographic "youth bulge", high unemployment, difficult economic conditions has been influenced by the preachers of radical ideologies.

2.5. The specifics of national identity in the global world

Nations are under considerable pressure from migratory flows, which lead to the erosion of consciousness, traditions and the state as an apparatus for managing society [2]. The consequences of the clash of interests of different structures go far beyond the regions in which they occur. The number of potential and actual conflict zones where, due to a careless step by the authorities or a tactical move by extra-regional players, an acute internal political crisis spilling over into civil war may flare up as interdependence and mutual openness in the regions grow. As a result of geopolitical transformations, and often catastrophes, countries that are actually the apparatus for population management arise and disappear. A state can be formed, but that does not mean that a nation is formed. At the same time, the nation is the key to a strong and successful state. Nation-building is a complex, multi-stage project. Its ultimate effectiveness depends on the will of the people and the competence of the state governing bodies, which systematically through ideological content and the creation of favorable external conditions can contribute to the construction of the nation. Thus, the formation of a nation will have positive dynamics and a result only within the framework of the simultaneous movement from the bottom up and from the top down. It seems impossible to build a nation relying solely on administrative resources, without a willingness on the part of society. A distinction must be made between ethnicity and nation, nationality can be formed by several ethnicities. It is essential that they have the will to unite. If a society has the ambition to build a nation and is deprived of the
support of power, it will not have its own identity, which is a characteristic not only of societies but also of states.

Among the direct manifestations of the identity of society are nationalism, active foreign policy, and for small and medium-sized countries the "besieged fortress" syndrome. This is especially characteristic of the countries of the Caucasus region and Ukraine – in the post-Soviet space, where the growth of national consciousness continues. Another example is the countries of the former Yugoslavia, where some of them still lack an element of national identity, but a manifestation of nationalism based on ethnic differences. Thus, as factors that indicate a readiness to create a single nation, national self-awareness and a sense of identity stand out, which on the one hand seems divided (for example, ethnic and national), and on the other - united. Trends related to identity strengthening and weakening are manageable. As an example, Ukraine, Russia, by annexing Crimea and conducting a military operation, under the pretext of protecting the Russian population, contributes to the mobilization of a radical, maximum nationalist element on the territory of the country.

The free movement of the population and the openness of borders contribute to the weakening of state "unity". A person who understands the world turns from a tied "pawn" into a "citizen of the world", which is used by individual funds representing grants and internships abroad to "educate" emissaries with their ideology. However, according to Newton's third law, "action always has an equal and opposite reaction", and in the East this rule takes the form of a counter-trend, within which the traditional consciousness struggles with the introduction of foreign elements. Thus, the element of clan relations – tribalism – still prevails in the system of social interaction for the Maghreb countries. Moreover, pressure from the world community on a particular, marginal in their opinion, element of the system leads to a sharp reaction, but never to obedience. Iran's nuclear ambitions during the period of sanctions, the imprisoned militarized North Korean regime, the repressive regimes in the countries of the Horn of Africa are developing due to the popular consolidation around the nation's leader, as well as with the help of those who are dissatisfied with the conditional 'consensus'.

These countries are forced to develop their own military potential, to make contacts with individual formations as emissaries of their activities and thus undermine regional and global security.

2.6. The role of the "fourth" power

Recently, information has become a key weapon of war. Even the small use of cyberspace provides great opportunities in terms of forming a space for the realization of the national interests of states, placing the "right" emphasis on the key events of modern history. Channels such as YouTube, Telegram, platforms such as "X", Facebook, LinkedIn are increasingly used, both to explain the development of the situation in areas of tension and to carry out propaganda aimed at one or the other of the warring parties. Last but not least, the "strong and rich" media broadcast live footage from the hot spots of the conflict, which once again changed public attitudes.

The phenomenon of social networks and ambassadors who repeatedly accelerate communication processes is increasingly the subject of discussion in political processes. The skillful use of informal methods to convey their point of view to the voter allows candidates in key countries around the world to win the presidential election (the role of the Facebook platform in the election campaign of D. Trump and the Telegram ambassador in Iran's 2017 presidential election), opposition groups to take people to rallies and stage revolutions (the influence of social networks on the intensity of protests during the 'Arab Spring') [3]. This is why one of the most politicized topics of public life today has become the problem of state control over information flows. Under these conditions, the thesis that myths and reality were in close proximity thanks to the activity of the media and communications, the resource of which is used by individual lobby groups, political parties, commercial corporations and entire countries [4]. Amorepressing issue is the option of presenting the news from the 'strong and rich' media: a cleverly selected video sequence of the development of the conflict is the most effective means in terms of its impact. Considering the strengthening of the clip-awareness of young people who are unable to perceive information in long logically verified formats (articles, journalistic investigations, documentaries). Due to small information forms, idealized or hyperbolized negative image of state leaders, stable patterns of perception of states and societies are formed, which allows the elite, which increasingly focuses not on national, but on its own interests, to carry out the necessary actions. Such videos should be short and consistent, containing one ideology at a time (a classic example is the chain: "Assad is a dictator. Down with Assad! ", " Putin is a murderer! To arrest Putney! ", " Trump is a criminal! To deprive him of the right to participate in elections! " In the United States the tournament was broadcast live on CBS, ESPN, and Tennis Channel. Up to the minute, a well-chosen moment (for example, immediately after the end of Friday prayer in Muslim countries) is able to provide a difference from thousands of people who have come to the demonstrations, thus deciding the fate of the issue on the agenda in one direction or another. This toolkit is used today not only by the forces that opposed the current regimes. The state, when communicating with society, has also learned to transmit the necessary ideas through new methods of communication.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Promoting the role of the UN

In order to increase the role of the UN internationally, steps can be taken to reform the organization at two levels, whereby at the regional (lower) level the organization can rely on individual regional structures, including political-economic and military, both at continental and intercontinental level, and at a morelocal level.

