

UDC 327.5: 355.4

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2024.54.40>

CONCEPTUAL SHIFTS IN THE PARADIGM OF WAR AND PEACE AMID THE TRANSFORMATION OF CONTEMPORARY WORLD POLITICS

Anastasiia Chupis

*Zaporizhzhia National University,
Department of Political Science
Zhukovsky Str., 66, 69002, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine
School of Social Sciences Södertorn University
Nobel Avenue, 7, Stockholm, Sweden
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3091-3332>*

Nataliia Lepska

*Zaporizhzhia National University,
Department of Political Science
Zhukovsky str., 66, 69002, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/-0001-6010-423X>*

The shifts in the global order that commenced in the late 20th century and continued into the 21st century have necessitated a reevaluation of our understanding and examination of the concepts of war and peace. These changes were brought about by processes of globalization, the transformation of the international security system from bipolar to multipolar, the proliferation of international terrorism, and advancements in technology in both civilian and military domains. However, the question remains: Have the approaches to studying these processes, as well as our fundamental understanding of these concepts, evolved? How have theorists and practitioners from various scientific disciplines worldwide approached the examination of these categories?

The article aims to investigate the transformation of the scientific discourse on the concepts of war and peace. It analyzes existing models and approaches to studying these phenomena, as well as the retrospective development of these areas within the social sciences. The research underscores the necessity of a cross-sectoral approach to studying these phenomena for a more profound understanding and analysis. It also seeks to identify the probable factors contributing to this transformation and the causal relationships between them.

The transition from national to private subjectivity in warfare complicates the implementation of established international law and underscores the crisis of the current international legal system. The authors of the article emphasize the need for a systematic rethinking of the phenomena of war and peace, comprehensively integrating technological, political, legal, and humanitarian perspectives to address contemporary conflicts and their global impact.

The article also substantiates the need to revise traditional methods of resolving armed conflicts, such as peacemaking and peacebuilding, as peace technologies and practices that worked in the past traditional war are now stalled. This is evidenced by Russia's war against Ukraine, which has been going on since 2014 and has been in its full-scale phase since February 2022. The study also emphasizes that it is necessary to introduce new technologies of peace engineering as a holistic, comprehensive, and multilevel policy in upholding peace as strength, resilience, and resilience of society, readiness for phase transitions from peace to war and from war to peace.

Key words: war studies, peace studies, conflict studies, polemology, irenology, peacemaking, peace engineering.

Introduction. After the end of the Second World War, and subsequently the Cold War, humanity had a unique historical opportunity to live for more than 70 years without global military conflicts. However, can this period be called truly peaceful? After all, in the 1990s, the world faced a new face of war: its localization, hybridization, and the acquisition of new features that were previously characteristic of terrorism alone. The worst examples of global upheavals at that time were the genocide in Rwanda, the outbreak of border conflicts in the republics of the former Soviet Union, the wars in the former Yugoslavia, and the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. At the same time, the concept of «frozen conflicts» developed in the post-Soviet space, both theoretically and practically, posing a serious challenge to the global and regional dimensions of collective security and conceptually opposing the approaches to sustainable peace promoted by leading international organizations. The global wars of the 20th century and their hybrid continuation in local wars have created a need for a scientific understanding of the phenomenon of peace, as it is no less complex and controversial in nature than the phenomenon of war. Scientific interest in this process remains relevant in the 21st century and has a new round of development in light of the current military aggression of the Russian Federation on the territory of Ukraine and a new wave of armed clashes between Hamas and Israel in the Gaza Strip.

War and War Study. The current century is marked by a significant increase in the number of military conflicts in the world. According to statistics collected and analyzed by researchers Max Roser, Joe Hassell, Bastian Erre, and Bobby MacDonald as part of the Oxford University project *Our World in Data*, the number of military conflicts involving foreign intervention increased 12.5 times between 1946 and 2020 [21]. According to the University of Geneva, as of the beginning of 2023, there are 110 active military conflicts in the world [16]. According to the annual report of the London International Institute for Strategic Studies for June 2023, a record number of regional and local conflicts was recorded over the past 30 years – 183 [4]. But is the nature of war in the 21st century the same as the conflicts of past centuries, or is this term changing under the influence of technological progress in response to the challenges of the times?

