International Society

Tamar MKALAVISHVILI*

Abstract

The article focuses on explaining the importance of having the International Society. Main positive aspects are indicated with the citations of Scientifics. Modern International Society is the firstling of European International Society. It was found in the Europe state system and with the spread of European culture, juridical norms and rules, it gained the global dimension. Nowadays, International society is in the developing process, so my thesis suggests you the possible variations how the international society might be in future

Introduction

International Relations is a fascinating topic, because it concerns people and culture throughout the world. The scope and complexity of the interactions among these groups make International Relations a challenging subject to master. There is always more to study. Narrowly defined, the field of international Relations concerns the relationships among the world's governments. But these relationships cannot be understood in isolation. They are closely connected with other actors (such as International Organizations, multinational corporations and individuals); with other social structures and process (including economies, culture, and domestic politics). And with geographical and historical influences. These elements together power the central trend IR today – globalization. (Goldstein 2010. P3).

The Theory of International Society

The theory of international society is seen by its proponents alongside that of international system. The concept of system is the more essential and less problematic: it simply requires us to recognize outlines of interfaces between states as possessing a coherence which, at least in part, determines their actions and possibly those of others. Bull (write full name), whose account of the relationship of system and society is the most careful, recognizes the vague character of international

society by proclaiming it no more than an 'element' in the international system. At the same time, however, he very definitely writes as though it has a capacity for action, as when it acts in common to assure its goals, which seems to ascribe to it a greater degree of reality than that of a mere element in a system.

The theory of an international society is unusual, in a way that of a system is not, in that societies are usually demarcated in terms of social relations among individual human beings. International relations as a discipline has the overall problem, in its state-centeredness, treatment of states as actors akin to individuals, and neglect of the complex social relations, which bind individuals and states. Bull recognizes this in a discussion, rather curious to the sociological eye, of the similarities and differences between the self-regulating society of states (lacking a central political authority) and the primitive stateless societies described by anthropologists. Formally, such a comparison may be quite possible, but Bull ignores the substantive difficulties, which arise when we discuss a society composed of what are 'already' (i.e. as a result of 'domestic' characteristics not considered by international theorists) social institutions.

What is unreliable here is that the idea and terminology of international society only works providing that the isolation of international studies from hypothetical discourse with other

* M.A., International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia.
 E-mail: tmkalavishvili@ibsu.edu.ge

social sciences is sustained. Such an insulation cannot be justified in the name of a division of labor in the social sciences. Definitely, there is a case that states are a very unique and important kind of social institutions, the interactions among which are equally distinctive, and in this sense require a specific mode of understanding, which implies a discipline. There is no case which can be sustained, however, it can deny the common features between the state and other social institutions or the connections between state-civil society and state-state relations, in the general context of the world society. In this sense international relations must be theoretically integrated with the mainstream of the social sciences. Its concepts should be developed not just by analogy with other social sciences - as in Bull's discussion of a stateless society - but consistently with them. The substantive connections between the concepts of international relations and of other social sciences must be clear.

Hedley Bull's discussion of international society lays bare a crucial problem in the way he gives a particular meaning to society. By defining society in terms of a consensus between its members he gives a great deal of weight to its normative coherence. There are, of course, approaches in sociology and anthropology, normally described as functionalist, which have adopted precisely such an approach - although Bull hardly acknowledges the connection. These approaches are widely discredited, however, not just because they tended to underrate social conflict, but because they define society in terms of one of its dimensions - in terms of the discussion in, they define it in terms of social rather than system integration. Precisely, the same could be said of Bull.

From this discussion we can see that, even from a formal point of view, the distinction between system and society is suspect. Even if it were not - if we could accept the identification of society and consensus - there is still the question of the substantive (and terminological) relationship between international society and human society or societies in a wider sense. The terminological issue is not the most important, but it bears thinking about, since it is potentially confusing to talk of a society of states, when the most societies are understood to be composed of individual human beings. The substantive issue is more important: is international 'society' a sub-set of some kind of human society in some wider sense? Or is it self-sufficient, with no theoretically articulable relationship to the larger pattern of human relations?

