

ISSUES AND PROSPECTS OF THE HUMAN RIGHT TO OWN SAFETY IMPLEMENTATION IN TIMES OF THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Oksana Myronets¹, Olena Makeieva¹, Oleksandr Skutelnik², Irena Balzhyk³,
and Serhii Skurikhin³

*¹National Aviation University, ²European University, Kyiv, and ³National
University “Odesa Law Academy”*

Abstract. The investigation’s topicality is dictated by the necessity of conducting scientific study on the understanding and issues of the human right to own safety in modern times to suggest noteworthy directions for the further development and improvement of the mentioned legal possibility implementation in the context of global challenges, war reality, post-pandemic development of the world. The purpose of the paper is to find out current issues and prospects of the human right to own safety in times of the new world order. Special-legal and general-scientific cognition methods have been used. By employing the dialectical method, theoretical background and current issues of the human right to own safety were investigated and the modern obstacles concerning this issue have been underlined. Comparative and formal-legal methods enabled us to suggest directions of the human right to own safety in modern times under the digitalization, global changes, and different social transformations under the cyber technological development of post-pandemic reality. The paper concluded that under the whole world policy concerning the human right to own safety implementation needs the transformation of the global safety concept. Being multi-directional, it includes economic, legal, social, ecological, information, military, and ideological elements that need to be transformed in times of the new world order to ensure safety for every person and the whole planet.

Keywords: Freedom of speech and information, safety of journalists, international humanitarian law, protection of civilians, new order, the role of the media in wartime.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3176/tr.2025.2.03>

Received 24 January 2025, accepted 21 March 2025, printed and available online 10 June 2025

© 2025 Authors. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License CC BY 4.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

1. Introduction

Being complicated and unpredictable due to its conflictual nonregulation, modern reality continues to require artificial security measures concerning mankind as a whole and every singular person. Post-pandemic circumstances associated with diverse countries' measures of military content dictate their own vision of safety conditions. As a complex category, it includes differently directed activities of various natures to ensure a state of being sure and calm or, in other words, being protected in the current environment. This one includes not only military measures that depend on weapons of different kinds and modernity, but political, economic, and legal as well. Only a prudent, financially supported, and ideologically accepted approach with an integral use of the above-mentioned can create an appropriate area for the state of safety in a country and making its further development possible. Furthermore, only under the strict implementation of the above-mentioned, a state as a political organization of the whole society on a certain territory, can support a sufficient safety level for every human within its boundaries. It makes it possible to implement human rights and freedoms appropriately and protect personal interests and juridically determined and supported possibilities as well. Thus, so-called human rights effectiveness is a matter of safety, much more than can be seen at first sight. With this connection, it is quite logical to acknowledge that moralizing, emotionalizing, legalizing, and politicizing episodes of mass violence are never helpful for a better understanding (Üngör 2024).

Also, it became quite visible considering the ongoing war in Ukraine, associated with many victims and huge losses in general. Russia launched a four-pronged invasion on Ukraine early on February 24, 2022, using approximately 150,000 men supported by armor, missiles, drones, artillery, and aircraft. While the international media reported that Russia had 'invaded' Ukraine, Ukrainians and those who support them emphasized that the invasion had actually started eight years prior, in 2014, when Russia took control of Crimea and launched an attack on the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts, resulting in over 13,000 fatalities (D'Anieri 2023). Life in Ukraine has been severely affected since Russia invaded on February 24, 2022. While some individuals have remained in their communities to volunteer in various roles, millions of citizens have been uprooted and fled for safety to the country's westernmost regions or overseas as refugees. As a result, people's only way of existing in the war-torn reality of Ukraine is to survive, but in different ways (Howlett 2023).

Although the war in Ukraine stands out, Ukraine was only 1 of 56 countries that experienced armed conflict in 2022 (SIPRI Yearbook 2023) at least six of which are in the Middle East (Libya, Yemen, Syria, Kurdistan, Palestine, Iraq) (Üngör 2024, SIPRI Yearbook 2023).

Parallel to this, and frequently without the intended results, international security assistance has grown to bolster the security sectors of allied countries. These changes indicate a shift away from 'liberal' initiatives, which have been around for decades. The official focus of these interventions has been on promoting democratic institutions, human rights, and the rule of law (Geis and Schröder 2024).

