

# opción

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,  
Lingüística y Semiótica, Problemas del Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 36, abril 2020 N°

91

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

ISSN 1012-1537/ ISSNc: 2477-9385

Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia  
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias  
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas  
Maracaibo - Venezuela



# Humanization as a paradigm of contemporary international relations system

**Sarsenov M. B.**<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of International Relations and Regional Studies, Ablai Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan.

[Sarsenov@AKKU.kz](mailto:Sarsenov@AKKU.kz)

**Raev D. S.**<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Department of International Relations and Regional Studies, Ablai Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan.

[Raev@AKKU.kz](mailto:Raev@AKKU.kz)

## Abstract

This work studies the theoretical problems of international relations development in conditions of globalization. The main factors of the humanization of the current international relations system are characterized via comparative qualitative research methods. As a result, pragmatism and political realism deny the identification of certain nations' aspirations with world moral laws. It is concluded that there are enough opportunities for the humanization process in modern international relations.

**Keywords:** Humanization, International, Relations, System, Political process.

## La humanización como paradigma del sistema contemporáneo de relaciones internacionales

### Resumen

Este trabajo estudia los problemas teóricos del desarrollo de las relaciones internacionales en condiciones de globalización. Los principales factores de la humanización del actual sistema de relaciones internacionales se caracterizan por métodos comparativos de investigación cualitativa. Como resultado, el pragmatismo y el

realismo político niegan la identificación de las aspiraciones de ciertas naciones con las leyes morales mundiales. Se concluye que hay suficientes oportunidades para el proceso de humanización en las relaciones internacionales modernas.

**Palabras clave:** Humanización, Internacional, Relaciones, Sistema, Proceso político.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

International relations are a specific type of public relations. They are related to the latter, not only because they are both the relations between social communities, but also because they include economic, social, political, spiritual, and cultural aspects. In this context, international relations are considered the continuation and development of public relations built on a national basis. In its turn, the difference between international relations and relations within public structures lies in that in the complex they form in terms of quality new system with characteristic features; they are of wider special and social dimension since they characterize interactions at least between two and more countries; the main subjects in these relations are nations, states, public movements and organizations with their needs and interests; their functioning is connected not with some certain form of public authority, but with wide range of international norms and values, which humanity created in the course of long-term evolutionary and revolutionary development (TSYGANKOV, 1998).

We have witnessed the destruction of the bipolar international relations system, which was followed by a so-called polycentric

unipolar system that is getting multipolar. In fact, there were at least three equilibrium poles of modern international relations system: USA, European Union, and Pacific Rim, where China dominates. Some other integration associations and states, which belong to BRICS, claim the role of world political centers (IONESCU et al, 2019).

Today Russia and China have similar views on world politics, therefore, these strong and self-reliant countries, which have their own political stance and take their stand, do not fit in the Pax NATO scheme suggested by Americans with its unipolarity. The basic drawbacks of this unipolar model of the modern world system are evident. The thing is that many other world states will not agree with the role of weak ones. What is more, these countries are definitely underestimated by unipolar strategists according to the list of the most important parameters of national strength. Having in mind special place and foreign policy and other resources, which possesses the USA, we should mention that they are not enough for sole will exertion regardless of other states, which either belong to the circle of great countries or belong to influential regional centers.

One way or another, no world state, including the only one superpower - USA, has nowadays enough resources to function as a global police officer in a unipolar world. In addition to this, the unipolar model directly contradicts many key and long-term tendencies of modern world development, which do not depend on the short-term political situation. It is all about drastic changes in the modern world, especially that happening in the last decade, including

growing democratization and globalization, which, in fact, presuppose the global transformation of modern international relations system towards realizing age-long ideals of the world without violence, world culture, international relations humanization.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

Current globalization is not a linear process; it goes along with world fragmentation, recurrent religious and ethnic fundamentalism, etc. True multipolarity has not been completed yet, it is still developing. Therefore, the modern world is often considered a fantastic hybrid – unimultipolar system. However, as it is shown, the notion asymmetric multipolarity clearly reflects the character of the current world system, which is perceived in this case as a transient stage of the modern world development and which reflects the specificity of certain power and resource distribution in kind of general force field of the aforementioned world tendencies.

The global nature of modern international political relations requires a completely new mechanism for their regulation, including a substantial restructuring of existing international organizations and the creation of new ones. This problem is most fully revealed in the writings of such famous researchers as PLOTNIKOVA (2004), BARANOVSKY (1999), and TSYGANKOV (2012; 2013).

