

TINATIN KEMASHVILI

PHD student of Sukhumi State University (Georgia)

## ON THE HISTORY OF THE FORMATION OF THE SYSTEM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52340/isj.2024.29.20>

**Introduction.** The system of international relations has its own history, so until the middle of the 17th century, international relations were characterized by the disunity of their participants, the lack of system of international interactions, the main manifestation of which were short-term armed conflicts or long wars. At different periods, the historical hegemony in the world were Ancient Egypt, the Persian Empire, the Empire of Alexander the Great, the Roman Empire, the Byzantine Empire, the Empire of Charlemagne, the Mongol Empire of Genghis Khan, the Ottoman Empire, the Holy Roman Empire, etc. All of them were focused on establishing their sole domination, building a unipolar world. In the Middle Ages, the Catholic Church, headed by the papal throne, tried to establish its domination over peoples and states. International relations were anarchic in nature and were characterized by great uncertainty. As a result, each participant in international relations was forced to take steps based on the unpredictability of the behavior of other participants, which led to open conflicts. It is precisely the consideration of these issues that is the goal of this article.

**Keywords:** *Geopolitics, international relations, Westphalian system, world order*

The modern system of interstate relations dates back to 1648, when the Peace of Westphalia ended the Thirty Years' War in Western Europe and sanctioned the disintegration of the Holy Roman Empire into independent states. It was from this time that the national state (in Western terminology, the «nation-state») was universally established as the main form of political organization of society, and the principle of national (i.e. state) sovereignty became the dominant principle of international relations. The main fundamental provisions of the Westphalian model of the world were: - the world consists of sovereign states (accordingly, there is no single

supreme authority in the world, and the principle of a universalistic hierarchy of governance is absent); - the system is based on the principle of sovereign equality of states and, consequently, their non-interference in each other's internal affairs; - a sovereign state has unlimited power over its citizens within its territory; - the world is regulated by international law, understood as the right of treaties between sovereign states that must be observed; - sovereign states are subjects of international law, only they are internationally recognized subjects; - international law and regular diplomatic practice are integral attributes of relations between states.

The idea of a nation state with sovereignty was based on four main characteristics: the presence of a territory; the presence of a population living in this territory; legitimate governance of the population; recognition by other nation states. In the absence of at least one of these characteristics, the state becomes sharply limited in its capabilities, or ceases to exist. The basis of the state-centric model of the world became «national interests», according to which it is possible to find compromise solutions (and not value guidelines, in particular religious ones, according to which compromises are impossible). An important feature of the Westphalian model was the geographical limitation of its scope. It had a clearly expressed Eurocentric character. After the Peace of Westphalia, it became customary to keep permanent residents and diplomats at foreign courts. For the first time in historical practice, interstate borders were redrawn and clearly defined. Thanks to this, coalitions and interstate unions began to emerge, which gradually began to acquire important significance. The papacy lost its significance as a supranational force. States began to be guided by their own interests and ambitions in their foreign policy.

At this time, the theory of European equilibrium arose, which was developed in

the works of N. Machiavelli. He proposed establishing a balance of power between the five Italian states. The theory of European equilibrium would eventually be adopted by all of Europe, and it would continue to work until modern times, serving as the basis for international alliances and coalitions of states.

At the beginning of the 18th century, when the Peace of Utrecht (1713) was concluded, which put an end to the struggle for the Spanish succession between France and Spain, on the one hand, and a coalition of states led by Great Britain, on the other, the concept of «balance of power» appeared in international documents, complementing the Westphalian model and becoming widespread in the political vocabulary of the second half of the 20th century. The balance of power is the distribution of global influence between individual centers of power - poles, and can take various configurations: bipolar, tripolar, multipolar (or multipolar), etc. d. The main goal of the balance of power is to prevent dominance in the international system by one or a group of states, to ensure the maintenance of international order.

Based on the views of N. Machiavelli, T. Hobbes, as well as A. Smith, J.-J. Rousseau and others, the first theoretical schemes of political realism and liberalism are formed. From a political science point of view, the system of the Peace of Westphalia (sovereign states) still exists, but from a historical point of view, it fell apart at the beginning of the 19th century.