Reading Bull, we are left with the feeling that the relationship by analogy may be as important as any substantive relationship. World society is acknowledged as a reference point, and together with world politics is accorded notional priority over the international. World society is, however, seen as something, which at best is just starting to come into existence; it does not exist in the way in which international society does. We see, therefore, that the priority of world society is purely nominal, since in any sense, which counts the society of states is quite obviously stronger, indeed has greater reality. This conception of world society betrays, however the same strong meaning of society, which we noted above: world society does not exist for Bull, because it lacks the coherent, shared values and framework of understanding, which to a degree at least, international society possesses. (Bull 2012, pp.13-14)

The international system of states may appear to be one of the most important, or at least the most developed system, which order global society; but it is not the only set of institutions to be increasingly organized on a global scale, for economic and cultural institutional networks also have global reach, and we can also talk about these as powerful systems within global society. It may even be the case that we can begin to talk about global society in terms of the development of common values and beliefs, and a common political culture, in which ideas of democracy and national status, for example, are widely diffused.

How are the concepts of global society and international society to be related? It is difficult to explore this issue clearly starting from the concepts supplied by Bull and his co-thinkers. First of all, if global society is defined in terms of a weak (social relationships), and international society in terms of a strong (common values, consensus) meaning of society, the relationship is logically complex. Secondly, there is a case for distinguishing between a society of human individuals and one of states. Thirdly, it is highly desirable that our conceptualization should assist in defining the transformation of relationships between the international and the global. At the very least, there is a case for a terminological adjustment, but this would seem merely to be an entailment of a substantive theoretical reformulation.

Taking into the consideration that strengthening the consolidation within the international society is strongly depended on the enlargement of democracy in the world together with above mentioned problems, it is necessary to point out here about the existence of anti-Western geopolitical blocks, which increases western democratic influence in the world. Among them we should mention as an example: Shanghai Cooperation Organization, which represents the alliance of People's Republic of China and Russian Federation, where together with those country members are the Central Asian Republics and observers from such countries as Iran India Pakistan. Other anti-western organization can be considered BRICS: Brazil, Russian, India, South Africa and China. This informal forum represents somehow the attempt of countries for the coordination activities to decrease the enlargement of Western influences in the world. Particularly, we can discuss here functioning of those institutions partly representing the problem for the increasing democracy and accordingly consolidation of international society, which very much depends on the consolidation of Western for extracting all types of disagreement, which exists for example between United states of America and European Partners and also with the some attempts to increase the public awareness in the different regions of the world related to the democracy, because only democracy and western values somehow should be the main guaranty of the consolidation of the international society and establishment peace in the different countries of the region.

It should be proposed that we have to distinguish between a society, its culture and institutions. Social relationships on a world scale constitute a society (weak sense). Within this global society, there is a global economic system, with not only world markets, but globally coordinated production. There are increasingly the elements of a global culture, including a political culture, but there are also very many segmentations corresponding to state, national, ethnic, religious, political, class, cultural and lifestyle divisions. Within this glob-

al society, too, there are numerous global institutions, among which the state system (international system) is pre-eminent, but not exclusively dominant, as well as many more locally based institutions.

From the point of view of global society, the development of what is called international society, is the development of the institutions and the institutional culture of the state system in the direction of greater coherence and consensus. Redefining international society in this way, we look at it as a development specific to the state system, but one, which reflects this system's role in global society. It is the product not only of developments within the system, but also of the system's with the structures, culture and other institutions of that society.

Viewed in this theoretical light, the development of what is called international society can no longer be seen in purely contingent relationship to the development of global society. Certainly there is no automatic, mechanical connection between globalization (in the sense of the extension and increasing integration of global society) and the integration of the state system, seen in terms of international society. The latter has its own dynamics, which do indeed need to be investigated empirically, both in themselves and in terms of their many and complex relationships to other manifestations of globalization. Developments in the state system must, however, be studied in the context of the entire picture of the development of world society, which does indeed have theoretical priority.

The idea of international society in the international theory and practice, can be the most wonderful one. The realization of this theory, mostly will be beneficial for the weak states, because their security in this case will be guaranteed.

