

**NEW FORMULA FOR PEACE: THE SYSTEM OF GLOBAL NON-  
AGGRESSIVE SECURITY**

**Marinich Volodymyr**

Ph.D candidate in Law

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine,  
member of the Scientific lab NGO «Cosmic Law Portal»

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3206-1436>

**Kurylo Volodymyr**

*Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor,*

*Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Agrarian Sciences of Ukraine,*

*Honored Lawyer of Ukraine, Head of the Department of Administrative and  
Financial Law*

*National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine*

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1268-801X>

**Myklush Maryna**

CEO, Law Group “FOX”,

member of the Scientific lab NGO «Cosmic Law Portal»

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-2202-9482>

**Holub Svitlana**

senior lecturer

Department of Criminal Law, process and Criminology  
Academy of Labour, Social Relations and Tourism, Ukraine,

member of the Scientific lab NGO «Cosmic Law Portal»

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2365-064X>

## **Abstract**

*The research sets out a formula for creating a new security system, which can be called the Global Non-Aggressive Security System (or GNASS).*

*According to this formula, states, private companies, non-governmental organizations, and individuals can join the GNASS regardless of their location or place of business.*

*At the same time, at the initial stage, the GNASS would consist of only three main elements.*

*The first element is the Transit Territorial Security Policy, which is based on the following principles: an effective structure (based on an interstate corporation), effective transport security corridors (the SATTRON), and effective legal solutions.*

*The second element implies the Non-Provocative Defense Policy, which is achieved by fulfilling the following conditions: the renunciation of all states from national military legislation and their accession to the UN Unified International Military Charter (which shall be developed); the reduction of the armed forces of all states through their refusal of military and other types of mobilization of people; the protection from prosecution and punishment of any individuals, private companies or non-governmental organizations that refuse to take part in hostilities.*

*The third element is the Food Security Policy, which is based on the construction of the Underground Greenhouse-Bomb Shelter System (the SUGREBOS) to guarantee food for people both in peacetime and during military conflicts and natural disasters.*

*According to the author, the development of a global security system based on the GNASS principle would eliminate military conflicts within several years, since the economic and security attractiveness of this system is so extreme that most states would agree to fulfill all the conditions for joining the GNASS.*

**Keywords:** *global security, non-aggressive security, non-provocative defense policy, national security, security system, security principles, security policy, international law*

## INTRODUCTION

The noted strategic thinker Basil Liddel Hart once said regarding the effectiveness of a global security strategy and system that can prevent or end a military conflict, “*The ideal outcome is to obtain your ends without firing a bullet or loss of lives*”[3, p. 213].

However, military conflicts on planet Earth over the past 100 years have shown the inconsistency and even provocativeness of the existing world order. As history shows, neither bipolar nor unipolar world order systems are capable of protecting the world from military conflicts, since these systems use such conflicts to maintain the existing world order.

Moreover, the Ukrainian-russian [5] and Israeli-Palestinian [6] military conflicts of 2022 – 2024, as well as earlier military conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, and other earlier conflicts, showed the inconsistency of the existing global security system built on the competition of military blocs and military strategies.

At the same time, such competition does not save the world from military conflicts but on the contrary creates a springboard for them, since each military bloc tries to build up and show military power that would be greater than that of its competitor. In turn, the military policy created by military blocs is initially the most losing, since with the increase in power and the renewal of weapons within the blocs all old weapons are resold to Third World countries and thus provoke even more conflicts [4, p. 152]. In addition, “demonstration performances” of each of the military blocs (to demonstrate power in front of a competitor) are sometimes carried out directly but usually in disguise, in the form of the use of their weapons, technologies, and specialists in deliberately provoked conflicts under the slogan “Military force is necessary to keep us secure”. “However, a military intervention will always make the overall situation worse and the prospects for constructive conflict transformation will shrink. Moreover, while lives might be saved somewhere, additional lives will be taken. And we have to face the reality. A military intervention will always take innocent lives” [1, p. 94]. Moreover, it is necessary to understand that the effectiveness of military blocs is determined by the final result that they can

achieve. However, confrontation between or among such military blocs with the maximum use of weapons would not bring victory to any of these blocs but would only lead to the last war on the planet. In addition, it would not be World War III or even World War IV, but it would be the World War of the Dead (since as a result of the use of all existing weapons, the entire population of the planet would just die). Thus, no matter what purpose these military blocs are created for, the result of their activities would always be negative.

