



Igor Mantsurov

Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor,
Corresponding Member of the National Academy
of Sciences of Ukraine,
Director of the Institute for Systemic Statistical Studies
(Kyiv, Ukraine)
Ambassador-at-Large of the International Human Rights
Commission (IHRC),
Extraordinary Professor at the University of the Western Cape
(South Africa)
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1753-0422>
i.mantsurov@ihrchq.org

Rafał Marcin Wasik

Secretary General of the International Human Rights Commission
(IHRC Corporation, Washington, D.C., USA)
Honorary Professor of the Higher School of Economics in Białystok
(Poland)

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-3958-7713>
office@ihrchq.org



Iryna Stolietova

PhD in Economics, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the State University of Trade and Economics
(Kyiv, Ukraine)
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6594-4569>
i.stolietova@knute.edu.ua

УДК 341.231.14

PREVENTING SYSTEMIC HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS: MECHANISMS OF INTERACTION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

ABSTRACT. This article critically examines the institutional and functional capacity of the United Nations and international organizations to prevent systemic human rights violations under conditions of increasing global instability, armed conflicts, hybrid threats, and large-scale socio-economic transformations. The study argues that contemporary human rights violations should be understood not as isolated legal incidents, but as systemic and interconnected phenomena generating cumulative demographic, economic, institutional, and humanitarian consequences.

Particular attention is devoted to the mechanisms of interaction between the United Nations, its specialized agencies, international organizations, and emerging non-state actors within the

framework of global preventive governance. The article identifies key limitations of the contemporary international human rights architecture, including fragmentation, institutional inertia, weak coordination mechanisms, political asymmetry, and the predominance of reactive approaches over preventive strategies.

In response, the study proposes a systemic analytical model linking human rights violations with demographic degradation, economic destabilization, and long-term structural risks. The article substantiates the need for a transition toward preventive governance based on integrated analytical systems, early-warning mechanisms, interdisciplinary approaches, and coordinated institutional responses at both global and national levels.

Special emphasis is placed on the role of sectoral interaction within the UN system, including the contribution of specialized agencies and international organizations to the development of preventive mechanisms and data-driven governance models. The case of Ukraine is examined as an empirical example demonstrating the systemic nature of contemporary human rights violations and the practical applicability of the proposed framework.

The paper also highlights the growing role of institutional innovation and emerging actors, including the International Human Rights Commission (IHRC), in strengthening the analytical and preventive capacity of global governance systems.

KEYWORDS: human rights; United Nations; systemic human rights violations; preventive governance; international organizations; early-warning systems; global governance; Ukraine; International Human Rights Commission (IHRC).

1. Introduction:

a world in a state of structural turbulence

The contemporary international system is increasingly shaped by armed conflicts, hybrid warfare, and prolonged geopolitical tensions, blurring the distinction between war and peace. Under these conditions, human rights violations should be understood not as isolated legal deviations but as systemic manifestations of global instability.

Modern risks have acquired a new qualitative dimension, including large-scale civilian losses, environmental degradation, demographic decline, and growing threats to long-term societal sustainability. These processes indicate that human rights violations are embedded in broader structural transformations.

The United Nations has played a fundamental role in establishing the global human rights regime through its normative and institutional frameworks. However, a persistent gap remains between norm-setting, monitoring, and effective prevention. In practice, the system largely operates in a reactive mode, addressing violations after their occurrence.

A key limitation lies in institutional constraints, including decision-making mechanisms that hinder timely responses to large-scale violations and crises.

At the same time, the global human rights architecture remains fragmented, lacking integrated analytical systems, rapid-response mechanisms, and effective links between data, analysis, and decision-making. Existing approaches often fail to capture the systemic nature of contemporary threats, including hybrid conflicts, environmental damage, and demographic transformations.

This creates a structural problem: prevention is replaced by post-factum response, leading to the underestimation of long-term consequences and the need for a systemic rethinking of global human rights governance.

2. Critical review of contemporary scientific literature

This section examines key theoretical and interdisciplinary approaches to human rights and international governance, focusing on classical foundations, contemporary Western scholarship, Ukrainian legal discourse, and the institutional framework of the United Nations.