Debates concerning International Society exists for a long time. Many people think that society is already formed and, they are members of it. Others consider that only some of the elements of International Society are indicated and the system is in the phase of becoming the International Society. The third group of experts claim that it is almost impossible to create such society, because system created by the sovereignty cannot become the society. According to them international society is a myth and these commandments and ideals like justice, freedom and equality and their concrete meaning can be found in the internal life of state and institutions. (Wight M. 1966, P.120).

History of the Development Thoughts about the International Society

The idea of International Society is strongly connected with the name Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), who is from Nederland's. It should be mentioned that, the world of Hugo Grotius created the idea concerning the International Relations, which is regulating the states relations about the members of this mentioned society. According to Hugo Grotius, potential solidarity exists in the members of International Society, and common economic, trade interests and diplomacy will bring them friendship relations. According to Hugo Grotius, people will have the common rules for habits and new laws will appear, which will regulate the relationship between states. If we

follow Hugo Grotius, war is foolishness and finally people will say no to war.

According to G. Evans and J. Newnham, in 40s the research of international relations gained the new dimension and directions. Many authors consider International Society as the friendship of sovereignty states, where the same rules are in action, but with no common government or state power (Nardin T. 1983, P.34).

As we see, it is just International System, where we see the order that's why we want to call it the International Society. We can conclude that society mandatory needs the existence International System. International Society should be germinated from the International System. According to H. Bull, without International System, it is almost impossible to have the international Society.

Modern International Society is the firstling of European International Society. It was found in the Europe state system and with the spread of European culture, juridical norms and rules, it gained the global dimension.

European International Society was developed in the middle century in Latin Christian world. This world was neither centralized nor isolated from other cultures or societies. It was the generator of novelty. It was a very long and complicated process to unite the non-European world into the new global society. At the end of XIX century it was clear that in the process of globalization United States of America and Japan had a leading role. This process had many problems and very often it resulted in bloody conflicts.

International Society is in the development process. Changes in balance of power, technology, and in the interests and priorities of human beings we can find the factors, which governs the development process of international society.

Types of International Society

How the modern international society will be developed? How will it be in future? E. Luard from Britain suggests us five possible versions of how society can be in future:

1. **Transnational Society** – In this kind of International Society, one tension of modern world – to weaken the meaning of state border- is more intensive. Nation- state, territorial state will lose its meaning. Transnational processes will be ruling in the world. At the same time terrorism can be developed, which will be a very complicated problem.

2. **International Society** – It will be different from the modern international society. This difference will be indicated in the fact that the role and power of international organization will be increased. International society can become like the world's ministry organs. Such kind of international society, can be the most peaceful society ever.

3. **Society of Influence Sphere** - In this kind of society leading powerful states can influence the world and international society, which can be developed in this direction. In this case, a distinct influential sphere will be outlined, where the

leading states will be dominated and will control the whole world.

4. **World composed with regions** - The process of regional integration can lead the government to concentrate on the level of regions (E.g. Continents), which means the strong weakness of government on the level of state and world. Every region will develop its own economy and political institutions and regions will not interfere in other regions businesses.

5. **The Society of Rich and Poor** - International Society is characterized with the tendency to formulate the Rich and Poor society. Which means that society will be distinguished according to their Economic development and level, not by the geography or ideology. World will be divided into three main economic classes, which will have the antagonist features. It will be very un-stable society, where the order will be established with the power of wealthy state.