Furthermore, the strategies developed by such military blocs for resolving existing military conflicts and preventing new conflicts based on the complete defeat of the enemy also do not support peace but only aggravate the current conflict situation. History has shown that even if one achieves victory on the battlefield, “a humiliated enemy will regroup and return to battle, with the burning memory of defeat fueling renewed efforts” [3, p. 168]. Moreover, military victories over an enemy in a specific conflict most often lead to a loss in the global aspect of peaceful existence, because “losers can almost always find creative ways to inflict pain on perceived winners, even at the cost of additional pain incurred by themselves, especially in the modern era of terror and when fearsome weapons can be obtained by almost anyone with relative ease” [3, p. 168)].

Thus, we can conclude that existing global security systems are often not guarantees of peace but provocateurs of military conflicts, and all attempts to further develop them are a dead end.

As Robert L. Dilworth and Shlomo Maital correctly noted in their book “Fogs of War and Peace: A Midstream Analysis of World War III”, the World has already entered the zone of a major global conflict and our task is to turn the world away from war and in the direction of peace [3, p. 195].

**THE AIM OF THE STUDY.** The article aims at developing a new formula for global security, which would offer new security formats taking into account all the above strategies while offering actual steps towards their implementation.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

It is necessary to remember that the aspirations of most people for peace led to the creation of the United Nations, which can be called the first global security system. The basis for this system was the UN Charter [2], which was signed on June 26, 1945, in San Francisco after the United Nations Conference on International Organization and came into force on October 24, 1945.

However, this system turned out to be ineffective and imperfect due to the “non-binding” and ambiguity of its legal acts (Resolutions, Declarations, Conventions, Treaties, and other acts). Moreover, major political players directly used the UN legal acts for their interests. Repeatedly the same provisions of the UN legal acts were used by such players simultaneously for different purposes, both for their military invasion of a foreign country and for condemning the military invasion of their competitor (Afghanistan, Syria, Libya, and so on) in the same country. Also, in some cases the desire of specific groups of people for independence was declared separatism, and in other cases - the right of the nation to self-determination. Moreover, in most cases, all such “*Fraus legi fit*” led to endless military conflicts.

Ultimately, the understanding of the weakness of the UN and the ideological confrontation between and among world leaders resulted in the creation and subsequent expansion of military-political blocs (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and others) that tried to assimilate to new elements of the global security system. However, as stated earlier, this system led to the emergence of even more military conflicts.

Since the 1990s, realizing the ineffectiveness of existing global security systems, many lawyers and political scientists have studied global security issues.

However, unfortunately, it should be noted that most of them did not offer new security formats but only proposed to eliminate shortcomings in existing systems not realizing that it is no longer possible to improve existing systems that can only be replaced.

For example, some researchers, such as Robert Lex Dilworth and Shlomo Maital, did not propose changing the format of the global security system but

proposed replacing its old “a win-lose strategy” with a new and more effective “a win-win strategy” [3, p. 168].

The proposed strategy consisted of three important elements:

— the constant communication of enemy countries’ representatives (discussion, dialogue, and negotiation) to reveal timely true (rather than formal) intentions and claims and have time to take steps towards peace to avoid the terrifying alternative of complete mutual destruction [3, p. 199];

— the fight against corruption in opposing countries, because as Dwight Ink said, “To believe that a country emerging from chaos can develop democratic processes and institutions without establishing a viable government with the capacity to serve its people is an oxymoron” [3, p. 199] - after all, no matter how much a country fights, if its government is corrupt, then the conflict will never end;

— a more equal distribution of wealth in the world, that is, creating a “Social Business Model” focused on improving the standard of living in the world (following the example of the Grameen Bank, which was created by Muhammad Yunus) [3, p. 213].