It is believed that at the territorial level, these organizations can act under the auspices of the UN, turning for assistance to other regional and intercontinental unions if necessary. This could allow the mechanism for implementing decisions to become moredynamic, strengthen ties between the world
organization and regional and mutually strengthen the authority of both the UN and regional organizations.

3.2. Increasing the role of "intermediary states" by using their influence in individual political and economic unions

The struggle for supremacy and leadership in the world order is expanding the poles of the global international system. Nevertheless, the main "players", the US and Russia, are competing to increase and impose control over both energy and natural resources, as well as individual countries. This gives the new "players" a chance to act as a mediator in the settlement of regional conflicts – in particular Russia-Ukraine and Israel-Hamas, respectively Palestine.

Recent crises, the coronavirus pandemic and the war in Ukraine, Europe's energy dependence on Russia, have caused disagreements among EU leaders, which in turn sharply reduced the Union's influence in the global international system.

At this stage, achieving a fully neutral position on the part of China, India, the UAE, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, and Türkiye is difficult due to economic and energy dependencies on the one hand and on the other the opposition of the United States as a global leader to date.

Türkiye, through President Erdogan, is pursuing a controversial foreign policy mostly for economic gain. This leads to the withdrawal of trust in the country and the limitation of its influence.

3.3. Challenges to diplomacy

Against the background of the changing international situation and the deepening regional conflicts (the Russian-Ukrainian, Middle East and Red Sea) and the risks of the emergence of new ones (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, the Caucasus, North and South Korea, Iran, China and Taiwan, etc.) require the use of new methods of diplomacy. Thus, the terms innovative and mediation diplomacy are becoming more widely used among diplomatic communities. .7

Under an innovative approach, on the one hand, the use of the development of information technologies and social networks for indirect and non-verbal influence should be perceived to form public opinions and attitudes.

Leaders of individual countries, their representatives and official institutions are increasingly using social networks to send messages. Their goal is to generate broad public support and lead to concrete negotiations.

On the other hand, innovative diplomacy also means entrepreneurial and effective diplomacy, i.e. using innovative approaches to solve global and regional problems.

An important issue for enhancing the ability of persons involved in shaping foreign policy in the implementation of effective diplomacy is the provision of a reliable mechanism for collecting and evaluating information.

To innovative diplomacy can be added a search for wider supporters, representatives from different countries and communities and expressing a common view on the particular case or conflict, to be attracted as participants in the mediation process of negotiations between the warring parties.

An example of success in this regard could be Türkiye's efforts to mediate in resolving the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia when Russia is sought to influence Armenia and Saudi Arabia and the UAE to influence Iran to end pressure on Azerbaijan.

It can be determined that an integral part of innovative diplomacy is mediation diplomacy, i.e. to use the abilities of persuasion to achieve understanding between the warring parties.

If in the past this was not applied because of the conquering ambitions, nowadays, by including "like-minded" people in the process, persuasion becomes more and more realistic. Of course, the attraction of additional participants is also based on mutual benefit on the one hand and the benefits that these countries will have on the other.

CONCLUSIONS

The increased political activity of individual social and class actors (primarily in the virtual space) catalyzes group responsibility for the future of the nation, while reducing the frequency of charismatic leaders appearing in the political arena who would be willing to take responsibility not only for cosmetic changes, but also for structural reforms. The crisis of leadership can be extrapolated to the international plan, where there are more and more zones of instability, the dynamics of which are becoming increasingly destructive in the context of the lack of political will to initiate measures from the crisis management course. Exceptions to this list are China and Iran, as well as Russia and Türkiye. Leadership implies defining the goals and logic of the country's development, as well as the ability to gradually implement them in the form of a national domestic and foreign policy course. In this context, in order to enhance the role of the EU, it is necessary to undertake changes in the decision-making process and the establishment of a new leadership policy. At this stage, Türkiye's governance policy can be described as authoritarian and leadership change is needed to enhance its role as a mediator and mediator in the global international system. Given Erdogan's ambitions to "root" in the country, such a change will take time.

The emphasis on state development cannot take place outside the context of global disruption (agenda fluctuations between conservatism and liberalism). At this historical stage, the world has entered an era of rebellion of conservatism against liberalism; this process is observed in almost all key states of our time. Serious changes of this scale cannot occur without "surface fluctuations": changes in elites accompany crises, transformations in the field of indoctrinal policy design.
provoke revision of previously unshakable paradigms. At the same time, the conflict plains are rarely preserved, the static of confrontation is not typical – both for forms, methods and for location. In this regard, clashes in the ‘Greater Middle East’ due to the discursive constraints of the participants will spread to the regions of Southeast Asia (the emergence of ISIL ‘branches’ in Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines) and the post-Soviet space (given the number of foreign fighters in Syria and Iraq, the South Caucasus and Central Asia are threatened), where many external elements are active. The key challenge within modern international relations can be called the need to find new rules of the game that reflect objective reality, but not speculative constructs that some actors ignore openly, others – non-public. In this sense, the discussion around the mutual legitimation of double standards is particularly valuable. The formation of a new foundation and alternative methods of diplomacy requires ideas for development and a global outlook based on an understanding of regional political technology processes and instruments.
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