Main Players of the International Society

While talking about the main players of the International Society, first of all states should be mentioned. States are the main actors in the International Relations and accordingly within the discussions about international society, it is important to mention about the gradual increase of the numbering of the states in the world. For example, if after the WW2 periods there were about 50 independent states in the world, because of the changes of the world political map, which were connected with the process of inter colonization, for example the number of the independent states increased and today there are 193 plenipotentiary members of the United Nations, which are the sovereign states and in this regards should be mentioned that state institutions, which are responsible for the foreign and internal policy of the states they represent the part of the international society, because on their functioning depends the international relations and accordingly the promotion of cooperation within the international society. (Nations, n.d.)With regard to the non-state actors it is necessary to point out about the International organization. We know that there are two main types of International Organizations: International Intergovernmental Organization and International Non-governmental Organizations. With regards to the International Intergovernmental Organizations their number today is about 240 and they have universal or regional character (Kegley C. S. Blanton. 2011. p. 138). For example, such organization as United Nations, is universal organization, which includes countries from the different regions of the world, but with regards to for example regional organization should be mentioned here about the European Union, about the African Union about the organization of American States ACI, CIS, etc. With regards to the International Non-Governmental Organizations their number according to the different experts is about 7 600 (Kegley. C. Blanton S. 2011. p. 138) and they also by this way play very important role in International Politics because they have such organizations as Freedom House or Green Peace or Red Cross and they have their influences in International Relations, so at the same time of course, the members of other non-state actors should be mentioned here about the nations of the different countries in the world according to the different experts, there are about 5000 (Neidze

V. 2004. P. 46) different nations and nationalities in the world and of course first of all international society itself incudes the different nations so at the same time taking into the consideration that the number of population in the world after the cold war period has been gradually increasing for about 80-85 million people per year (M. Zgenti, J. Kharitonashvili. 1999. p. 19) and all new people are automatically becoming the members of International Society. In General, we should say here that International Society represents the relationship between the different people and nations, as Nicholas Speakman American Specialists of International Relations and Geopolitics once mentioned, international relations represents the relationship among the different people from the different states. With regards to the issue, where the International Society will be developed, if we take into the consideration some negative and positive scenarios, one of the positive scenarios should be mentioned here about the gradual democratization of the International Society, which means the gradual increase in the number of the democratic states in the world, for example if during the World War II period there were only 13 democratic states, their number increased till 37 in last centuries, today according to the Freedom House there are about 90 democratic states in the world (Freedom House in the World. 2013). Furthermore, it is necessary to mention here about the process of Globalization, increasing the cooperation among the states and existence, for example the International Regimes, which regulate the relations among the nations, for example International Regime of an Antarctica, UN Convention of 1959, which regulates the cooperation of the states over the Antarctica, which is recognized as the neutral continent, free from the nuclear technologies, etc. or for example some nuclear regimes, which exist in the world in the different regions. Furthermore, here should be mentioned about the different International Conventions, which regulate the cooperation among the nations as the different fields, for example the field of Human Rights, one of the main conventions universal declaration of Human Rights, which was adopted in December 10, 1948, or in the field of transport and communication, for example International Maritime Law, which was adopted in 1982.

But, among the negative factors, it is necessary to point out the North South Gap Today, in the developing world (global South), lives about 80% of the World population, however, they produce only 40% of the World GDP (Mukhaev R. 2009. P. 596).

Furthermore, the problem of terrorist should be mentioned here. According to the US Department of state, there were 44 International terrorist organizations in 2008 (Goldstein J. Pevehouse J. 2010. P. 207). Taking into consideration the fact, that in the beginning of the XXI century, nearly half of the World`s population still must make do on less than $2 per day (Basic Facts about the United Nations. UN Department of Public Information. New-York. 2004. P. 144).