The system of international relations that emerged after the Napoleonic Wars was normatively enshrined in the Vienna Congress of 1814-1815. The victorious powers saw the meaning of their collective international activity in creating reliable barriers against the spread of revolutions. Hence the appeal to the ideas of legitimism. The Vienna system of international relations is characterized by the idea of a European concert - a balance of power between European states. The Concert of Europe was based on the general agreement of large states: Russia, Austria, Prussia, France, and Great Britain. The elements of the Vienna system were not only states, but also coalitions of states. The Concert of Europe, while remaining a form of hegemony for large states and coalitions, effectively limited

their freedom of action in the international arena for the first time.

The Vienna international system confirmed the balance of power established as a result of the Napoleonic Wars and secured the borders of national states. Russia secured Finland and Bessarabia for itself and expanded its western borders at the expense of Poland, dividing it between itself, Austria and Prussia.

The Vienna system fixed a new geographical map of Europe, a new balance of geopolitical forces. This geopolitical system was based on the imperial principle of controlling the geographical space within the colonial empires. During the Vienna system, the following empires were formed: British (1876), German (1871), French (1852). In 1877, the Turkish Sultan took the title of «Emperor of the Ottomans», and Russia became an empire earlier - in 1721.

Within the framework of this system, the concept of great powers was formulated for the first time (then, first of all, Russia, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia), multilateral diplomacy and diplomatic protocol were formed. Many researchers call the Vienna system of international relations the first example of collective security.

At the beginning of the 20th century, new states entered the world arena. These were primarily the USA, Japan, Germany, and Italy. From that moment on, Europe ceased to be the only continent where new world leaders were formed.

But new wars showed the weakness of these systems, which they tried to impose on the world, and which, ultimately, did not stop the leading powers from unleashing the First World War. Trying to prevent any possibility of a new bloody war, the leading countries of the world gave rise to a new system of international relations - the Versailles-Washington. The years of its formation were 1918-1922, that is, immediately after the First World War. The peace conference, which was to develop the terms of the post-war settlement, opened in Paris on January 18, 1919. The key role was played by the USA, England, and France. However, their interests did not coincide on all issues. Formally, 27 countries participated in the conference, but in fact the main issues were discussed at the «council of 10», which included two representatives from each of

the leading powers. As events unfolded, many of the functions of this body were transferred to the «council of 4», which included US President W. Wilson, British Prime Minister D. Lloyd George, French Prime Minister J. Clemenceau and the head of the Italian government Orlando.

On the positions of the leading powers. The most acute issue was regarding Germany. France took the toughest position. Clemenceau sought to weaken his neighbor as much as possible, and possibly even dismember Germany. It was assumed that a network of new states would form on the ruins of the old countries, which would be oriented toward France in their foreign policy. In addition, the French Prime Minister expected to receive a considerable share for France in the division of the colonies of the defeated opponents. England had already managed to realize part of its interests during the war. Its troops occupied most of the German colonies, and the German fleet was defeated or captured by the English. Therefore, it was not in England's interests to weaken Germany even more, since it was not in its interests to allow France to excessively strengthen its position in Europe. In addition, Prime Minister Lloyd George feared the spread of Bolshevik ideas in Europe, and this is why a relatively strong Germany could serve as a barrier against the «world socialist fire». Wilson's «Fourteen Points» outlined the position of the United States. Almost immediately, the knots of contradiction became obvious: the fate of Germany and its colonies, the future of the empires that had finally collapsed, the question of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and the attitude towards events in Russia. The conference was unable to decide anything about Russia; the country's fate was being decided on the battlefields of the Civil War. As for the other issues, they were resolved during the discussions that unfolded at the conference. In the end, the conference in Paris adopted the following: the Covenant of the League of Nations was ready, an organization for discussing world politics was created. The colonies were divided, and mandates for the administration of these territories were issued to the victorious countries. The fates of former empires such as the Ottoman Empire and Austria-Hungary were being decided. Germany's fate was sealed: the peace terms were extremely

harsh for the country: Germany would lose Alsace and Lorraine, the districts of Eupen and Morain, Northern Schleswig, the demilitarization of the left bank of the Rhine, the country would also lose all its colonies, the army would be reduced to 100,000 men, it would be forbidden to have a submarine fleet and military aviation. Naturally, since Germany was responsible for unleashing the war, it had to pay reparations to the Entente countries. The Treaty of Versailles changed the political map of Europe. It also consolidated the position of Eurocentrism in international relations. This could not but cause discontent in the countries of the New World, such as Japan and the United States. Therefore, it would have been impossible to consolidate the new precarious system of international relations with one conference. Please do not forget to format the link correctly.