During a war, a pandemic, or a situation of emergency survival is understood as physical first of all. It is quite logical and natural for mankind. In this understanding,

for example, the latest pandemic COVID-19 became visible evidence of an uncontrollable threat to personal vital safety in the whole world. At the same time, wars, being local or almost planetary, always represent a tremendous danger to humans' natural existence and development. Actually, modern wars, including the so-called classical components such as infrastructure disruption, human losses, and torture, illegal property confiscation, the use of unforgivable weapons with the violation of laws and customs of war, which in general may be understood as martial crimes, are increasingly combined with technologies. We may only reasonably conclude that hybrid wars follow human reality as not only a way of conflict resolution but, unfortunately, a constant attribute of hidden passive-aggressive communication and supervision of some countries over others to be in some understanding prepared to continue a conflict resolution visibly with the involvement of weapons and soldiers. In such conditions, human safety is under a permanent threat and, in fact, perennially depends on the decision of some rulers or a group of them, which may be based on financial interests or mental issues. Furthermore, on the one hand, being unplanned in their greatest number of cases, natural catastrophes, and disasters remain to be an essential obstacle for mankind's survival even in modern times. On the other hand, the current reality reaction of the civilized world's community to the aggressive criminal activity of some countries demonstrates its dependence on the presence of nuclear weapons in the arsenal of war-initiative states. Moreover, in the twenty-first century 'staying in a position of looking for a balance' due to economic connections and benefits between developed and developing economies, appears to reveal real thinking to choose between economic-profitable and human-vital safety under the veiled concerns expressions. Being not only multicultural with the features of the transhumanistic direction of its development, but post-pandemic, still military in different localities, digitalized, and not stable by its nature, the modern reality may be characterized as a new world's order. Unfortunately, current conditions of many years of wars in different parts of our planet, despite a large number of different human rights global and local organizations and institutions, a wide range of international and regional acts on the protection of human rights, the issue of the lack of a guaranteed mechanism for the protection of human rights, including the right to safety as one of the main ones, have been revealed. It needs its comprehensive main issues analysis to suggest some directions in the existing problem-solving.

Thus, the purpose of the article is to determine current issues and prospects of the protection of the human right to safety in times of the new world's order. To achieve this aim, the following tasks are necessary: 1) to consider theoretical-legal fundamentals of the human right to safety under the new world's order; 2) to analyze the current state, issues, and challenges for the protection of the human right to safety in times of the new world order; 3) to investigate particularities and suggest prospects of the protection of the human right to safety in times of the new reality.

The tasks mentioned investigate the subject of the article, i.e. the protection of the human right to safety in times of the new world order, taking into account the legally regulated relations and activity in the sphere of the human right to own safety protection.

2. Methodology

To achieve the aim of the paper, general-scientific and special-legal methods of cognition have been used. By using the dialectical method, theoretical background and current issues of the protection of human rights to safety in times of the new world order have been investigated and the modern challenges concerning this issue have been outlined.

The use of theoretical general scientific methods of abstraction and generalization represented the authors' vision of the new world order as a modern post-pandemic, global but with increasing localization reality, followed by pandemic consequences, multi-year and relatively new military localizations, continuous digitalization with the features of planned totality and gradual implementation of transhumanistic ideas.

Deductive thinking concerning the nature and functionality of the new world order generalized the vision of differently directed challenges for the implementation and protection of human rights to own safety.

Functional analysis of the new world order predisposed that its differently directed changes and related consequences are not always regulated and protected by the law, and problems associated with this are waiting for reasonable solutions from the legislative bodies.

The deep analysis of a category of 'safety' revealed it as a crucial requirement for the current times concerning ensuring an appropriate safety level for every human as well as a whole of mankind to survive under the constantly changing conditions on our planet and forms of human interaction. Comparison of 'safety' and 'security' as synonymous was the way to find that their interpretation may differ according to the context and, thus, be a reason for the misunderstanding at the level of scientific discussions and even legislation.

The formal-dogmatic method contributed to the development of the authors' explanation of the protection of the human right to safety in times of the new world order a state of being under protection in receiving, holding, and implementing human rights. A theoretical analysis of the content and roles of its managerial and oriented-based components synthesized the requirement of their interrelated dialogue at the level of state authoritative bodies with the further developmental state policies, as well as efficient conscious involvement of civil society institutions and humans in this process.

Scientific functional investigation of the interconnection between the implementation of the right of humans to own dignity and the human right to own safety revealed that the practical realization of the second ensures a stable level of dignified living for every social member and society.

The use of functional analysis, system approach and general scientific methods of synthesis and generalization were used to formulate and represent the authors' understanding of a human right to own safety under the new world order as a complex concept combining economic, juridical, social, information, ecological, military, and ideological safety in a country and in the framework of which person's safety right is implemented.

Systems thinking over the human right to own safety with the aim of its deeper scientific understanding as a complicated phenomenon enabled to define and analyze economic, juridical, social information, ecological, military, and ideological challenges concerning the researched category.

The set of general theoretical scientific methods, paying the greatest attention to deduction, abstraction, and generalization, associated with the functional analysis and system approach allowed suggestion of economic, legal, social, ecological, information, military, and ideological directions of the multi-directional world policy concerning the human right to own safety implementation, which need to be transformed within the change of the global safety concept.