International drug trade also represents the big problem and among with the other corruptions and conflicts. According to the Heidelberg Institute, there were 414 conflicts in the different regions of the world in 2013(Conflict Barometer 2013). Due to it, one of the main necessary aspect here first of all is further democratization of the world and promotion of cooperation in different fields, such as culture and education.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As a conclusion, it should be mentioned that human beings themselves create the society, where they live. Also human being is the main actor in creating the International Society. Here should be mentioned that the process especially is very difficult for the weak and small states, because if the international system is anarchic or if the international society or institutions are weak, in this case it is very difficult to maintain the state sovereignty. Humanity strives to live in a world were justice will be the ruler, they are searching for a place without wars or conflicts. Taking into the consideration the positive and negative factors related to the international society's development we can make a comparative analysis of the optimistic and pessimistic scenarios of the development of international society. With regards to pessimistic scenarios, there were presented in the beginning of the last century by Samuel Huntington, who did not believe in the further process of the globalization and is strengthening the consolidation of the International Society, because according to him there were eight different civilizations and most of this anti-western civilizations they would unite against west, and he presented his ides "The west and the rest" and by this way he somehow separated the western civilization with other civilizations. Partly, with regards to ArthurToby, British scientist, he mentioned about the existence even more as a first state 21 and later 33 different civilizations in comparison with Huntington. Some experts think that because of the above mentioned factors there are more than 5000 nationalities in the world and they belong to different civilizations, and it will be impossible by this way to develop the globalization, which will promote the strengthening of globalization at the same time. We can see here the existence of the North South Gap, when for example on the shear of North is coming on about the 15 % of the world population, but at the same time they produce more than 16% of the world GDP. With regards to the optimistic scenarios of course we can rely on the concept of Fukuyama in his research "The end of the history and last man". where he mentioned about the perspectives of the democracy enlargement in the world and we also can justify the concept of Francis Fukuyama too, taking into the consideration the democratization of the world, that today there are about 90 countries, which are free according to the standards of the Freedom House, also for example during the World War period there were only 13 democratic countries in the world. Also taking into the consideration the increasing role of the international democratic organizations such as European Union as a NATO for becoming gradually the global actors' not only regional actor. Furthermore, increasing the access to the information, that today about more than 3 billion people have the access to the internet it gives us reason to say about the possibilities of the development and consolidation of the international society by the positive scenarios. But one of the important factors probably for the consolidation of the international society represents further democratization in the world, because as we know democracy do not fight with each other and due to this factor of course in different countries democratic institutions will be developed as it would provide the stability and also more liberal approach not only toward the citizens but also on foreign political approach, which will be oriented not only on the conflict, but also will be oriented on cooperation with other states and nations. One of the main important factors in my point of view for the further democratization is to increase the public awareness of the world population related to the democracy because most of the countries, especially in the countries of the global South, people do not know about the civil, political, economic and social rights. For example, if International society would work for the introduction the subject democracy and human rights, mandatory subject in the high schools of the different countries it would somehow promote the introduction of the democratic mentality among of the young population on which depends the future of international community, future of democracy and future of world politics.

References

Bull H. (2012). The Anarchical Society. 3rd edition. Columbia University Press. PP.13-14.

Butterfield H. and Wight M. (Eds). (1966). Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the International Politics. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. P.120;

Evans G., Newham J., (1990). The Dictionary of World Politics. Simon and Schuster, New York, PP195-196.

Goldstein Joshua S., Pevenhouse Jon C. (2010) International Relations. Boston, USA.P3. P. 207.

Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research (Germany). Conflict Barometer 2013, retrieved on 05.11.2015 from: http://hiik.de/de/downloads/data/downloads_2013/ConflictBarometer2013.pdf

Kegley C., Blanton S. (2011) World Politics. Trend and Transformation. Boston, USA. P. 138

Luard E. (1976). Types of International Society. The Free Press, New York, pp.345-358.

Mukhaev R. (2009) Political Science. Prospect, Moscow. P. 596.

Nardin T. (1983). Law, Morality, and the Relations states. Princeton University Press, Princeton, P.34

Wight. M. 1966Western Values in International Relations. In: "Diplomatic Investigations. Essays in the Theory of International Politics". London: Allen & Unwin.

Wight M. (1991) International Theory. The Three Traditions. Edited by G. Wight and B. Porter. Leicester University press, PP. 37-48; 39.

UN Department of Public Information (2004). Basic Facts about the United Nations. New-York. 2004. P. 144.

UnitedNations, U. (n.d.). Member States of the United Nations. Retrieved September 5, 2015, from http://www.un.org/en/members/

ნეიძე. ვ. (2004) მსოფლიოს სოციალურ-ეკონომიკური გეოგრაფია. გამომცემლობა "ლეგა". თბილისი. [Neidze V. (2004) Wold Social-Economical Geography. Lega. Tbilisi]

ჟღენტი მ., ხარიტონაშვილი ჯ. (1999) მსოფლიოს ეკონომიკური და სოციალური გეოგრაფია. თშ-ს გამომცემლობა. გვ. 19. [Zhgenti M., Kharitonashvili J., (1999) World Social-Economical Geography. TSH]