The transient character of the current stage lies also in that bipolarity, unipolarity, and multipolarity are just certain and, to a great extent, formal fixations of distributing collective power and national strength in the world, and are definitely not characteristics of modern international relations. Therefore, for instance, in the multipolar world several hostile and almost equally strong states can confront; on the other hand, in that formal scheme of national strength distribution, these states can cooperate. In other words, the formal structure of a new developing world order should acquire its own meaning.

It will largely depend on subjective factors, including certain foreign policy strategies and tactics, concepts and doctrines, which are chosen by key players on the modern international stage, including Russia, of course. Thus, the developing conceptual aspects of the strategic way we perceive modern international relations, and world concepts in the XXI century, in particular, are of great significance.

As for the aforementioned developing world concept of the XXI century, it is to emphasize that this concept is based on the necessary building of globalization mechanism that is adequate in content and functionally cooperative. The efficiency of such governance will mostly depend on its combination of national and international efforts with the UN as the only universal mechanism supporting international peace and security. Admitting the appearance of, in terms of quality, new dangers to modern multipolar world order, it is necessary to predicate on strategic long-standing goals, which reflect an adequate

understanding of not short-term, but leading world policy tendencies under conditions of globalization in the modern world.

With that in mind, the strategic goals of international relations democratization and humanization should be of high priority for leading countries' foreign policy. Certainly, the way to these goals cannot be easy and fast, especially in the current political situation. Whichever the obstacles are, steps to the aforementioned goals could be as following:

- To stop claiming against unilateral dominance, acknowledge and move towards multipolarity;
- To establish efficient international and national mechanisms and procedures of right enforcement for national minorities within the sovereign state;
- To involve civilians in solving international problems;
- To provide minimal coercive measures approved by international law;
- To set humanitarian limits on international sanctions;
- To give national and international guarantees of human rights and freedoms observance etc.

The truly multipolar world order of the XXI century is possible only if the majority of the world community, and its real and potential power centers, are willing to. Moreover, development and improvement of true partnership between members of modern international relations, which are based on the general understanding of new world policy architecture of the XXI century, play an important role. Taking into consideration all the aforementioned, we can say that international relations include the most powerful advantage influencing both political and non-political international processes. It includes:

- A politically significant activity of UN and other legitimate international bodies, organizations and institutions;
- Political actions of international, supranational institutes, and also corresponding public groups, associations and unions;
- Sovereign countries' foreign policy, which shapes world policy, international relations, and connections.

This leverage imposes demanding requirements for:

- Subjects and members of international relations, especially for their behavior in critical situations;
- Norms of international law, which they are guided by;

- Security services, which are brought into action, when international security is undermined;
- Political decisions, which authorized bodies to make;
- The administrative management apparatus is responsible for current bureaucratic work.

The mentioned leverage poses for subjects and members of international relations many problems concerning their funding. International relations clearly tend to globalization, which is to spreading and interpenetration, complementation and mutual enrichment. It is, primarily, due to drastic changes in Central and East Europe, in CIS (including Central Asia and Kazakhstan). The barriers that divide international relations according to ideology are being broken; the world division into two conflicting political camps with their closed political and state systems, and the confrontation as well, recede into past; the model of the bipolar world, which was represented by two superpowers – USA and USSR, loses its meaning. Globalization of political international relations stems from growing role and meaning of universal (global) problems in the modern world, which have socio-environmental, socio-economic, personal and socio-political character:

- Preventing nuclear war;
- Stopping arms race, disarmament;

- Peaceful settlement of regional, interstate and international armed conflicts;
- Non-violent world-building based on trust in international relations;
- Security system reinforcement.

The global character of modern international political relations also requires a new mechanism for their regulation, including the considerable reestablishment of existing international organizations and building new ones.

### **3. RESULT**

International political relations considerably influence international and world order. As far as international order is concerned, it means such an international relations organization, which is supposed to ensure the good functioning of states and other international institutes, and to build and maintain corresponding conditions for their existence, security and development. As for world order, its sense lies in meeting human requirements, including survivability, well-being, and justice in regard to certain people. International political relations influence international and world order in the way that they possess great capabilities – diplomatic, organizational and legal, material and technical, and informative-

outreach – to implement in interstate and international relations such principles as:

- Preservation and approval of universal political and moral values;
- Commitment to fair international and national security, and also the peaceful settlement of controversial international issues and conflicts;
- Respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- Non-intervention in each other's internal affairs;
- Absolute precedence of international law over political and state communities.