3. Results

3.1. Theoretical-legal fundamentals of the human right to safety under the new world order

Outside reality and internal needs have always dictated mankind's style of living, thinking, and activity. Executing its value-oriental function with the use of ideological-forming informational mechanisms, law is to be flexible under different conditions. Only if current juridical regulators are in line with the needs of legal relations participants and requirements of the existing system of their activity may ensure safety for the first and the second ones. Thus, safety as a state of being protected is significant for both sides and is predisposed by their real behavior and its consequences. At the same time, even with the good intention of the mentioned parties in conditions of challenges and instability, the state of being safe may be under question. We mean that only the combination of the internal and external components mentioned can represent a healthy and productive environment for stable safety and its increase in every society. Furthermore, state administrators' policy as competent managers with their ruling prevailing directions on civil societies. Further promotion and support have to be read to offer an updated vision for the countries' development and update in changing conditions. With this connection, we could underline that today's global processes associated with post-pandemic consequences, multi-year and relatively new military localizations, continuous digitalization with the features of planned totality and gradual implementation of transhumanistic ideas, etc. are already pictured as a renewed style of procedural functioning on our planet in different areas of mankind's life. Due to the mentioned above, we consider that the existing reality can already be defined as a new world order. A new world order appears to be emerging (Rees 2023). Accordingly, being a crucial requirement for the current times a category of 'safety' deserves its deeper analysis concerning ensuring an appropriate safety level for every human as well as a whole of mankind to survive under the changing conditions on our planet and forms of human interaction.

Worldwide use of safety, security, or protection categories has become normal for our daily life and professional communication. Moreover, legal language is firmly connected to the mentioned terminological units on national, regional, and

international levels. At the same time, being used as synonymous the mentioned notions may differ according to the context and, thus, be a reason for the misunderstanding at the level of scientific discussions and even legislation.

Security is a difficult concept to define. There have been many theoretical and epistemological efforts to construct a general idea of what security can be; however, there is no univocal definition of the concept (Arbeláez Villegas 2023). There is a special differentiation of this term being used in various areas of human activity. For example, talking about safety and security in aviation, Wift H. highlights that differing definitions of safety and security were published by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) in their annexes to the Chicago Convention, which is why the two realms have historically been kept apart. According to these documents, safety is defined as “The state in which risks associated with aviation activities, related to, or in direct support of the operation of aircraft, are reduced and controlled to an acceptable level,” and security as “Safeguarding civil aviation against acts of unlawful interference”. While airports and law enforcement agencies handle security, personnel, protocols, and equipment are regarded to be the main factors affecting safety, particularly in the case of air operators and providers of air navigation services (Wipf 2020).

This reveals just one case where the mentioned categories represent some significant difference within the specificity of the aviation sphere. Thus, a variety of human activity areas due to their attributive features may always have some influence on the understanding of the categories mentioned. Paying attention, for example, only to the existing difference between aviation safety and aviation security, we may conclude that the mentioned may be determinative in the scope of cases. Another example is represented by the manifestations and influences of safety and security rhetoric in the enactment and review of national security laws to advance and justify new national security laws (Garne 2023: 231).

Spheres of term usage always must be taken into account in the interpreting and, thus, a common understanding of this or that term. In our point of view, the human safety right should be understood as a state of being under protection in receiving, holding, and implementing human rights. The state mentioned is two-componential due to its nature. The first may be defined as an outside element or managerial and is related to the state of a country in the mining of its administrative bodies which are to provide differently directed service to a society. The second one, accordingly, may be determined as inside or oriented-based and relates to a level of personal consciousness and culture to make socially acceptable choices while making decisions.

The first component must be human centered to be effective in the implementation of a human right to own safety. As we may prudently admit, only a democratic form of state political regime can provide an approach in the state ruling, where a citizen, a foreigner as this country visitor, or even a person without citizenship may be a central figure of state activity. Otherwise, we may get a state-power centered model that is traditional for undemocratic political regimes. Thus, humans of any type of legal connection, including, own citizens are understood as power-supportive elements whose rights are not protected and there is no real human right

to own safety protection as well. At the same time, the second component must be the essence of civil society to be self-motivated enough for its development and its country's prosperity.

In our point of view, only under their interrelated cooperation is a dialogue at the level of state authoritative bodies with further appropriate state policies producing and introduction possible, as well as efficient conscious involvement of people and civil society institutions in the mentioned process.

3.2. Role and significance of the human right to own safety and its connection with a human right to own dignity

In human rights protection, a human right to own safety implementation has a key significance. Analyzing the scope of human rights represented by worldwide, regional, or national systems and determined by corresponding international, regional, and national legal documents, we may conclude that two of them represent a core of the whole general system in this issue. The first one is represented by a human right to own safety and the second is a human right to own dignity. In our point of view, others are their different variational expressions.