Classical and Contemporary Approaches

The intellectual foundations of the modern human rights system originate in classical political and legal philosophy. The works of Locke¹, Kant², and Grotius³ established the principles of natural rights, universal law, and international legal order, later institutionalized within the United Nations system and international legal instruments.

Contemporary Western scholarship offers diverse interpretations of human rights and global governance. Liberal institutionalism emphasizes international cooperation and the role of organizations (Keohane⁴, Nye⁵, Moravcsik⁶), while critical and realist approaches focus on structural inequalities, geopolitical asymmetries, and institutional limitations (Wallerstein⁷, Arrighi⁸, Mearsheimer⁹, Krasner¹⁰). Empirical studies analyze conflict dynamics and the effectiveness of international institutions (Fearon¹¹, Collier & Hoeffler¹²).

Despite significant contributions, existing approaches remain fragmented and insufficient for explaining systemic human rights violations within interconnected demographic and economic processes.

Ukrainian Legal and Institutional Discourse

Contemporary Ukrainian scholarship combines legal, economic, and institutional perspectives on human rights under conditions of armed conflict and structural transformation. Important contributions include studies by

¹ J Locke, *Two treatises of government* (Awnsham Churchill 1689).

² I Kant, *Perpetual peace: A philosophical sketch* (1795).

³ H Grotius, *De jure belli ac pacis* (1625).

⁴ R O Keohane, *After hegemony: cooperation and discord in the world political economy* (Princeton University Press 1984) <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7sq9s>.

⁵ R O Keohane, J S Nye, *Power and interdependence: world politics in transition* (Little, Brown 1977).

⁶ A Moravcsik, 'Taking preferences seriously: a liberal theory of international politics' [1997] 51(4) International Organization 513–553 <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081897550447>.

⁷ I Wallerstein, *The modern world-system* (Academic Press 1974).

⁸ G Arrighi, *The long twentieth century: money, power and the origins of our times* (Verso 1994).

⁹ J J Mearsheimer, *The tragedy of great power politics* (W.W. Norton & Company 2001).

¹⁰ S D Krasner, *Sovereignty: organized hypocrisy* (Princeton University Press 1999) <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt-7s9d5>.

¹¹ J D Fearon, 'Rationalist explanations for war' [1995] 49(3) International Organization 379–414 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300033324>.

¹² P Collier, A Hoeffler, 'Greed and grievance in civil war' Oxford Economic Papers [2004] 56(4) 563–595 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oepp/gpf064>.

Shemshuchenko¹³, Shapoval¹⁴, Kopylenko¹⁵, Mamutov¹⁶ and Ustymenko¹⁷, focusing on constitutionalism, economic governance, and institutional regulation.

At the same time, the existing discourse remains predominantly normative and lacks an integrated analytical framework linking human rights with demographic and economic dimensions.

UN Institutional Framework

The United Nations has established an extensive normative system for human rights protection through international legal instruments, specialized agencies, and strategic policy documents. However, a significant gap persists between normative commitments and operational preventive capacity.

International institutions continue to function primarily within a reactive paradigm, while comprehensive preventive mechanisms and integrated analytical systems remain insufficiently developed.

Interim Conclusion

The review demonstrates the absence of a comprehensive interdisciplinary framework integrating human rights, demographic processes, economic transformation, and preventive governance within a unified analytical model.

3. Purpose of the study

The purpose of this article is to develop a systemic framework for understanding human rights violations as structural phenomena under conditions of global instability, and to substantiate the role of the United Nations and international organizations in the transition from reactive responses to preventive global governance.

4. Scientific novelty and practical significance of the article's results

Scientific novelty. This study conceptualizes human rights violations as systemic structural phenomena and proposes an integrated analytical framework linking them with demographic degradation and economic destabilization, while introducing the notions of structural misalignment, political economy of inaction, and the shift from monitoring to preventive governance.

Practical significance. The proposed framework can be applied in international and national governance systems to support early warning, risk assessment, and preventive decision-making, including through the use of demographic indicators

¹³ Ю Шемшученко (ред), *Сучасний унітаризм: доктрина і практика* (Юридична думка 2021).

¹⁴ В Шаповал, *Основи конституціоналізму (нарис з історії, теорії і практики)* (Мишалов Д. В. 2021).