In turn, the American public organization “World BEYOND War” (whose founders and participants are scientists, researchers, journalists, and famous public figures) proposed radically changing the existing global security system. At the same time, they declare that only the achievement of the following goals can lead humanity to peace [1, p. 93–94]:

— all countries should move to “a non-provocative that requires the immediate phasing out of foreign military bases; dismantling military alliances; and ending all invasions and occupations”;

— encourage full compliance, from all countries to existing disarmament treaties;

— make transition steps toward General and Complete Disarmament a fundamental requirement of all future disarmament treaties and agreements;

— develop comprehensive strategies for economic conversion to aid the shift from a military economy to a pro-peace, sustainable economy;

- democratize international monetary institutions;
- require a nonviolent first response, rooted in the rule of law, to all acts of terrorism (whether it be state-sponsored terrorism or terrorism from below).

In fact, according to the logic of the members of the “World BEYOND War” organization, all world leaders who strive for opposing goals only provoke and prolong military conflicts rather than resolve them.

At the same time, they believe that peaceful goals can be achieved by other methods [1, p. 95–97], namely:

- Nonviolent Alternatives to Military Intervention;
- Arms embargoes;
- End all military aid;
- Work through supranational bodies (e.g. UN, ICC);
- Ceasefires;
- Aid to refugees (relocate/improve proximal camps/repatriate);
- Pledge no use of violence;
- Withdrawal of military;
- Meaningful diplomacy;
- Conflict resolution framework;
- Accurate information on facts;
- Ban war profiteering;
- Peacebuilding engagement; reframe the either/or us/their choices;
- Effective policing;
- Nonviolent civil resistance;
- Conciliation, arbitration, and judicial settlement;
- Human rights mechanisms;
- International law.

However, even though the proposals of the “World BEYOND War” organization are by far the most structural, consistent, and effective in achieving peace and ending wars on the planet, they are still not specific enough in describing the methods for their implementation in practice.

Nevertheless, the “Shift to a Non-Provocative Defense Posture” is very important. The essence of this proposal is as follows:

*“A first step toward demilitarizing security could be non-provocative defense, which is to reconceive and reconfigure training, logistics, doctrine, and weaponry so that a nation’s military is seen by its neighbors to be unsuitable for offense but able to mount a credible defense of its borders. It is a form of defense that rules out armed attacks against other states.*

*Non-provocative defense implies a truly defensive military posture. It includes radically reducing or eliminating long-range weapons such as Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles, long-range attack aircraft, carrier fleets and heavy ships, militarized drones, nuclear submarine fleets, overseas bases, and possibly tank armies. In a mature Alternative Global Security System, a militarized non-provocative defense posture would be gradually phased out as it became unnecessary” [1, p. 95–97].*

However, as mentioned earlier, representatives of this organization did not indicate specific and feasible methods and criteria for creating such a Worldwide “Non-Provocative Defense Policy”.

In turn, as the noted strategic thinker Basil Liddel Hart said regarding the possibility of implementing such strategies (which he called the “indirect approach”), “However, such strategies require fortitude and the ability to see beyond the obvious” [3, p. 213], hinting that modern political leaders lack the courage and willpower to abandon bloody wars to the bitter end and begin to use an “indirect approach”.

To change the global security situation for the better, it is necessary to develop new formats and approaches to regulating interstate relations. The article aims to form a new vision and understanding of global security based on alternative approaches to solving the problem and changing the status of international law and the United Nations.

To obtain the most effective scientific results of the research, general scientific methods (analysis and synthesis, deduction and induction, and system-structural),



general philosophical methods (dialectical and hermeneutics), and special methods (historical and legal, formal legal, comparative legal) were applied.

## **RESULTS**

**Basic principles.** According to the author, the formula for creating a new security system, which can be conditionally called the “Global Non-Aggressive Security System” (or GNASS), could be organized under the auspices of the UN and separately within unions such as the European Union.

According to this formula, states, private companies, non-governmental organizations, and individuals can join the GNASS regardless of their location or activity. At the same time, it is the possibility of joining this system not only of states but also of non-state actors that would make this system incredibly strong and effective, because the opinions of the majority of people, private companies, and non-governmental organizations on many issues can differ radically from government policy lobbied by a small group of politicians.

At the initial stage, the GNASS can consist of only three main elements: the Transit Territorial Security Policy, the Non-Provocative Defense Policy, and the Food Security Policy.

**The Transit Territorial Security Policy** is based on the creation of a unified Safety Transit Transport Road Network (or SATTRON) crossing the territories of all the GNASS participating states. At the same time, the SATTRON would be in the common possession of all GNASS participants (including in the possession of non-state actors).

The SATTRON is a network of transport transit corridors on the territory of all GNASS member states, which would become a natural barrier to any military invasion. No one would ever risk attacking a GNASS member state because such actions would require troops of the attacking state to cross the SATTRON`s transport corridors (on the ground, underground, or above ground). In turn, any violation of the terms of the SATTRON use (including the unauthorized crossing of roads by military units or their use for military purposes anywhere and on the territory of any state)

would be considered an unauthorized military incursion into the territory of all GNASS participating states and a violation of the rights and interests of all GNASS and SATTRON participants (including non-state actors). That is, such a military invasion would oppose the attacking state against not only the GNASS participating states but would also counter it against all non-state GNASS participating entities in different parts of our planet, who would voluntarily create pressure on the attacking state.

At the same time, in addition to ensuring safety, the SATTRON would create a strong economic effect.

To date, the transport component in the cost of goods very often reaches up to 50% of its price and up to 90% of the time it takes to overcome the way from the state of raw materials to finished products in the store.

Today, there are public and private carriers in the world. However, on the one hand, the state transport system is clumsy and not interested in solving promising tasks. On the other hand, private transport companies, against the background of mutual competition, are only interested in personal enrichment and are not ready to participate in creating a common perspective. This situation makes any country vulnerable.

In turn, an efficient transport system has been the basis for the independence and power of the state for a long time. Ancient Egypt was able to become a powerful state, primarily because it was able to create an efficient and cheap transport and transit system for cargo delivery along the Nile connecting central Africa with the Mediterranean coast. Ancient Rome became a powerful state not only because it knew how to fight well (in those days many states fought well) – but it created the most efficient, safe, and cheap transport and transit system. Many city-states joined the Roman Empire without a fight only because Rome offered businesses and small rulers more favorable economic conditions, and, first of all, related to the delivery of goods. That is, already in ancient times, states were able to understand the importance of the transport system and were able to create a business-oriented transport and transit system.

Thus, creating an effective transit transport system would significantly reduce the cost of the final product allowing faster and cheaper delivery of technologies, raw materials, and products to the final recipient.

At the same time, this task can be implemented based on three principles: an effective structure, effective transport corridors, and effective legal solutions.

An *Effective structure* involves the establishment of an interstate corporation (the SATTRON). It shall be an interstate joint-stock transport and transit corporation, in which the distribution of shares would be as follows - 51% is held by the participating states, and 49% by private investors-shareholders.

*Effective transport corridors* require the physical construction of a group of direct, controlled, and closed transport (road and rail) corridors. These corridor systems shall be of different vectors and link states' most important transport and cargo hubs. It does not cancel the existing road system but creates an alternative one.