Dignity continues to be a central concept in political and moral philosophy (Perry 2023). According to societal conceptions, human dignity is a privilege that entitles its bearer to specific considerate treatment that is not available to those who lack it (Ilesanmi 2023). The level of dignity according to living entities is contingent upon their evolutionary hierarchy (Gluchman 2017). Human dignity is a naturalistic idea that considers some characteristics to be innate to human nature (Ilesanmi 2023). As Valentini prudently stipulates, human rights are frequently described as privileges that people have merely because of their intrinsic worth (Valentini 2017). A more comprehensive explanation of the idea of dignity can be found in an emancipatory theory of dignity, which draws from social movements and grassroots human rights activism from a variety of historical eras, cultural contexts, and political settings. (Ilesanmi 2023). The idea of dignity is used to characterize the whole of the traits and attributes that make someone or something deserving of respect and admiration. Life is the fundamental value that makes up the right to be treated with dignity. Since humans are the ultimate living form, they are entitled to the highest standards of dignity (Gluchman 2017). Reconceptualizing the relationship between human rights and dignity, Valentini claims that rather than focusing on the intrinsic dignity of all people, human rights establish guidelines for upholding the status dignity of those under sovereign authority (Valentini 2017).

We think that the right of humans to own dignity implementation may be connected with the human right to own safety implementation if we understand the second as the possible form of the first concept expression. In such a case, an implemented human right to safety is an ordinary state of dignified human existence. Thus, we may suggest that the role of safety as a human right is not only significant but is inside the core of the implementation of human dignity. Accordingly, the implementation of the right to human safety ensures a stable level of dignified living in a society for every member and society as a whole.

3.3. Current issues and challenges for the human right to own safety in times of the new world order

Modern issues and challenges concerning the human right to own safety are differently directed due to their origin and development in times of the so-called new order in the world. A new ‘world order’, a notion that originated with the idea of an institutionalization of international relations that developed at the beginning of the 17th century, is emerging. In our point of view, the current reality as post-pandemic, transhumanistic, with the characteristics of war in different, still global but with increasing glocalization already represents a specific order that is a new one.

The two major shocks constituted by the COVID-19 pandemic and the international crisis that has unfolded since the start of the conflict in Ukraine have put an end to the old ‘world order’. War did not have to happen, but competition and mistrust became deeply ingrained in both the Ukraine–Russia and West–Russia relationships, and those two conflicts had become tightly connected (D’Anieri 2023). The Russian war against Ukraine will speed up the decline of the liberal peacebuilding paradigm (Geis and Schröder 2024). This could allow a new social contract to emerge in many countries.

Moreover, the above-mentioned is additionally characterized by gradual, but total in its intention digitalization. The ‘digital age’ has brought about numerous advancements, yet it has also introduced complex challenges into modern life (Stovpets et al. 2023). Acharya, Estevadeordal, and Goodman offer a novel definition of the world order and pinpoint four essential components of its multiplexity: 1) It is predicated on the ability to interact; 2) Interdependence extends far beyond economic issues to encompass connections in the areas of the environment, sustainable development, governance, security, and connectivity; 3) Leadership is issue-specific; and 4) There are clusters of international cooperation that transcend both global-level collaboration and purely regional interactions based on geography (Acharya et al. 2023). These developments point to the fact that alternatives to the liberal internationalism narrative, which was once hegemonic and focused on democratization, human rights, market economies, and international institutions that promoted corresponding norms and practices, are beginning to emerge (Geis and Schröder 2024). Thus, we insist that the new world order represents differently directed challenges for the implementation and protection of human rights to own safety. In this regard, we support the position that challenges human rights protection in general and a human right to own safety in particular depend on calls to human rights implementation under the latter-day circumstances.

However, three main factors combined to ensure that Ukraine’s status remained unresolved: the inability to balance the various actors’ perceptions of the status quo and the ensuing security needs; the conflict between Russia’s views of its ‘sphere of interest’ and the spread of Western democratic institutions; and the domestic costs of adopting conciliatory policies (D’Anieri 2023). Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has exposed another fault line in America’s global influence, as traditional allies of the US failed to support sanctions imposed by Washington (Rees 2023). The world leaders seem to have been too focused on using the lessons learnt from the last war to

stop the current one to see that the renewed armaments race not only created World War II but also failed to stop a third world war (Geronik 2024).

We are more than sure that the state of the planetary transformation mentioned still requires analysis and awareness to be understood and defined both scientifically and legally. Thus, a new reality of the mentioned process represents issues for countries and different subjects of social-legal relations, where countries may even take more suppressive positions that may be challenging for democracies.