Therefore, on November 12, 1921, a new conference opened in Washington to discuss the contentious issues. It resulted in the signing of three main agreements that allowed the completion of the structure begun at the Paris Conference, but not completed. Three treaties: the «Four Treaty» of the USA, Japan, England, France (on the inviolability of the possessions of the four countries in the Pacific Ocean basin, thereby the USA forced Japan and England to denounce their agreement of 1902), the «Five Treaty» of the USA, Japan, France, England, Italy (on establishing proportions for their combat fleets; this allowed the USA to pacify the «mistress of the seas» England, and this is the first document that was able to limit the arms race, albeit insignificantly), the «Treaty of Ten» (on China, the principle of «open doors» on the territory of this country, which did not allow European countries, according to the old tradition, to divide China into spheres of influence, not letting strangers into the market with their goods). Thus, these three treaties were able to shake the principle of Eurocentrism in international relations, allowing the countries of the New World to actively interfere in world politics, and even, at times, dictate their terms. With the completion of the Washington Conference, the stage of formation of a new model of international relations was completed. Centers of power emerged that managed to develop a relatively

stable system of relationships among themselves. The most controversial issues related to the post-war settlement were basically resolved, and tensions in relations between the great powers were relieved. At the same time, it was impossible not to note that the new model of international relations was internally contradictory, and, therefore, not a particularly stable structure. Soviet Russia and offended Germany, which were left behind, it was unclear how the defeated countries would be woven into the new system, and numerous problems of the awakening Asian continent were ignored. All this subsequently led to the fact that the Versailles-Washington system ceased to support peace throughout the world and led the country to another military conflict, which involved 61 states out of 73 that existed at that time. The collapse of the Versailles-Washington system was inevitable. There were too many contradictions. Discrimination against the position of the defeated states and Soviet Russia and the formation of the «bloc of the offended» (Germany and the Soviet Union), who wanted to revise the status quo of the system, an ineffective instrument for managing international relations - the League of Nations, which was in the hands of England and France - countries pursuing a policy of appeasement (inciting Nazi Germany against the Soviet Union), consolidating the leadership of the USA, Great Britain and France in the new system. Significant territorial, political and economic (to varying degrees for these countries) development of the victorious countries actually gave them the right to collectively change the characteristics of the international system and shape its principles. Other winners (like Italy) remained in the background, which caused discontent among the latter, since they clearly wanted more, and later began to lay claim to this more in a rather aggressive form. As a result, all these contradictions resulted in the Second World War. The world needed a new system of international relations that would correspond to the realities of that time. The Versailles-Washington system, due to its imperfections, did not last long. Moreover, the malfunction of the system led the world to the Second World War. Initially, the selfish interests of France, thirsting for revenge on Germany and a leading position in Europe, the interests of England, which declared

itself an arbiter, which watched the conflicts of others from the sidelines and did not interfere in their affairs, as well as the United States, which was breaking through to the role of the main hegemon of the world, made this world order one-sided and inflexible, which made it a very unreliable substance. Several political and economic crises in Europe and Asia were enough to destroy the Versailles-Washington system. Nothing, including the League of Nations, which was charged with maintaining peace and order, could save this system from collapse. However, after the failed attempt to regulate international relations, the actors learned lessons that they were able to apply later to the functioning of the Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations.

The Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations, enshrined in treaties and agreements at the Yalta (4-11 February 1945) and Potsdam (17 July - 2 August 1945) conferences of the heads of state of the Anti-Hitler coalition. The issue of a post-war settlement at the highest level was first raised during the Tehran Conference of 1943, where even then the strengthening of the position of two powers - the USSR and the USA - was clearly evident, to which the decisive role in determining the parameters of the post-war world was increasingly transferred, that is, the prerequisites for the formation of the foundations of the future bipolar world were already emerging during the war. This tendency was fully manifested at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, when the main role in solving the key problems associated with the formation of a new model of international relations was played by two, now superpowers - the USSR and the USA. The Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations was characterized by: - the absence (in contrast, for example, to the Versailles-Washington system) of the necessary legal framework, which made it very vulnerable to criticism and recognition by some states; - bipolarity based on the military-political superiority of two superpowers (the USSR and the USA) over other countries. Blocs were formed around them (OVD and NATO). Bipolarity was not limited to the military-force superiority of the two states, it covered almost all spheres - socio-political, economic, ideological, scientific-technical, cultural, etc.; confrontation, which meant that the parties constantly opposed

their actions to each other. Competition, rivalry and antagonism, and not cooperation between the blocs were the leading characteristics of the relations; - the presence of nuclear weapons, threatening multiple mutual destruction of the superpowers with their allies, which was a special factor in the confrontation of the parties. Gradually (after the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962) the parties began to consider a nuclear conflict only as the most extreme means of influencing international relations, and in this sense nuclear weapons had their deterrent role; political and ideological confrontation between the West and the East, capitalism and socialism, which brought additional uncompromisingness to international relations in disagreements and conflicts; - a relatively high degree of controllability of international processes due to the fact that it was

necessary to coordinate the positions of only two superpowers; the reality, the irreconcilability of the confrontational relations between the USSR and the USA, significantly limited the ability of the UN to implement its statutory functions and goals. The end of the Potsdam era was marked by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the world socialist camp, which followed the failed attempt at Gorbachev's perestroika, enshrined in the Belovezh Accords of 1991. Today in international relations there is no system by which the world community lived, the system is replaced by the struggle of the Powers and their doctrine, hence the conflicts and wars. We believe that the completion of the geopolitical struggle of the powers for their interests will also complete the formation of a new system of international relations.

#### References:

- [1]. Kortunov, S.V. The Collapse of the Westphalian System and the Formation of a New World Order / S.V.Kortunov // World Politics. - M.: GU-HSE, 2007. - P. 45-63.
- [2].Kosov, Yu.V. World Politics and International Relations / Yu.V. Kosov. - M.: 2012. - 456s.
- [3]. Cedric, Moon. The End of a Superpower / S. Moon / Russia Today. - 2014. - December 2.
- [4]. Systemic History of International Relations: 4 volumes / Ed. by D.Sc. (Pedagogy), prof. A.D. Bogaturov. -V.1.- M.: 2000. - 325s.-1-v
- [5]. Fukuyama, F. The End of History? / F.Fukuyama // Questions of Philosophy. - 1990. - № 3. - P. 56-74.
- [6]. Fukuyama, Francis. The End of History and the Last Man / F. Fukuyama; trans. from English by M. B. Levina. - M.: ACT, 2007. - 347s.

### ТИНАТИН КЕМАШВИЛИ

Докторант Сухумского Государственного Университет (Грузия)

#### К ВОПРОСУ ИСТОРИИ ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ СИСТЕМЫ В МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЯХ

Система международных отношений имеет свою историю, так до середины XVII в. международные отношения характеризовались разобщенностью их участников, бессистемностью международных взаимодействий, главным проявлением которых выступали кратковременные вооруженные конфликты или длительные войны. В разные периоды историческими гегемонами в мире были Древний Египет, Персидская империя, Держава Александра Македонского, Римская империя, Византийская империя, империя Карла Великого, Монгольская империя Чингис-хана, Османская Империя, Священная Римская империя и др. Все они были ориентированы на установление своего единоличного господства, построение однополярного мира. В средние века свое господство над народами и государствами пыталась установить католическая церковь во главе с папским престолом. Международные отношения имели анархический характер и отличались большой неопределенностью. В результате, каждый участник международных отношений был вынужден предпринимать шаги, исходя из непредсказуемости поведения других участников, что приводило к открытым конфликтам. Именно рассмотрение этих вопросов ставит целью представленная статья.