It is no exaggeration to say that the phenomena of war and peace are complex objects of scientific knowledge. Therefore, it is not surprising that their research is multidisciplinary. Representatives of various scientific currents and paradigms have developed a wide range of theories and concepts of war and peace over many centuries. Among them are the classical works of Sun Tzu, Plato, Aristotle, A. Augustine, T. Aquinas, G. Hegel, I. Kant, K. F. Clausewitz, and others. The understanding of new types of wars has been advanced by such outstanding scientists as A. Toffler, M. van Creveld, E. Luttwak, F. Hoffman, M. Kaldor, S. McFate, and others.

Thus, relying on philosophical ideas and postulates, philosophers addressed the ethics of war, its nature, and whether it is part of human nature. Medieval philosophers saw the role of war in the struggle and defense of the Christian religion. That is why this period gave rise to phenomena such as the Crusades, which illustrate the idea of the Holy War very well. The «knightly war» was a direct successor to the Germanic concept of war as «God's judgment,» but it was humanized under the influence of the Christian Church and the general growth of civilization. Under the influence of the religious teachings of medieval scholasticism, the concept of just war was born. The wars of this period relied mostly on human resources.

Medieval approaches were replaced by the development of professional armies and the concept of total war, which relied on professional armies, the development of new types of transport communications (primarily railways), and the development of new and improved types of firearms and artillery (especially indirect artillery and machine guns). The main focus was on achieving technological superiority and superiority in the number of weapons and mobilized troops, which together resulted in increased firepower on the fronts to exhaust the enemy. The

concept of «total war» was introduced by General Erich Ludendorff, one of the most prominent commanders of the First World War. In contrast to earlier wars, which maintained a strict separation between the military and the civilian population, the concept of “total war” proposed the idea of general mobilization and massive involvement of the civilian population in the needs of war. Until the end of the First World War, the use of armed forces was not seen as a crime but as an acceptable way to resolve conflicts.

The 1919 Covenant of the League of Nations [19] and the 1928 General Treaty for the Renunciation of War (Kellogg-Briand Pact) [3] aimed to outlaw war. The adoption of the United Nations Charter in 1945 confirmed this trend: “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force...”. At the same time, the UN Charter [20] enshrines the right of states to individual or collective self-defense in response to aggression by another state (or group of states). Additionally, the UN Security Council, acting based on Chapter VII of the Charter, may decide on the joint use of armed forces in response to a threat to the peace, a breach of peaceful relations, or an act of aggression.

At the present stage, we can distinguish four main approaches to the study of war, namely: military science (practical knowledge used by the military in organizing military campaigns directly within the theater of operations); economic and political (justification of the resources of warfare, the purpose, needs, and capabilities of the parties, and the diplomatic and political resources involved by the parties during hostilities); international law (a body of international documents regulating the legal aspect of the rights, obligations, and capabilities of the subjects of hostilities, and the protection of civilians); and technological (innovative technologies used for warfare and the achievements of scientific and technological progress).

More modern studies of the theory and strategy of war can be found in the works of the American historian and military theorist Edward Luttwak, who, in his book “Strategy and Logic of War” [12], first published in the late 20th century, provided a comprehensive analysis of modern approaches to warfare. Luttwak took into account new technological approaches and capabilities used in the wars in the Balkans, where he was directly present and involved as a military analyst. All of these works are classics of military strategy and form the basis for the development of military science today.

The above-mentioned studies have become an important foundation for the development of scientific research in the field of conflict studies. However, viewing war through the prism of the military-technological approach does not provide a complete picture for analyzing conflicts, as it mostly overlooks the analysis of the causes and consequences of conflicts and focuses mainly on the process of warfare itself. This approach is therefore insufficient for political science, which in its research focuses on the study of the destructive power of military conflicts, the protection of civilian rights, conflict prevention, and overcoming their consequences. Political science research does not exclude the analysis of military-technical resources, technologies, and processes, which are naturally interconnected and necessary for forming a holistic picture of scientific inquiry. These questions lie at the intersection of several humanities: political science, international relations, international law, sociology, demography, cultural studies, and history, as well as several technical sciences. Wars and post-war processes have repeatedly become undeniable catalysts for the development of scientific and technological progress.