¹⁵ *Парламентаризм та законотворення: вибрані лекції* (О Копиленко та ін. (упоряд), Ін-т законодавства Верховної Ради України 2017).

¹⁶ В Мамутов, 'В основі державного суверенітету – суверенітет економічний' [2011] 6 Вісник Національної академії наук України 7–8.

¹⁷ В Устименко (ред), *Гарантії дотримання соціально-економічних та екологічних прав людини в умовах війни та повоєнної трансформації* (ДУ "ІСПД імені В. К. Мамутова НАН України" 2024).

and the development of coordinated institutional mechanisms, with potential contributions from organizations such as IHRC.

5. MAIN RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This section focuses on the critical analysis of the United Nations system in preventing systemic human rights violations, identifying its structural limitations, and substantiating the transition toward a preventive model of global governance.

5.1. Critical Analysis of the United Nations System

The United Nations represents the most comprehensive institutional framework for human rights protection, having established universal normative standards through international legal instruments. However, a fundamental contradiction persists between the normative strength of the system and its limited operational capacity to prevent violations. In practice, the existing institutional architecture remains predominantly reactive, addressing violations after their occurrence rather than preventing them.

The United Nations system includes more than 30 entities, including 15 specialized agencies operating in areas such as labor, education, migration, health, and humanitarian protection¹⁸. Despite broad institutional integration, human rights governance remains fragmented and lacks unified analytical and preventive mechanisms capable of transforming information into coordinated action.

A key limitation lies in the functioning of the Security Council, where the veto power of permanent members constrains timely and coordinated responses to large-scale violations. This institutional design, rooted in mid-twentieth-century geopolitical realities, is increasingly incompatible with the complexity of contemporary global risks.

Elements of such procedural mechanisms already exist within several UN-affiliated institutions. Within the International Labor Organization (ILO), the Decent Work Agenda establishes standards for labor rights protection, while recent developments recognize safe and healthy working conditions as a fundamental right¹⁹. UNESCO applies procedural mechanisms related to freedom of expression and the right to education, including the so-called “Procedure 104”²⁰.

In the field of migration governance, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) applies the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), enabling real-time monitoring of population movements and humanitarian needs²¹.

¹⁸ Specialized agencies and related organizations maintaining liaison offices at Headquarters (United Nations) <<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/specialized-agencies>> (accessed 27.05.2026).

¹⁹ Decent work and the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development (International Labour Organization (ILO)) <<https://www.ilo.org/topics-and-sectors/decent-work-and-2030-agenda-sustainable-development#introduction>> (accessed 27.05.2026).

²⁰ Examination of communications relating to human rights in UNESCO’s fields of competence (104 Procedure) (UNESCO) <<https://www.unesco.org/en/communication-information/procedure104>> (accessed 27.05.2026).

²¹ Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) (International Organization for Migration (IOM)) <<https://dtm.iom.int>> (accessed 27.05.2026).

These examples demonstrate that elements of data-driven and procedural governance already exist across different sectors of the UN system, although they remain fragmented and insufficiently coordinated. At the same time, the comprehensive systematization of such protocols across all UN entities constitutes a separate field of research and goes beyond the scope of the present study²².

At the same time, the UN system lacks integrated mechanisms for risk identification, forecasting, and preventive coordination. Existing approaches remain largely descriptive and retrospective, while institutional responses are delayed and insufficiently adaptive to rapidly evolving threats.

Thus, the UN system remains normatively advanced but structurally insufficient for preventing systemic human rights violations. Its principal limitations include fragmentation, institutional inertia, weak predictive capacity, and the dominance of reactive logic.

5.2. *Directions of the Transition toward an Efficient Human Rights Architecture*

The identified limitations indicate not the failure of the United Nations as an institution, but the need for a qualitative transformation of the global human rights architecture. Contemporary risks are systemic, multidimensional, and rapidly evolving, whereas existing institutional structures remain state-centered, procedurally rigid, and politically constrained. This creates a structural mismatch between the nature of modern threats and the institutional mechanisms designed to address them.

An additional limitation is the persistence of the reactive paradigm, in which monitoring and documentation are often substituted for prevention. Although the UN system has developed extensive reporting mechanisms, these instruments do not automatically generate timely preventive responses. As a result, violations continue to escalate while institutional interventions remain delayed.