Finally, international political relations at the current developmental stage tend to democratization, demilitarization, and humanization. Democratization, though having different forms and results in different nations and states, is reflected in universal aspiration to, on the one hand, eliminate authoritarian-bureaucratic and totalitarian regimes, and on the other hand – build an advanced society and legal state. Demilitarization is surely based on global disarmament but is not reduced only to it. It also includes:

- Elimination of military-political units;

- The drastic transformation of the arms industry;
- Quality change of scientific, state and managerial units, public institutes, lifestyle and consciousness of many people burdened with stereotypes from Cold War times.

International political relations humanization means that politics and state cease being self-goal and self-value. They become a means of meeting the growing human requirements, defending their rights, freedoms, and interests. International political relations humanization presupposes increasing meaning of non-governmental subjects and members, and representatives of national diplomacy in particular, in the relations system. In modern political literature, there is no opinion on the question about who the main subject of international political relations is. One point of view remains widespread, according to which state or group of states are such a subject because the state is the only national institute authorized to carry out internal policy, take part in relations with other states and international organizations, conclude contracts, declare war, etc.

This so-called statist approach to international relations forming and functioning, which appears to be the result of legal tradition in modern political thought, has been reflected in the formation of different interstate associations, unions and organizations aimed at ensuring national security in regions, and in the world in general. Over the last years, this approach was complemented with a broader – political – approach, according to which the main subject of

international political relations is the national political system. Supporters of this approach think that its advantage lies in that it allows involvement in international political relations of not only the state but also other equally important institutes: national political organizations and establishments, political-cultural and legal communities (SHUMILOVSKIKH et al, 2019).

Along with the statist approach, there is also an antistatist approach. Its followers consider non-governmental and even non-political organizations and movements as main subjects of international political relations. Their arguments are reduced to that, the authority of state as the main element of international political mechanism is going down: firstly, due to its inability to manage deep crisis phenomena in the world; secondly, due to paralysis, stagnation, and absence of state's will; thirdly, due to obvious state's immorality, which plays in great power games and fools its citizens.

Antistatists consider that the authority of non-governmental organizations in the international political relations system is constantly growing and expanding, which shows the general tendency towards increasing the role of civil structures in the world. To their mind, it is evident due to multinational corporations (MNC), which transform all sides of human activities, including political ones, and transmit the global community to new historical epoch.

International political relations need to analyze not only in terms of the way they develop and function but also in terms of their

theoretical substantiation. Such a substantiation can be represented in different ways. The first method is to develop the globalist-futurological concept. These concepts have the following characteristics: future society is supposed to be financially and politically strong and stable; its spiritual and political basis consists of global consciousness and the corresponding type of political thinking; human norms and values, which are supposed to change human lifestyle and behavior, play the leading role; the necessary condition for its establishment and development is structures of civil society and, primarily, human resources and knowledge.

These characteristics are completely reflected in the concept of Sustainable Society, which is considered the first one in modern foreign, and American in particular, global studies-21. The concept of Sustainable Society covers almost all main aspects of world community life, including the political one.

The system of basic guidelines and values, which Sustainable Society is based on, are of special interest. It is to emphasize those founders of the Sustainable Society concept look far beyond the aforementioned systems development, which is necessary, they say, to ensure world strength and stability. They strive to build a futurological picture of Sustainable Society based on these systems and introduce a new ideal of public-political humanity development. The aforementioned and many other ideas of the Sustainable Society concept are represented in different world order models. Many

respectful futurologists study this society as one of the crucial goals of global human evolution.

The second method is related to creating general methodological theories, which are supposed to shape key principles and techniques of scientific analysis of international political relations. To these theories belong the following: H. Morgentau's theory of political realism, R. Aron's peace and war theory, Q. Wright's theory of factors, G. Liska's equilibrium (balance-of-power) theory and J. Galtung's world-systems theory. Among these theories, H. Morgentau's theory of political realism plays an important role. Its sense consists of the following basic statements. First, international relations represent ancient as well as a self-reliant political system.

A characteristic feature of the international relations studies after the World War II lies in that they are carried out on the basis of behaviorism, system analysis, game theory, modeling, and general methodology, which have one common aim – to substantiate global international relations optimization by means of modern theory, to ensure true predictions in this sphere and so get rid of unpredictable political actions. In this context, real international politics can be compared to rational theory as a photo to portrait drawn with a brush. Rational international politics is efficient if it reduces risks and increases benefits that is when it relies on rationality and requirements for success.

Second, the most important guideline allowing political realism to find a meaningful and rational way in international politics is the notion of interest which is defined in categories of governance. Moreover, if in general theory notion of interest can have various meanings depending on the certain subject character, in international political theory this notion is usually introduced as national interest. According to H. Morgentau, the notion of national interest in international political relations consists of the following factors: interest character, which should be protected; political environment, where interest operates; and rational need, which restricts the choice of goals and means for all the figures on the international stage. Any foreign policy should be built on physical, political and cultural reality, which nation represents. In the world divided by rivalry and fight for power between different sovereign nations, foreign policy of any nation should meet its primary requirement – to survive. Therefore, all nations, according to their capabilities, strive to one thing – to protect its physical, political and cultural identity in the face of possible external intrusion.