These questions, which are reasonable for post-conflict societies and the need for a more comprehensive understanding of them, have often led to the growing popularity of conflict studies in political science after the end of another interethnic or interregional conflict, especially those involving international institutions such as the League of Nations and its successor UN, later the OSCE, NATO, the EU, and others. In parallel, in response to the crises caused by global

wars, the body of international law on military conflicts was formed and developed. Based on the reflections of medieval philosophers on the nature and justice of war, the legal justification of the legitimacy of wars was developed and established. The result of this was the consolidation in international law of the rules governing the possibility of warfare (*jus ad bellum*) and the norms of permissible actions and rules of conduct of the belligerents (*jus in bello*) [22].

The Geneva Convention, which codifies the rules for the protection of civilians and victims of war and its additional protocols, in particular, regulating the rules of warfare and the weapons that are permissible for use, became a fundamental normative act in the field of international military law.

After the Second World War, there was an active development of research in the fields of conflict studies, political science, and sociology of war. Gaston Bouthoul, a French sociologist, proposed to distinguish a new interdisciplinary area of war research – polemology. The main goal and slogan of the study of war in the context of the new direction was to ensure peace through the study of war [6, p. 104]. In his article published in 1968, Bouthoul substantiates the need for a new pacifist-oriented discipline as a contrast to the existing areas of military science that deal directly with the methods and strategies of warfare. In his research, he relies on the central place of war in it, while peace is perceived by him as a derivative phenomenon – a state of absence of war. Subsequently, in contrast to polemology, a field of study focusing on peace and peace processes is distinguished – irenology. In the twentieth century, the first departments and research institutes for the study of war, military conflicts and peace, conflict mediation, and international peacekeeping processes appeared in universities in Europe and the USA.

In the 1989 article «The Changing Face of War: Into the Fourth Generation» [11, p. 22–24], US military analysts proposed a classification of wars into four generations. This classification is often used and reinterpreted in political science research, as it is convenient and helps to visualize the stages of development of military science and technology. Researchers have distinguished the first generation of wars, characterized by linear tactics and the use of cold steel and muskets. The second generation is characterized by the introduction of «fire and maneuver» tactics during the First World War and immediately before it. The third generation was characterized by the tactics of broad maneuvers, encircling the enemy, and breaking through its defense lines to great depths using large tank formations and aviation.

The most interesting part of the study was the forecast for the next, fourth generation, which, according to the researchers, should have the following characteristics: the use of terror and terrorist actions mostly directed not only against military but also civilian targets; subjugation of the population and suppression of any attempts at public resistance; targeted aggressive attacks on traditional cultural and historical values of the population; use of information technologies for psychological pressure and disorientation of the civilian population; and sponsoring extremist organizations, guerrilla movements, civil wars, and revolutions.

It is these characteristics that we can see in the wars of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Scholars have been challenged to study war and peace in the paradigm of preventing new global military conflicts and finding ways to respond proportionately to terrorist acts, which are not war by nature but are increasingly being used for military and political purposes. Analyzing all these factors, the American researcher Mary Kaldor proposed the concept of the «new war.» According to Kaldor, the «new war» is not only a military conflict but something in between a war (political violence) and a crime (violence for private interests), where battles are rare and violence is mostly directed against civilians.

The researcher also emphasizes that the methods of conducting «new wars» significantly violate international law, international humanitarian law, human rights laws, and the Genocide

Convention. «In essence, everything that used to be considered undesirable and illegal side effects of the old war has become central to the way of warfare that characterizes the new wars,» Kaldor says, adding that new wars are difficult to end and tend to spread uncontrollably [9, p. 2]. Certain aspects of the «new war» are also characteristic of the Russian aggression against Ukraine, which began in 2014 and continues to this day.