The study substantiates the need for a transition toward preventive governance based on integrated analytical systems, early-warning mechanisms, predictive analytics, and coordinated institutional responses. In this context, the proposed World Council for the Prevention of Human Rights Violations is conceived as a complementary analytical and coordination mechanism operating in cooperation with the UN General Assembly, international organizations, academic institutions, and civil society. Its functions would include risk assessment, forecasting, and coordination of preventive responses.

To strengthen the preventive capacity of the UN system, it is proposed to initiate the development and submission to the United Nations General Assembly of a dedicated resolution tentatively titled: *“Resolution on Strengthening Preventive Governance Mechanisms in the Field of Systemic Human Rights Violations”*.

Such a resolution could establish a normative framework for the transition from reactive to preventive approaches, including the formalization of early-

²² Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (United Nations) <<https://www.unhcr.org/media/guiding-principles-internal-displacement>> (accessed 27.05.2026).

warning systems, integrated analytical mechanisms, and coordinated decision-making procedures across the UN system.

Its implementation would require the development of functional and sector-specific protocols regulating the activities of specialized agencies, funds, and programmes. These protocols should define standardized approaches to risk identification, data exchange, analytical coordination, and preventive response.

Elements of such procedural mechanisms already exist within several UN-affiliated institutions. Within the International Labor Organization (ILO), the Decent Work Agenda establishes standards for protection of labor rights, while recent developments recognize safe and healthy working conditions as a fundamental right. UNESCO applies procedural mechanisms related to freedom of expression and the right to education, including the so-called “Procedure 104”. In the field of migration governance, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) applies the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), enabling real-time monitoring of population movements and humanitarian needs.

These examples demonstrate that elements of data-driven and procedural governance already exist across different sectors of the UN system, although they remain fragmented and insufficiently coordinated. At the same time, the comprehensive systematization of such protocols across all UN entities constitutes a separate field of research and goes beyond the scope of the present study.

5.3. Systemic Model: Human Rights, Demography, and Economic Transformation

Traditional approaches primarily interpret human rights violations as legal or humanitarian problems. However, under conditions of global instability, such violations should also be understood as systemic phenomena generating interconnected demographic, economic, and institutional consequences.

The proposed analytical model is based on the following causal chain:

human rights violations →
demographic degradation →
economic destabilization →
structural societal risks

Within this framework, human rights violations function as an initial systemic shock producing cumulative effects across multiple domains. Their consequences include declining birth rates, excess mortality, migration pressures, deterioration of public health, and structural demographic imbalances.

Demographic degradation, in turn, generates long-term economic consequences through the loss of human capital, declining productivity, fiscal pressure, weakening investment activity, and distortion of development priorities. Human rights violations therefore operate not only as legal phenomena but also as hidden macroeconomic variables influencing long-term development trajectories.

An important feature of the model is the existence of feedback mechanisms: economic decline reduces state capacity, which contributes to further violations and accelerates demographic deterioration. This creates a self-reinforcing cycle of instability.

The proposed framework demonstrates that effective prevention requires the integration of human rights into broader systems of economic governance, strategic planning, and institutional forecasting. Preventive governance must therefore rely on interdisciplinary approaches, quantitative indicators, and integrated analytical mechanisms.

The case of Ukraine provides an empirical example illustrating the systemic nature of contemporary human rights violations and their measurable demographic and economic consequences.

6. Ukraine as a case study of systemic human rights violations

The ongoing armed conflict in Ukraine provides an important empirical basis for analyzing human rights violations as a systemic and multi-level phenomenon. Unlike localized crises, the Ukrainian case is characterized by nationwide scope, prolonged duration, and structural complexity encompassing legal, demographic, economic, and environmental dimensions. This makes Ukraine not only an object of humanitarian concern, but also a methodological prototype for developing a broader analytical framework.

6.1. Hierarchical Structure of Violations

The Ukrainian case reveals a hierarchical structure of human rights violations. At the first level, violations of non-derogable rights – including the right to life, prohibition of torture, and physical integrity – constitute the core of systemic degradation, as reflected in attacks on civilian infrastructure and civilian casualties.

At the second level, violations affect civil and family rights, including freedom of movement, private life, and protection from forced displacement, resulting in disruption of family structures and large-scale internal migration.

At the third level, socio-economic rights are undermined through destruction of housing, infrastructure, healthcare, education, and employment systems. Vulnerable groups, including children, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, and internally displaced persons, experience disproportionate cumulative impacts.

At the fourth level, environmental rights are affected through land contamination, ecosystem destruction, and long-term environmental degradation with consequences for future generations.

6.2. Interconnected Nature of Violations

A defining feature of the Ukrainian case is the interconnectedness of violations. Infrastructure destruction reduces access to healthcare and increases mortality; displacement contributes to unemployment, poverty, and social exclusion;

environmental degradation undermines livelihoods and accelerates demographic decline.

These interdependencies demonstrate that human rights violations form a self-reinforcing systemic network rather than isolated legal incidents.

6.3. Demographic and Economic Consequences

Ukraine demonstrates significant demographic transformations under conditions of systemic violations, including declining birth rates, excess mortality, reduced life expectancy, migration, and deterioration of mental health. Demographic indicators provide measurable evidence of long-term structural effects and enable the transition from qualitative assessments to quantitative analysis.

These processes generate substantial economic consequences, including contraction of the labor force, declining productivity, increased fiscal pressure, structural reorientation toward military needs, and reduced investment attractiveness. Human rights violations therefore function not only as humanitarian problems but also as drivers of macroeconomic destabilization.

6.4. Role of International Organizations

The Ukrainian case highlights both the importance and the limitations of international organizations. Humanitarian assistance, monitoring, and support for displaced populations remain significant; however, institutional responses are often delayed, fragmented, and insufficiently preventive.

This confirms the predominance of reactive approaches within the contemporary global governance system.

6.5. Ukraine as a Methodological Prototype

Beyond its national context, Ukraine provides a basis for developing a replicable analytical model for studying systemic human rights violations. Its significance lies in the integration of legal, demographic, economic, and institutional dimensions, as well as in identifying causal relationships and feedback mechanisms applicable to other conflict zones.

6.6. Policy and Institutional Implications for Ukraine

The proposed analytical framework has direct implications for national governance and human rights policy in Ukraine. Under conditions of continuing security challenges, the transition from reactive responses to preventive governance becomes particularly important.

Priority areas include the institutionalization of early-warning systems, integration of demographic indicators into strategic planning, development of interagency coordination mechanisms, and strengthening cooperation with international organizations and analytical platforms.

Special importance should be attached to the development of digital and analytical capacities, including the use of big data, artificial intelligence, and geospatial analysis for monitoring and forecasting systemic risks.

The implementation of preventive governance also requires broader institutional cooperation involving research institutions, think tanks, and non-state actors capable of contributing analytical expertise and innovative approaches.

6.7. Interim Conclusion

The Ukrainian case demonstrates that systemic human rights violations generate interconnected demographic, economic, and institutional consequences extending far beyond the legal sphere.

At the same time, Ukraine serves not only as a case of crisis, but also as a methodological prototype illustrating how systemic analysis of human rights violations can support both global institutional design and practical policy transformation within national governance systems.

7. Institutional mechanisms for the prevention of systemic human rights violations

The analysis conducted demonstrates that the contemporary global system remains predominantly reactive. Under these conditions, the key institutional challenge is the transition toward preventive governance based on early identification of systemic risks, continuous monitoring, and coordinated preventive responses.

Global Early Warning System

A central element of the proposed framework is the establishment of a Global Early Warning System (GEWS) for systemic human rights violations. Its functions should include the identification of high-risk regions, monitoring of key indicators, detection of escalation signals, and forecasting of risk scenarios.

The system should integrate legal, demographic, economic, and environmental data using predictive analytics and digital monitoring tools, transforming fragmented information into actionable knowledge.

Integrated Analytical and Governance Mechanisms

Preventive governance requires integrated analytical platforms uniting international organizations, academic institutions, and research centers. Such platforms would support interdisciplinary analysis, real-time data exchange, and coordinated strategic planning.

A key innovation is the institutionalization of a continuous analytical cycle:

data → analysis → forecasting → decision-making

This conceptual model enables the transition from delayed crisis response to adaptive and evidence-based governance.

Within this architecture, the proposed World Council for the Prevention of Human Rights Violations would function as a coordination and analytical mechanism responsible for risk assessment, integration of analytical outputs, and coordination of preventive actions in cooperation with the UN General Assembly and international organizations.

Technological and Institutional Dimensions

Modern preventive systems increasingly rely on big data analytics, artificial intelligence, geospatial monitoring, and digital platforms capable of supporting real-time analysis and forecasting.

At the same time, effective implementation requires concentration of intellectual, financial, and organizational resources, as well as stronger coordination between global, regional, and national levels of governance.

Non-state actors and analytical organizations, including IHRC, may contribute through methodological development, research cooperation, and participation in global analytical initiatives.

Interim Conclusion

The transition toward preventive governance requires integrated institutional structures, interdisciplinary cooperation, advanced analytical systems, and coordinated political action. Without such transformation, the global human rights system will remain fragmented, reactive, and insufficiently effective.

8. Conclusions

The conducted analysis allows drawing the following conclusions.

1. The contemporary global human rights system has entered a stage of structural inadequacy, as its institutional configuration no longer corresponds to the complexity and dynamics of contemporary global risks. This limits the capacity of international institutions to respond effectively to systemic violations.
2. Despite significant normative achievements, the United Nations-centered architecture remains constrained by fragmentation, political conditionality, and institutional inertia, reducing its preventive effectiveness.
3. Human rights violations should be understood as systemic structural phenomena embedded in broader demographic, economic, and institutional processes. Their cumulative effects extend far beyond the legal sphere and directly affect long-term societal stability.
4. The study substantiates a multi-level analytical model linking human rights violations with demographic degradation and economic destabilization. This framework explains how localized violations evolve into systemic macro-level risks.
5. Systemic human rights violations function not only as consequences of instability, but also as drivers of structural transformation weakening institutional resilience and sustainable development.
6. The persistence of a reactive paradigm remains a major limitation of global governance. Delayed responses and fragmented actions transform the system into a mechanism of crisis management rather than prevention.
7. A fundamental problem lies in the mismatch between contemporary global risks and the institutional design of international organizations. This reduces adaptability and limits effective responses to rapidly evolving threats.

8. The political economy of inaction contributes to selective and inconsistent international responses, undermining the universality and credibility of the global human rights system.

9. Monitoring should not be equated with prevention. Without mechanisms capable of transforming analytical information into timely action, monitoring alone remains insufficient.

10. Preventive governance requires the integration of data collection, analysis, forecasting, and decision-making into a continuous institutional cycle supported by interdisciplinary and evidence-based approaches.

11. Global early-warning systems constitute an essential instrument for identifying systemic risks, coordinating preventive responses, and strengthening multi-level governance capacity.

12. Institutional innovation and integrated analytical platforms are necessary for bridging the gap between analysis and action and improving the coherence of preventive strategies.

13. Non-state actors, including organizations such as the International Human Rights Commission (IHRC), may contribute to the development of preventive governance through analytical cooperation, knowledge exchange, and methodological support.

14. The case of Ukraine confirms that systemic human rights violations generate measurable demographic and economic consequences and demonstrates the practical applicability of the proposed analytical framework.

15. The proposed model has important policy implications for national governance systems, including the development of early-warning mechanisms, interagency coordination, and data-driven decision-making aimed at strengthening national resilience.

16. The future effectiveness of human rights protection depends on the ability of international and national institutions to adopt integrated, preventive, and analytically grounded governance models adapted to the challenges of the twenty-first century.

REFERENCES

Bibliography

Authored books

1. Arrighi G, *The long twentieth century: money, power and the origins of our times* (Verso 1994).
2. Grotius H, *De jure belli ac pacis* (1625).
3. Kant I, *Perpetual peace: A philosophical sketch* (1795).
4. Keohane R O, *After hegemony: cooperation and discord in the world political economy* (Princeton University Press 1984) <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7sq9s>.
5. Keohane R O, Nye J S, *Power and interdependence: world politics in transition* (Little, Brown 1977).
6. Krasner S D, *Sovereignty: organized hypocrisy* (Princeton University Press 1999) <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7s9d5>.

7. Locke J, *Two treatises of government* (Awnsham Churchill 1689).
8. Mearsheimer J J, *The tragedy of great power politics* (W.W. Norton & Company 2001).
9. Wallerstein I, *The modern world-system* (Academic Press 1974).
10. Shapoval V, *Osnovy konstytutsionalizmu* (narysy z istorii, teorii i praktyky) (Myshalov D. V. 2021) (in Ukrainian).

Edited books

11. *Parlamentaryzm ta zakonotvorennia: vybrani leksii* (O Kopylenko ta in. (uporiad), In-t zakonodavstva Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy 2017) (in Ukrainian).
12. Shemshuchenko Yu (red), *Suchasnyi unitaryzm: doktryna i praktyka* (Iurydychna dumka 2021) (in Ukrainian).
13. Ustymenko V (red), *Harantii dotrymannya sotsialno-ekonomichnykh ta ekolohichnykh prav liudyny v umovakh viyny ta povoiennoi transformatsii* (DU “IEPD imeni V. K. Mamutova NAN Ukrainy” 2024) (in Ukrainian).

Journal articles

14. Collier P, Hoeffler A, ‘Greed and grievance in civil war’ Oxford Economic Papers [2004] 56(4) 563–595 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oep/gpf064>.
15. Fearon J D, ‘Rationalist explanations for war’ [1995] 49(3) International Organization 379–414 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300033324>.
16. Moravcsik A, ‘Taking preferences seriously: a liberal theory of international politics’ [1997] 51(4) International Organization 513–553 <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081897550447>.
17. Mamutov V, ‘V osnovi derzhavnoho suverenitetu – suverenitet ekonomichnyi’ [2011] 6 Visnyk Natsionalnoi akademii nauk Ukrainy 7–8 (in Ukrainian).

Ігор Манцуров, Рафаль Марчін Васік, Ірина Столєтова

ЗАПОБІГАННЯ СИСТЕМНИМ ПОРУШЕННЯМ ПРАВ ЛЮДИНИ: МЕХАНІЗМИ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЇ ОБ’ЄДНАНИХ НАЦІЙ І МІЖНАРОДНИХ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙ

АНОТАЦІЯ. У статті здійснено критичний аналіз інституційної та функціональної спроможності Організації Об’єднаних Націй і міжнародних організацій щодо запобігання системним порушенням прав людини в умовах зростаючої глобальної нестабільності, збройних конфліктів, гібридних загроз та масштабних соціально-економічних трансформацій. Обґрунтовується, що сучасні порушення прав людини слід розглядати не як ізольовані юридичні випадки, а як системні та взаємозв’язані явища, що породжують кумулятивні демографічні, економічні, інституційні та гуманітарні наслідки.

Особливу увагу приділено механізмам взаємодії між Організацією Об’єднаних Націй, її спеціалізованими установами, міжнародними організаціями та новими недержавними акторами в межах глобального превентивного управління. У статті визначено ключові обмеження сучасної міжнародної архітектури захисту прав людини, зокрема фрагментарність, інституційну інерцію, слабкість координаційних механізмів, політичну асиметрію та домінування реактивних підходів над превентивними стратегіями.

У відповідь запропоновано системну аналітичну модель, яка пов’язує порушення прав людини з демографічною деградацією, економічною дестабілізацією та довгостроковими структурними ризиками. Обґрунтовано необхідність переходу до превентивного управління, заснованого на інтегрованих аналітичних системах, механізмах раннього попередження, міждисциплінарних підходах і скоординованих інституційних рішеннях як на глобальному, так і на національному рівнях.

Особливий акцент зроблено на ролі секторальної взаємодії в системі ООН, включаючи внесок спеціалізованих установ і міжнародних організацій у розвиток превентивних ме-

ханізмів та моделей управління, заснованих на аналізі даних. Кейс України розглядається як емпіричний приклад, що демонструє системний характер сучасних порушень прав людини та практичну застосовність запропонованого підходу.

Також у статті висвітлено зростаючу роль інституційних інновацій і нових акторів, зокрема Міжнародної комісії з прав людини (IHRC), у посиленні аналітичного та превентивного потенціалу систем глобального управління.

Ключові слова: права людини; Організація Об'єднаних Націй; системні порушення прав людини; превентивне управління; міжнародні організації; системи раннього попередження; глобальне управління; Україна; Міжнародна комісія з прав людини (IHRC).