Each such transport corridor would have to meet the following basic conditions:

- the most direct transport highway (automobile as well as railway);
- such a highway shall not intersect other transport highways (neither automobile nor railway);
- it would be intended only for freight transport;
- the mentioned highway would be completely isolated from external transport systems, except for its entry points (that is, it would be completely closed from the outside world);
- the entry points to the corridor would be located in certain places along the entire path of the corridor (the entrance of transport to the corridor would be under the control of the interstate control group);
- the corridor would be under constant external surveillance (satellites or cameras on the road);
- for each cargo, there would be only one control point (at the entrance to the corridor) and only one planned exit point;
- transport shall move non-stop at a minimum speed of 120 – 140 km/h (the only stops are for changing drivers);

— in the perspective of 10 – 15 years, only electric vehicles shall move in the corridor, and in the perspective of 30 – 50 years – only transport without drivers.

The essence of the corridor is straightforward:

— cargo transport that entered this corridor is gaining high speed and moving to its destination non-stop under the supervision of government agencies;

— cargo control and accrual of customs or other payments is carried out only once at the point of entry, and payment of customs payments - at the destination;

— in the directions that such corridors would occupy, smuggling would eventually disappear as a type of business.

*Effective legal solutions* require the signing of an open agreement on the establishment of an interstate joint-stock transport and transit corporation (the SATTRON). This agreement would not be about the unification of state transport systems but about the development of a new alternative transport and transit system, within which the participating states and private investors invest funds (money, land, transport terminals, technologies, and so on) in the creation of a transport system and share income.

Based on this SATTRON Treaty, participating states shall amend their national legal acts to meet the following conditions:

— the establishment of uniform rules for the organization of transportation and control of carriers for all carriers that would use transit corridors;

— the development of a single preferential tariff system for all carriers and uniform rules for customs and border control.

The SATTRON prospects for the near future:

— the creation of an effective security system for the participating states;

— the mutual business integration of the participating States;

— a significant reduction in the cost and acceleration of cargo delivery, an increase in transportation safety as well as the reduction in atmospheric pollution on the territory of the participating states;

— the development of many alternative transport corridors, the effectiveness of which would not be affected by either the war or the economic crisis;

- the creation of a support system for carriers of partner states in conditions of economic crises (preferential access to the corridor);
- the environmental improvement.

In the future, it can be applied to sea and air transport – the principles would be the same but the control system would be different (the role of corridors would be performed by ships moving under the satellite control of the corporation).

**The Non-Provocative Defense Policy** is based on the complete rejection of states from all systems that compel the killing of people (legally, physically, or socially).

The Non-Provocative Defense Policy requires states wishing to join the GNASS to meet three main conditions.

The first condition is the complete renunciation of the state from the military mobilization of the population and from other types of mobilization of people that force or may force people to take part (of any kind) in the killing of other people (regardless of what purpose is pursued). At the same time, the state shall recognize the fact that military mobilization of a person (like any other coercion of a person to kill or participate in the killing, regardless of what purpose is pursued) is violence against a person, the torture as well as cruel, inhuman disrespectful treatment, that is a relic of a medieval totalitarian, uncivilized, undemocratic and aggressive form of government and organization of society.

The second condition is the state's refusal of national military legislation and its accession to the UN Unified International Military Charter (that shall be developed). According to and based on this Charter, any state would have the right to create on its territory contractual voluntary armed forces for its defense or the protection of the GNASS participants but it would be required to register these armed forces in the UN General Register (structure, weapons, and strength). The maximum number of such armed forces may not exceed more than 0.01% of the total population of such a state. At the same time, the provisions of the UN Unified International Military Charter, based on which contract voluntary armed forces of the state would be created, shall establish a prohibition for such armed forces to cross the borders of any state and use

weapons or other force concerning the civilian population of any state (including its own).

The third condition is the establishment of a prohibition on the prosecution and punishment of any individuals, private companies, or non-governmental organizations that refuse to take part in hostilities (or take part in any other actions that lead or may lead to the killing of other people regardless of the purpose). At the same time, all GNASS participants acknowledge and confirm the fact that any non-state entity (individual, private company, or non-governmental organization) that has joined or has declared a desire to join the GNASS regardless of its nationality and territorial affiliation cannot be subject to military mobilization (or other type of coercion to take part in the killing of other people) in any state on Earth (including outside of the GNASS) and is protected by all GNASS participants.