In the early 2000s, the concept of «hybrid warfare» was put forward by the American scholar and retired military officer Frank G. Hoffman. This concept quickly gained popularity and became the subject of numerous scientific studies. In his work «Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Warfare», published in 2007, Hoffman gave the following definition: «A blurring of the modes of warfare, a blurring of who is fighting and what technologies are being used, which in turn gives rise to a wide range of diversity and complexity that we call hybrid warfare. Hybrid warfare can be waged by both states and various non-state actors. They involve several different modes of warfare, including conventional means, irregular tactics and formations, terrorist acts, indiscriminate violence and coercion, and criminal unrest» [8].

In 2018, in response to Russia's aggression against Ukraine, a team of Ukrainian researchers edited by Volodymyr Horbulin published the study «World Hybrid War. The Ukrainian Front», in which scientists analyze the main features and differences of the war against Ukraine from the standard conventional interpretation of war. They distinguish hybrid methods of warfare against their country, based on the use of not only the purely military potential of the aggressor state but also a whole range of resources such as information: IPs spread through controlled media and social networks, terrorist acts to put pressure on the civilian population, actions aimed at weakening the economy and depleting the state's resources, and more. In other words, this is a war not only on the military front but also a diplomatic, political, economic, and information confrontation in which the resources of the state being attacked can become a weapon in the hands of the aggressor [2].

Remote warfare, the active use of UAVs and other unmanned aerial vehicles, leads to a certain gamification of warfare processes, which in turn challenges scholars in the field of military, political, and legal science to study the impact of these new technologies on the traditions of warfare and the possible revision of international law and the identification of new international norms of warfare and their codification.

Having traced historical and political trends and their implementation through military mechanisms, we can state that in the last few centuries, there has been a movement from private to national and back to private subjectivity of warfare. This change in agency complicates the implementation of established international law, where the state is the bearer of the right to aggression or violence, and it is also responsible for preventing the use of force without a valid reason. Thus, the responsibility for an act of aggression lies with the state and its establishment, whereas in wars of a new type, accountability is more difficult. These features have become a catalyst for the crisis of the international legal system that we can now observe. Norms and laws cease to operate in the real conditions of armed conflicts, so international «policemen» such as the UN *de facto* have their hands tied in responding to conflicts, and essentially only have the function of an observer, even in situations where the state is the bearer of aggression. The creation of several tribunals in the late 20th and 21st centuries can be seen as a striking example of this thesis.

Given the above material, we propose a conceptual framework for war studies through the prism of a cross-sectoral approach to the study of wars and their paradigm shift (Table 1).

Studying peace. Most scientific dictionaries, such as Merriam-Webster's [14], Oxford [15], and Cambridge [13], define the term peace in quite similar terms. Based on these sources,

Table 1

Historical period	Legal framework	Gene-ration of war (Lind)	Political Concept	Resource	The entity initiating the war	Consequences	Ending Wars and Establishing Peace (Outcome)
1 Middle Ages	2 Pre-convention period (before the signing of the Peace of Westphalia)	3 -	4 Just war	5 Irregular infantry and cavalry. Weapons: spears, bows and arrows, and more.	6 Feudal Lords and the Church (private initiative on the use of violence)	7 The transition to the monopolization of power by force	8 Conquest of new territories, expansion of the influence of the Catholic Church
Revolutionary and anti-colonial wars (French Revolution, American Revolutionary War)	1 The formation of prerequisites for the development of international law is the proto-convention period. The number of casualties among the civilian population is decreasing		Total war	Regular army and rebel forces. The use of linear tactics, the use of muskets	National states (monopolization of power by the state)	Change of political regime	Declaration of Independence
World War I	2 Active development of IHL. Formation of Hague Law and Geneva Law			Regular army and universal mobilization. Implementation of "fire and maneuver" tactics, and development of artillery.		The end of empires	The signing of peace treaties: Treaty of Versailles; Treaty of Saint-Germain; Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine; Treaty of Trianon; Treaty of Sevres; Treaty of Lausanne

<p>1 Second World War</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>Cold War (1945-1991)</p>	<p>Deterrence by conventions and international law</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Proxy war Perpetual war Limit-trophic conflicts</p>	<p>The creation of gray zones and the division of regions of influence, the conduct of military confrontation, and the redistribution of regions using waging wars on the territories of other states</p>	<p>Superpowers and blocs</p>	<p>The Caribbean crisis, the threat of a direct nuclear collision, the formation of a bipolar geopolitical system</p>	<p>The unification of Germany. The collapse of the USSR</p>
<p>Peaceful coexistence of the USSR and the USA</p>							
<p>The end of the 20th – beginning of the 21st century</p>	<p>Searching for ways to circumvent conventions, withdrawal from signed international treaties, or deliberate violation of their norms</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Hybrid War (by Hoff-man) A new war (by Kaldor)</p>	<p>The war is being waged both with the use of traditional weapons and with the use of diplomatic and economic resources. Terrorists act as methods of influencing the civilian population. Use of information and psychological resources to open new fronts of struggle: - Cognitive; - Conscientious; - Semantic - Discursive - Psychological - Mental - cyber war.</p>	<p>A return to the privatization of violence: states and quasi-state entities, terrorist organizations, the Communist Party of Ukraine, and TNCs.</p>	<p>Terror against the civilian population, large-scale displacement of the population, increased tension, and destruction of the architecture of collective security was laid after the end of World War II. Crisis in the work of organizations that were supposed to guarantee safety, de facto impossibility of their activities.</p>	<p>The difficulty in determining the end of wars of a new type is the blurring of conflict boundaries. Freezing conflicts.</p>

we can define peace as: «a calm state/time, the absence of social conflicts, the period between wars.» However, these definitions suggest that peace is merely a derivative, antonymous category in contrast to «war.» But is it correct to assume that war as a state of society preceded peace? This is one of the first scientific contradictions and dilemmas in the approach to studying peace as a subject of social science research.

Additionally, the subjectivity, complexity, and multidimensionality of this phenomenon may pose certain difficulties for the study of peace. Subjectivity is manifested in the assessment of this state, with a lack of objective criteria and scales for assessing peace. Complexity can be seen in the difficulty of achieving the level of peace that existed in the pre-conflict phase, necessitating an interdisciplinary approach to solving problems caused by the conflict. The multidimensionality of the category of «peace» can be characterized through the prism of the approach proposed by the renowned Norwegian researcher Johan Galtung, one of the founders and popularizers of peace studies globally. Galtung developed a dual approach to the study of peace, proposing to consider this phenomenon in terms of «negative peace», characterized by the absence of war, and «positive peace», defined by the presence of social goods such as justice, equality, and welfare in society [7, p. 170].

In the context of globalization, the impact of military conflicts can have reverberations in geographically distant regions. The food crisis in the African region caused by Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine is a good example of the latter point. This process demonstrates another difficulty in studying the nature of peace, namely its interdependence with other socio-political and international processes.

The need to study peace as a separate scientific phenomenon emerged in the period between the two world wars and was developed after their end. Both in the academic aspect, which was also catalyzed by the process of rapid development of the sciences against the background of post-war recovery, and in the practical aspect, becoming one of the main areas of peacekeeping activities of such international organizations as the League of Nations (until 1946), the UN, the OSCE, and others. When referring to international organizations that promote peace in their activities, it can be noted that the approach to the definition in the system of international relations also defines the category of «peace» as the need to prevent international conflicts through the resolution of disputes through diplomacy and the development of institutions to strengthen democracy. This approach has somewhat developed the idea of Raymond Aron's vision of one of the concepts of peace, who saw the peaceful period through the prism of the absence of violent confrontation in the pursuit of political goals [5, p. 47].

In his 2021 research paper, Ukrainian historian Mykola Henyk made a comparative analysis of 3 different scientific approaches to periodizing the stages of peace research. He chose the models of J. Kondziel and K. Jazwinski, H. Kubiak, and L. Krisberg [1, p. 12–14]. For convenience, we present these approaches in the form of a comparative table (Table 2).

As we can see, these approaches use different scientific optics in the research process, so the number of proposed stages and their periodization differs, but they give us a cross-sectoral understanding of the importance of peace studies research.

In light of this, it is impossible not to mention attempts to separate peace studies into a separate scientific field. The first such attempt was made in the 1930s by Joseph Starke, a lawyer, and employee of the League of Nations. His ideas were published in 1968. Stark proposed to distinguish «Irenology is the science of peace». He said that: «it makes it possible to define sets of theories, concepts, hypotheses, principles, generalizations, general laws, conclusions and provisions that can be formulated on the subject of peace» [18, p. 15].

Table 2

Stages/ Approaches	J. Kondziel and K. Jazwinski	H. Kubiak	L. Krisberg
1 stage/ Phase	1945–1955 – analysis of ideologies: fascism, totalitarian socialism, nationalism, and chauvinism	before the First World War (until 1914) – the dominance of the concept of peace was the absence of war and the main attention was paid to the study of war	1914–1945 – emergence of academic interest in conflict resolution problems in the USA during the Great Depression
2 stage/ Phase	1955–1968 – the separation of peace research into a separate discipline, the study of the consequences of a possible nuclear conflict, the political phenomenon of the "Cold War"	the interwar period (1918-1939) – a period of attempts to guarantee peace with the help of a global international organization and the political idealism of V. Wilson	1946–1969 – founding of numerous peace research institutions;
3 stage/ Phase	1968–1980/1990 – study of development problems, socio-economic backwardness, and conflict of the North-South axis.	from the beginning of the Second World War (1939) – to the mid-1960s – the dominance of the school of political realism of H. J. Morgenthau and the search for the "balance of power"	1970–1985 – development of the concept of positive peace, entry into conflict research programs, mediation, and negotiation training;
4 stage/ Phase		from the mid-1960s to the Revolutions of 1989 – the evolution of the definition of peace, the emergence of the concept of positive peace	1986–2005 – conflict research through deepening knowledge about its causes, escalation, and negotiation process
5 stage/ Phase		1990s: reorientation of attention to research on psychological aspects of peace	

In general, by characterizing the approaches to the study of peace by social scientists, we can distinguish thorough research in the fields of sociological, political, legal, economic, and psychological sciences.

Here are some key aspects of sociology's contribution to the study of peace: analysis of the dynamics of conflict and peace in societies; research on social movements dedicated to peace; study of peacebuilding and reconciliation processes in post-conflict societies. They also study transitional states from war to peace and vice versa; they study the mechanisms of restoring public trust. Sociologists also investigate which international and state institutions can be drivers or spoilers of peace; they study the role and influence of culture, social identity, ethnicity, nationality, and religion on conflict and peace. It should be noted that these aspects and approaches are also studied by political scientists. However, speaking about the contribution of the political science community to the peace research process, it is necessary to note the following important aspects that are studied by these scholars. Political scientists study the political structures, processes, and dynamics that shape peace, security, and conflict resolution.

The most famous schools of peace studies in the field of sociology include two main ones: American and Scandinavian. However, it was the Scandinavian school, in particular, thanks to the works of the aforementioned Galtung, that managed to raise the issue of peace studies to the level of interdisciplinary research. The leading institutions in peace studies are still educational institutions and research centers: The Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO) (Norway), research departments of the universities of Lund and Uppsala, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden), as well as leading American universities and think tanks, such as the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) and others.

Currently, in the world research practice, there are separate scientific areas of peace studies, such as peace studies, conflict resolution studies, and conflict studies. Interest in studying and researching in these areas is quite high. We can also distinguish areas that focus on the study of peace operations and approaches to their implementation. For example, in the legal sciences, this will include research in the field of transitional and restorative justice and mediation. In sociological and political sciences, this will include the study of reconciliation mechanisms, and the study of the gender aspect of peacebuilding processes, for example, through the implementation of Resolution 1325 on Peace, Women, and Security (WPS agenda) [17].

The psychological sciences are developing a negotiation direction – facilitation and dialog for peace. It should be emphasized that as a subject of scientific research, the results of scientists' work are used in practice, and vice versa – practices developed by representatives of international, donor, and non-governmental organizations used during field missions may later become the subject of academic study. That is why an intersectoral approach to peace studies and the study of approaches offered by different scientific disciplines and communities is more relevant than ever.

Because of the acuteness and urgency of this problem, we believe it is necessary to emphasize that in the context of modern hybrid wars, past approaches to understanding the processes of ending wars and, as a result, concluding peace agreements between the parties that were subjects of war are no longer effective. The technologies and practices of peace that worked in the past traditional war are now stalled. This is evidenced by Russia's war against Ukraine, which has been going on since 2014 and has been in its active phase since February 2022. Therefore, we emphasize that it is necessary to introduce new technologies of peace engineering as a holistic, comprehensive, and multilevel policy in defending peace as a force, resilience, and resilience of society, readiness for phase transitions from peace to war and from war to peace [10]. The transition to new generation wars with multi-domain structures and hybrid nature determines the transition from separate areas of peacekeeping, peacemaking, peacebuilding, and preventive diplomacy to a holistic approach of peace engineering in the new peace agenda, not from weakness to aggression, but from the strength of democracy. This is exactly the need that is being demonstrated in the context of the ongoing Russian-Ukrainian war.

Conclusions. Understanding the paradigms of war and peace has been a complex and multi-stage process from the point of view of various scientific fields. However, the growing number of military conflicts, which are becoming close to the two world wars of the 20th century in terms of scale and intensity, suggests that the scientific community needs to continue studying these phenomena, taking into account new challenges from the technological process, economic, social and security changes that bring new types of conflicts. In this process, synergy is needed between the academic community and practitioners working with conflicts, peacekeeping operations, and implementing peaceful approaches on the ground. Without such cross-sectoral interaction, it is difficult to imagine the realization of the concept of sustainable peace, but in many regions, peace is not only a category studied through the prism of academics but also a guarantee of further democratic development. Unfortunately, Ukraine has been living in a state

of lack of peace and security since 2014. Therefore, for our academic community, the conceptual study of peace should become an urgent issue to formulate positions and strategic documents that will present a vision of peace formed in scientific approaches and based on the experience of practitioners. The introduction of innovative peace engineering practices should help ensure the organic solidarity of the democratic world and its resilience in the face of the current threat of aggression by authoritarian states, the protection of human rights and sustainable development of society, and compliance with international law.

References

1. Генік М. Методологічні проблеми міждисциплінарних досліджень миру / Політичні дослідження. – № 1 (2021). С. 8–21. URL: https://ipiend.gov.ua/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/genyk_metodologichni.pdf
2. Світова гібридна війна: український фронт : монографія / за заг. ред. В.П. Горбуліна. – К. : НІСД, 2017. 496 с.
3. 1928 General Treaty for the Renunciation of War (Kellogg-Briand Pact) URL: <https://iilj.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/General-Treaty-for-the-Renunciation-of-War-Kellogg-Briand-Pact.pdf>
4. Armed Conflict Survey / IISS. URL: <https://www.iiss.org/en/publications/armed-conflict-survey/2023/editors-introduction/>
5. Aron R. Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations. Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers New York • Washington, 1967. 790 p.
6. Bouthoul G. Polemology and the solution of conflicts / Impact of science on society, XVIII, 2. P. 103–109. URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000012842>
7. Galtung J. Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. Journal of Peace Research, 1969. No. 6. – P. 167–191. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/422690?seq=4>
8. Hoffman, F. G. Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars. Arlington, VA: Potomac Institute for Policy Studies. 2007, 69 p. URL: https://www.potomac institute.org/images/stories/publications/potomac_hybridwar_0108.pdf
9. Kaldor M. New and Old Wars / Polity Press, Cambridge, 2012, P. 268.
10. Lepskyi M., Lepska N., The War in Ukraine and its Challenge to NATO: Peacekeeping to Peace Engineering. American Behavioral Scientist (ABS) (SAGE Publications). 2023. T. Volume 67. Issue 3. P. 402–426. URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epub/10.1177/00027642221144833>
11. Lind W. S., Schmitt J. F., Wilson G. I. The Changing Face of War: Into the Fourth Generation / Marine Corps Gazette October 1989, P. 22–26 URL: <https://indianstrategicknowledgeonline.com/web/THE%20CHANGING%20FACE%20OF%20WAR%20INTO%20THE%204Th%20GENERATION.pdf>
12. Luttwak E. N. Strategy: The Logic of War and Peace, Revised and Enlarged Edition. Harvard University Press, Belknap Press. 2001. 308 p. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1c7zfsc>
13. Peace / Cambridge Dictionary URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/>
14. Peace / Merriam-Webster dictionary URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/peace>
15. Peace / Oxford English Dictionary URL: <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=peace>
16. RULAC: Rule of Law in Armed Conflicts. URL: <https://www.rulac.org/>
17. S/RES/1325. Security Council Resolution on women and peace and security URL: https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/SC_Resolution_WomenPeaceSecurity_SRES1325%282000%29%28english_0.pdf

18. Starke J. G., *An Introduction to the Science of Peace (Irenology)*. Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff. 1968. 214 p.
19. The Covenant of the League of Nations URL: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/leag-cov.asp#art1
20. United Nations Charter URL: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>
21. War and Peace / M. Roser, J. Hasell, B. Herre and B. Macdonald. URL: <https://ourworldindata.org/war-and-peace>
22. What are jus ad bellum and jus in bello? URL: <https://www.icrc.org/en/document/what-are-jus-ad-bellum-and-jus-bello-0>

КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНІ ЗМІНИ ПАРАДИГМИ ВІЙНИ ТА МИРУ В ПРОЦЕСІ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЇ СУЧАСНОЇ СВІТОВОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ

Анастасія Чупіс

*Запорізький національний університет,
кафедра політології*

*вул. Жуковського, 66, 69002, м. Запоріжжя, Україна
Школа соціальних наук Університету Сьодерторну,
Алея Нобеля, 7, м. Стокгольм, Швеція
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3091-3332>*

Наталія Лепська

*Запорізький національний університет,
кафедра політології*

*вул. Жуковського, 66, 69002, м. Запоріжжя, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6010-423X>*

Зміни в глобальному порядку, які почалися наприкінці 20-го століття і тривали в 21-му столітті, викликали необхідність переоцінки нашого розуміння та вивчення понять війни та миру. Ці зміни були спричинені процесами глобалізації, перетворенням міжнародної системи безпеки з біполярної на багатополярну, розповсюдженням міжнародного тероризму та прогресом технологій як у цивільній, так і у військовій сферах. Проте залишається питання: чи еволюціонували підходи до вивчення цих процесів, а також наше фундаментальне розуміння цих понять? Як теоретики та практики з різних наукових дисциплін у всьому світі підійшли до вивчення цих категорій?

Стаття спрямована на дослідження трансформації наукового дискурсу щодо понять війни та миру. Вона аналізує існуючі моделі та підходи до вивчення цих феноменів, а також ретроспективу розвитку даних напрямків як частини соціальних наук. Дослідження підкреслює потребу крос-секторального вивчення цих феноменів задля більш ґрунтовного осмислення та аналізу. А також намагається визначити ймовірні фактори, що сприяють цій трансформації, і причинно-наслідкові зв'язки між ними.

Перехід від національної до приватної суб'єктності у війні ускладнює імплементацію встановленого міжнародного права та підкреслює кризу сучасної міжнародно-правової системи. Автори статті наголошують на необхідності системного переосмислення явищ війни та миру, всеохопно інтегруючи технологічні, політичні, правові та гуманітарні перспективи для вирішення сучасних конфліктів та їхнього глобального впливу.

У статті також обґрунтовується необхідність перегляду традиційних методів врегулювання збройних конфліктів, таких як миротворчість та миробудівництво, технології та практики миру, що працювали в умовах минулої традиційної війни, наразі пробуксовують. І це засвідчує війна РФ проти

України, що триває з 2014, а в повномасштабній фазі – з лютого 2022. Дослідженням також наголошується, що варто впроваджувати нові технології мироінженерії – цілісної, всеохопної та багаторівневої політики у відстоюванні миру як сили, стійкості та резильєнтності суспільства, готовності до фазових переходів від миру до війни та від війни до миру.

Ключові слова: війна, мир, вивчення війни, вивчення миру, конфліктологія, полемологія, іренологія, миротворчість, мироінженерія.