Considering the above, in our view, the directions of challenges concerning the human right to own safety may be represented as economic, juridical, social, information, ecological, military, and ideological. For example, the first direction is associated with economic calls that will represent the world's economic transformation. With this regard, it can be admitted that on the one hand, hawkish US policy towards China over trade and security shows no signs of softening, suggesting that the two superpowers will continue to decouple in the years ahead as they compete to be the world's number one economy (Rees 2023). On the other hand, talks concerning the so-called digital economy are increasing. Thus, economic sustainable development has been the subject of hot debate, and digital economy and factor allocation are important variables for sustainable economic development (Wu et al. 2024). The digital economy is the future of our planet. At the same time, being ordinary and socially acceptable for developed countries, this way seems to be challenging for developing states. There are a lot of problems followed by hunger, instability, and human rights violations there. Also, even in the 21st century, those countries have an insecurity concerning social policy and protection.

Societies all over the world are concerned about the possibility of World War III. Thus, on the one hand, there is a gradual increase in medical and social support for people. However, in order to attain the same level of living and participation chances as their peers without disabilities, individuals with disabilities need to make greater financial contributions. Their degree of well-being is being overstated if these are not taken into consideration. Programs for social protection must take these expenses into account to be comprehensive. Merely approximating the mean expenses incurred by individuals with impairments is inadequate for the development of social security schemes (Mont 2023). Furthermore, if the threat of violence grows under the new global order, military spending is certain to rise. Russia has already invaded Ukraine, and it seems unlikely that the ongoing US-China tensions over Taiwan will go away (Rees 2023).

The above-mentioned reveals the absence of specific required state policies in developing countries associated with the absence of appropriate funding for them. It is also followed by issues in education and educative activities. At the same time, the new world reality that includes military conflicts in different parts of our planet represents additional issues for the training of children. For example, analyzing education safety of teacher-students social groups during the ongoing war in Ukraine, the most frequent psychological issues with online learning were related to internal issues like stress during bombing, anxiety, worries about relatives in the occupied territory, depression, burnout, psychological exhaustion, sadness, frustration, and the

loss of a loved one, as well as external ones like constant shelling and air alarms. The two biggest technological challenges during a conflict were blackouts and the absence of Internet (Sytnykova et al. 2024).

These days, it is impossible to discuss issues of human life, individual rights, and information rights in an abstract way without considering how the newest digital technologies – including artificial intelligence – are developing. The swift digitization and adoption of all-encompassing cybertechnologies are closely linked to the conversation surrounding human rights (Stovpets 2023). The future of data or cyber security depends on biometrics. In the upcoming years, deep fakes and other new technological tools will be used to abuse the human target (Khan et al 2023). Thus, information safety is changing now and will require intensive legislative attention in times of the new world order. Moreover, differently directed changes of current reality are not always regulated and protected by the law. For example, the legal status of people with integrated implants is still lacking in intensive scientific debates and juridical offers concerning the issue. However, the quantity of such people is increasing, and being associated with technological decisions over the problem is waiting for reasonable solutions from the side of legislative bodies.

One more challenge is represented by ecological damage after the war and military conflicts on our planet. For instance, Russia's war on Ukraine has had catastrophic effects on both the natural and constructed environments, in addition to the high human costs. The conservation and preservation of the natural environment must be taken into consideration when implementing wartime tactics and means, according to international law (Hryhorczuk et al. 2024).

Ideological challenges of the changes in order on our planet, unfortunately, are not always associated with the democratization of moral and religious views. In our time, we witness a true proliferation of rights. There is no conflict or human problem that does not lead to a debate about the rights we have and whose protection we demand. Such a scenario gives rise to the emergence of multiple challenges for a theory of human rights (García 2023).

Everything mentioned above predisposed challenges for the human right to own safety implementation because a state of safety may be reached only if there are answers to the questions mentioned.

4. Discussion

The prospects of the discussed issue concerning the human right to own safety in conditions of the new world's order are based on the above-mentioned challenges.

The nature of world order is in transition, and we need to update our conceptual frameworks for understanding the capacities of leading powers and other state and non-state entities to provide regional and global public goods (Acharya et al. 2023).

We suppose that modern reality is in the process of gradual representation of the possible solutions to the revealed calls in different spheres of current reality. In our point of view, in times of the new world order, a human right to own safety may be

understood as a complex concept combining economic, juridical, social, information, ecological, military, and ideological safety in a country and in the framework of which a person's safety right is implemented.

As Rees predicts, the emergence of a new world order is likely to lead to a reorganization of GVCs... However, the new world order could be negative for the global economy (Rees 2023). Thus, the level of human safety in the economy will depend on prudent steps of the whole world to make balanced economic growth on the planet and modern law must play its role in supporting this process by relevant legislation. As the economy is fundamental to every country's functionality, in times of the new world order economic safety implementation is the core of the human right to own safety implementation. Thus, it is essential to develop economies being updated to new standards and requirements.

Modern juridical science must be prepared to give the answer to new calls and support international research discussions in times of the new order. Current legislative activity has to be ready to produce efficient juridical regulations as a response to the new challenges. At the same time, practitioners in the juridical sphere must be flexible to accept a new type of activity or its specifics. Pragmatic adjustments to the institutions and procedures of legislative review must get special attention and priority. Reforms must realistically address the methods used in the creation and evaluation of laws, as well as the exponential expansion of authority made possible by rhetoric about safety and security. Claims about safety and security need to be reframed to embrace the expansion and preservation of democratic institutions, customs, and culture (Carne 2023). Thus, juridical safety will be able to play its significant role as an element of the human right to safety implementation.

In our point of view, the law must be effective to support distance learning under the new order in the world. On the one hand, some people may be more flexible working and gaining higher education by attending online programs. On the other hand, non-resilient healthy, and disabled people may participate in the process of education under its online format as well. Distance learning being the only option during the COVID-19 period represented its positive consequences that should not be rejected.

Safety consciousness functions in a behavioral way to promote operational safety. We contend that people's awareness of potential safety threats and their ability to avoid them tells us whether they are better positioned to reduce accidents, or safety performance (Saleem and Malik 2022).

The value of internet schooling is undeniable during wartime conflicts. One way to address the pedagogical issues during the ongoing conflict in Ukraine is to have online classrooms using Zoom, Meet, a popular communications tool that connects teachers and students via chat, phone, video, and audio. Both the professors and the students were prepared for remote learning. This method is seen to be practical for learning theory and for obtaining assignments for online independent study (Sytnykova et al. 2024). Thus, we insist on the further development of distance learning programs to gain higher education due to its flexibility under different possible challenges of the new world order. Every student has to be psychologically

prepared to get an education by being self-motivated, and it should be associated with adequate technical support and skills. Life-long education and self-education with the accent of own differently directed safety must be the priority of modern times.

Furthermore, education must promote respective and adequate attitudes toward veterans and people injured in times of war, including their own reaction and communication with people who have a post-trauma syndrome. Special psychological training, programs, etc. must become a part of education at different levels in times of the new order on our planet. The whole social sphere has to be retransformed. It is impossible to dispute Mont's assertion that in order for social security programs to be inclusive, the additional expenses that individuals with disabilities face must be taken into consideration. Social protection programs need to be designed with the costs of disability in mind to effectively and sufficiently address such costs for households. Creating a portfolio of services that both target the expenses that individuals encounter and offer a financial reward to compensate for idiosyncratic costs is a natural method to do this. Common cash payments will most likely be sufficient to cover the residual once the key categories of disability costs are sorted (Mont 2023). Talking about future social protection, it is quite important to develop inclusive programs and transform the current reality for people with specific needs who may be represented by people with integrated implants.

Similar prospects we see for information education as the basis for the information security and safety of a human being in general. When human behavior is the source of vulnerability, information security-conscious care behavior reduces the likelihood of information breaches. Though many security breaches are caused by users' ignorance, carelessness, lack of knowledge, mischievousness, apathy, and resistance, the conscious part of users' behavior plays a crucial role. A key factor in changing information security behavior is awareness (Safa et al. 2015). People of all ages know very little about privacy protection and there is a serious lack of legal awareness. Therefore, for more people to be able to employ legal knowledge to defend themselves when they meet privacy infractions, it is vital to increase citizens' awareness of the law (Wang and Yue 2022). We anticipate several unquestionably positive effects of digitalization on human rights, including full digital inclusion, online freedom protection, digital literacy promotion, ethical and responsible technological innovation, and the establishment of strong legal frameworks that protect people's rights in the digital realm (Stovpets et al. 2023). Thus, the new world order requires the implementation of the right to information safety as an integral part of human safety right implementation.

Understanding and controlling technology's explosive potential and establishing responsible technological governance are the goals of any modern political system (Stovpets et al. 2023). People think that as time goes on, technology will change due to the country's gradually improving privacy protection laws, the growing popularity of privacy protection education, and the defense of private rights (Wang and Yue 2022). Determining how people, public and private institutions and social situations will interact with digitalization – which is clearly going to increase

considerably more – is the primary objective (Pūraitė 2020). On the one hand, we support the idea that a mindful approach to AI deployment could provide us better life standards, education, healthcare and longevity (Stovpets et al. 2023). On the other hand, we agree that the main challenge in the very near future for the European Union in general, its member states separately at national levels, and other states around the world is to refine the definitions of all human rights in the online context (Pūraitė 2020). It is admitted that there is no sense in talking about human rights and freedoms unless there are no safety protocols designed and some reasonable limitations for using AI-means and technologies until they are studied enough (Stovpets et al. 2023). It is imperative that sufficient regulations be strengthened to safeguard fundamental rights in digital spaces and, more importantly, that state intervention be balanced with calls for a reinterpretation of those rights. That would not only elevate the idea of human rights to a new plane, but it would also help state institutions, foster public confidence in the government, and unleash fresh potential in each person (Pūraitė 2020).

As a part of human safety, a similar approach must be implemented concerning ecological safety implementation. The necessity to look at the environmental effects of all armed conflicts and to put more effective measures in place to safeguard the environment throughout the war is highlighted by the recognition of the environmental consequences of this conflict (Hryhorczuk et al. 2024). Therefore, there are the following recommendations: (1) Integrate digital technology with corporate operations and environmental governance (2) Quicken the process of building market digitization. The foundation for the deep integration of digital and traditional factors will be laid by strengthening the development of the Internet, and digital infrastructures in the factor markets (Wu et al. 2024). The security benefits outweigh its performance (Galal et al. 2022). With this connection, Bowsher hopes that a situated, combative approach to knowledge-making charts one pathway by which human rights might successfully navigate the digital-authoritarian conjuncture (Bowsher 2024).

The whole world policy concerning the human right to own safety implementation needs the transformation of the global safety concept. Being multi-directional, it includes economic, legal, social, ecological, information, military, and ideological elements that need to be transformed in times of the new world's order to ensure safety for every person and the whole planet.

5. Conclusion

It has been proved that today's global processes associated with post-pandemic consequences, multi-year and relatively new military localizations, continuous digitalization with the features of planned totality and gradual implementation of transhumanistic ideas, etc. already picture a renewed style of procedural functioning on our planet in different areas of mankind's life. Hence, we consider that the existing reality may already be defined as a new world order. Accordingly, being a crucial

requirement for the current times a category of ‘safety’ deserves its deeper analysis concerning ensuring an appropriate safety level for every human as well as a whole of mankind to survive under the still changing conditions on our planet and forms of human interaction.

It was approved that the right of humans to own dignity implementation may be connected with the human right to own safety implementation if we understand the second as the possible form of the first concept expression. In such a case, an implemented human right to safety is an ordinary state of dignified human existence. Thus, it was suggested that the role of safety as a human right is not only significant but is inside the core of the implementation of human dignity. Accordingly, the implementation of the right to human safety ensures a stable level of dignified living in a society for every member and society as a whole.

It was defined that under the current conditions, a human right to own safety may be understood as a complex concept combining economic, juridical, social information, ecological, military, and ideological safety in a country and in the framework where a person’s safety right is implemented. Also, it was concluded that the whole world policy concerning the human right to own safety implementation needs the transformation of the global safety concept. Being multi-directional, it includes economic, legal, social, ecological, information, military, and ideological elements that need to be transformed in times of the new world order to ensure safety for every person and the whole planet.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Authors Contributions

Authors contributions are equal.

Availability of data and materials

Data will be available on request.

Funding

No funds, grants, or other support was received.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare they have no financial and competing interests.

Statement of human rights:

This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any authors.

Addresses:

Oksana Myronets

Faculty of Law

National Aviation University

03058, 1 Lubomyr Huzar Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine

Olena Makeieva

Department of Theory and History of State and Law
Faculty of Law
National Aviation University
03058, 1 Lubomyr Huzar Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine

Oleksandr Skutelnik

Private Higher Education Institution
European University
03115, 16B Akademik Vernads'ky Blvd., Kyiv, Ukraine

Irena Balzyk

Department of General Theory of Law and State
National University "Odesa Law Academy"
65009, 2 Akademichna Str., Odesa, Ukraine

Serhii Skurikhin (corresponding author)

Department of General Theory of Law and State
National University "Odesa Law Academy"
65009, 2 Akademichna Str., Odesa, Ukraine

E-mail: serhii.skurikhin@sci-academy.cc

References

- Acharya, A., A. Estevadeordal, and L. W. Goodman (2023) "Multipolar or multiplex? Interaction capacity, global cooperation and world order". *International Affairs* 99, 6, 2339–2365. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiaad242>
- Arbeláez Villegas, L. C. (2023) "The contradictory relationship between security and human rights". *Direccion de Investigacion Criminal e Interpol – DIJIN* 65, 2. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47741/17943108.484>
- Bowsher, J. (2024) "After truth, after shame ... after information politics? Rethinking the epistemologies of human rights in the digital-authoritarian conjuncture". *The International Journal of Human Rights* 28, 8-9, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2024.2315277>
- Carne, G. (2023) "The legal rhetoric of safety and security: improving national security law process, enactment and content by moderating its executive and legislative influence: the legal rhetoric of safety and security". *University of Western Australia Law Review* 50,1, 168–238.
- D'Anieri, P. (2019) "The sources of conflict over Ukraine". In *Ukraine and Russia: from civilized divorce to uncivil war*, 1–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- García, F. E. (2023) "Ideología y derechos humanos: lo común" [Ideology and human rights]. *Derechos y libertades: Revista de Filosofía del Derecho y derechos humanos*, 50, 2, 57–66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20318/dyl.2024.8230>
- Galal, H., M. Mannan, and A. Youssef (2022) "Blindfold: keeping private keys in PKIs and CDNs out of sight". *Computers and Security* 118, 102731. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2022.102731>

- Geis, A and U. Schröder (2024) “The Russian war against Ukraine and its implications for the future of liberal interventionism”. *Politics and Governance* 12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.7348>
- Geronik, A. (L.) (2024) “The Cold War in retrospect: a continuous international conflict or a world war?”. *Cogent Social Sciences* 10, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2300527>
- Gluchman, V. (2017) “Nature of dignity and human dignity”. *Human Affairs*, 27, 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humaff-2017-0012>
- Howlett, M. (2023) “Nation-building from (below) the grassroots: everyday nationalism in Ukraine’s bomb shelters”. *Nations and Nationalism* 29, 1, 63–69. DOI: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.12877>
- Hryhorczuk, D., B. S. Levy, M. Prodanchuk, O. Kravchuk, N. Bubalo, A. Hryhorczuk, and T. B. Erickson (2024) “The environmental health impacts of Russia’s war on Ukraine”. *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology* 19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12995-023-00398-y>
- Ilesanmi, S. O. (2023) “Religious ethics and the human dignity revolution”. *Journal of Religious Ethics* 51, 652–672. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jore.12465>
- Khan, H. U., M. Z. Malik, S. Nazir, and F. Khan (2023) “Utilizing bio metric system for enhancing cyber security in banking sector: a systematic analysis”. *IEEE Access* 11, 80181–80198. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2023.3298824>
- Mont, D. (2023) “Estimating the extra disability expenditures for the design of inclusive social protection policies”. *Frontiers in Rehabilitation Sciences*, 4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fresc.2023.1179213>
- Perry, M. W. (2023) “The dignitarian return”. *European Journal of Political Theory* 24, 2, 299–309. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/14748851231216878>
- Pūraitė, A., R. Adamonienė, and A. Žemeckė (2020) “Sustainable digitalization in public institutions: challenges for human rights”. *European Journal of Sustainable Development* 9, 3, 91. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2020.v9n3p91>
- Rees, D. (2023) “Regime shift: new world order will challenge globalization”. *Shroders*. Available online at <https://www.schroders.com/en-us/us/institutional/insights/regime-shift-new-world-order-will-challenge-globalisation/>. Accessed on 01.04.2025.
- Safa, N. S., M. Sookhak, R. Von Solms, S. Furnell, N. A. Ghani, and T. Herawan (2015) “Information security conscious care behaviour formation in organizations”. *Computers and Security* 53, 65–78. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2015.05.012>
- Saleem, F., M. I. Malik (2022) “Safety management and safety performance nexus: role of safety consciousness, safety climate, and responsible leadership”. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19, 20, 13686. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192013686>
- SIPRI Yearbook (2023) *Armaments, disarmament and international security*. Available online at <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/sipri-yearbook-2023-armaments-disarmament-and-international-security-summary>. Accessed on 01.04.2025.
- Stovpets, O., Y. Borinshtein, I. Yershova-Babenko, D. Kozobrodova, H. Madi, and O. Honcharova (2023) “Digital technologies and human rights: challenges and opportunities”. *Amazonia Investiga* 12, 72, 17–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.72.12.2>
- Sytnykova, Y., T. Petrenko, O. Bezkorovaina, and A. Ptushka (2024) “Challenges for universities to online technologies implementation in the conditions of war in Ukraine”. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools* 99, 193–208. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v99i1.5436>

- Üngör, U. Ü. (2024) “Screaming, silence, and mass violence in Israel/Palestine”. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 1–9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2024.2309709>
- Valentini, L. (2017) “Dignity and human rights: a reconceptualisation”. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 37, 4, 862–885. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqx011>
- Wang, Z. and Q. Yue (2022) “Privacy law protection based on the information security assurance algorithm”. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 1–11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/8006605>
- Wipf, H. (2020) “Safety versus security in aviation”. In C. Bieder and K. Pettersen Gould, eds. *The coupling of safety and security*. (SpringerBriefs in Applied Sciences and Technology.) Cham: Springer. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47229-0_4
- Wu, S., J. Tang, M. Li, and J. Xiao (2024) “Digital economy, binary factor mismatch and sustainable economic development of coastal areas in China”. *Heliyon* 10, 4, e26453. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e26453>