Most military conflicts have shown that the decisive role in these conflicts is played by the process of military mobilization, that is, the ability of the state through legislative threats or social condemnation to force a large number of people to take part in a military conflict against their will. The refusal of states to military mobilization would make it possible to radically change the conflict situation in the world since the number of people willing to voluntarily fight and kill is significantly less than the number of people who were forced to do this against their will. That is, after the abandonment of military mobilization, the number of people willing to fight would always be insufficient to wage a war of conquest against other states.

In turn, the release of human and material resources due to the abandonment of military mobilization would allow each state to direct them to improve its economy and the well-being of the population.

**The Food Security Policy** is based on the creation of a System of Underground Greenhouses-Bomb Shelters or SUGREBOS under each Megalopolis, in which the required amount of critically important agricultural products would be grown. The activity and harvest of such greenhouses would not depend on the earth, sunlight, rain, snow, wind, hurricanes, and other external factors. The technology for growing agricultural products in such conditions has already been developed by “Safe Planet:

Quality Revolution” Limited Liability Company (“SPQR”, LLC) and is beginning to be implemented by private businesses in Ukraine. In a safe time, the SUGREBOS would enable to growth of agricultural products for state or international orders to provide food to vulnerable populations in the state of registration or to provide relief to the starving population of other states. During periods of pandemics, wars, or natural disasters, the SUGREBOS would provide the minimum required number of agricultural products to the population that would take refuge in these greenhouses for protection.

## **CONCLUSION**

The result of the research is the formula for creating a new security system, which can be called the “Global Non-Aggressive Security System” (Global Non-Aggressive Security System or GNASS).

According to this formula, states, private companies, non-governmental organizations, and individuals can join the GNASS regardless of their location or activity.

At the same time, at the initial stage, the GNASS would consist of only three main elements.

The first element is the Transit Territorial Security Policy, which is based on the following principles: an effective structure (based on an interstate corporation), effective transport security corridors (the SATTRON), and effective legal solutions.

The second element implies the Non-Provocative Defense Policy, which is achieved by fulfilling the following conditions:

— the refusal of all states from military and other types of mobilization of people that force or may force people to take part in the killing of other people regardless of the purpose being pursued;

— the refusal of all states from national military legislation and their accession to the UN Unified International Military Charter (which shall be developed);

— the prohibition of prosecution and punishment as well as protection from such prosecution and punishment of any individuals, private companies, or non-governmental organizations that refuse to take part in hostilities.

The third element is the Food Security Policy, which is based on the construction of the Underground Greenhouse-Bomb Shelter System (the SUGREBOS), which guarantees to provide food to people both in peacetime and during military conflicts and natural disasters.

According to the author, the creation of a global security system based on the GNASS principle would eliminate military conflicts within a few years, since the economic and security attractiveness of this system is so extreme that most states would agree to fulfill all the above conditions for joining the GNASS.

At the same time, it is necessary to understand that the main condition for states to join the GNASS is that these states fulfill all the conditions established by the GNASS Policies.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Ed. T. Jenkins. A global security system: an alternative to war (2018-19 edition). Charlottesville, Virginia : World BEYOND War, 2018.
2. Charter of the United Nations and statute of the international court of justice. Blue limited edition. New York : United Nations Publications, 2015.
3. Dilworth R. L., Maital S. Fogs of war and peace: a midstream analysis of World War III. Westport, Conn : Praeger Security International, 2008. 240 p.
4. Ed. T. G. Weiss, M. A. Kessler. Third World security in the post-cold war era. Boulder : Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1991. 183 p.
5. UN General Assembly (Eleventh emergency special session). Aggression against Ukraine. (02.03.2022).
6. UN General Assembly (Tenth emergency special session). Protection of civilians and upholding legal and humanitarian obligations. (26.10.2023).