Finally, pragmatists and political realists realize the moral meaning of political actions and inevitable confrontations between moral laws and requirements for effective political activity. However, they emphasize that moral principles can be implemented in states and nations' actions according to particular circumstances of time and place rather than in an abstract way. H. Morgentau points out that sense of pragmatism and political realism lies in the choice not between moral principles and national interest without moral virtue, but between one

set of moral principles beyond political reality and another set of principles corresponding to reality.

In this context, pragmatism and political realism deny the identification of certain nations' aspirations with world moral laws. Truth does not align with public opinion. All nations try to relate their private aspirations to world moral goals, but it does not mean that they are right. Interest in categories of international political power builds chances of fair treating all nations because it protects from moral pretension and political pressure from any nation. As H. Morhentau writes, careless speculation about that carrier and representative of moral good is a certain nation, and another nation embraces evil, is invalid in both moral and intellectual contexts. Such speculation leads to values distortion and mad violent crusades.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

Considering all the aforementioned, we can conclude that humanization is a controversial, but quite possible process in the modern world. It is slowly coming true, sometimes followed by inconsistent processes. Of course, humanization does not cover all international relations. There are many difficulties, problems, which cannot be solved just like that. It can also be stated that humanization is elective, regional, as not all the spheres and regions in international relations undergo humanization. Finally, humanization has not reached

that level yet, where an individual is considered the utmost value in international relations.

The value of a group of people is likely to be acknowledged. An international community starts responding only to massive murders. There are even debates on the topic of how many victims are needed to consider crime a genocide. Surely, it is inappropriate in terms of humanity, but so is a modern reality. There is such a situation in the modern world, where the world community considers one group of people more valuable than others. Perhaps, it will be so to some extent. More importantly, we move towards humanization, anyway. To sum up, there are enough opportunities for further humanization in modern international relations, an important task is to seize them.

Certainly, we will not manage to build a global humanistic community in the near future, but we can approach it. Having analyzed contemporary politics in CIS countries, including Kazakhstan, in terms of international relations humanization, we can claim that it is controversial. On the one hand, the absence of democratic tradition, consequences of totalitarian state collapse, the USSR's legacy in the form of the complicated economic, international situation and weak civil society are evidence for many human rights problems in the country and Russian incoherent foreign policy in this sphere. On the other hand, there is progress in human rights in comparison to the Soviet period and reaching out to international European standards in this sphere.

**REFERENCES**

- BARANOVSKY, V. 1999. **International organizations as mechanisms for regulating international relations.** Modern international relations/ Edited by A.V. Torkunov. Moscow: Russian Political Encyclopedia: 121-122. Russia.
- IONESCU, C., FISCHER, C., HOECK, V., & LUTTGE, A. 2019. "Discrimination of Ceramic Surface Finishing by Vertical Scanning Interferometry". **Archaeometry**. Vol. 61, N<sup>o</sup> 1: 31-42.
- PLOTNIKOVA, O. 2004. **Theory, system, and practice of international relations of the regions.** Novosibirsk: Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Russia.
- SHUMILOVSKIKH, L. S., RODINKOVA, V. Y., RODIONOVA, A., TROSHINA, A., ERSHOVA, E., NOVENKO, E.,... & SCHNEEWEIB, J. 2019. "Insights into the late Holocene vegetation history of the East European forest-steppe: case study Sudzha (Kursk region, Russia)". **Vegetation History and Archaeobotany**. Vol. 28, N<sup>o</sup> 5: 513-528.
- TSYGANKOV, A. 2012. **Universal values in the world and foreign policy.** M.: Publishing house of Moscow University: P. 224. Russia.
- TSYGANKOV, P. 1998. **Humanization of international relations: contradictions and paradoxes.** Social sciences and modernity. N<sup>o</sup> 1: 51-59. Russia.
- TSYGANKOV, P. 2013. **Non-state actors in world politics of the 21st century.** Gypsies, Browser-Observer. N<sup>o</sup> 9: 5-17. Russia.



**UNIVERSIDAD  
DEL ZULIA**

---

## **opción**

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 36, N° 91 (2020)

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.  
Maracaibo - Venezuela

[www.luz.edu.ve](http://www.luz.edu.ve)

[www.serbi.luz.edu.ve](http://www.serbi.luz.edu.ve)

[produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve](http://produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve)