

Ministry Of Higher Education and Scientific Research.
University Djilali Bounaama Khemis-Miliana.
Faculty of Law and Political Science
Department of Political Science

Major: International Relations/ Master 2 (2021/2022)

Preparing by Prof : B.BOKRETA

Some Definitions Relating To the Specialization of International Relations

THE TREATY OF WESTPHALIA

The Westphalia area of north-western Germany gave its name to the treaty that ended the Thirty Years' War, one of the most destructive conflicts in the history of Europe. The war or series of connected wars began in 1618, when the Austrian Habsburgs tried to impose Roman Catholicism on their Protestant subjects in Bohemia. It pitted Protestant against Catholic, the Holy Roman Empire against France, the German princes and princelings against the emperor and each other, and France against the Habsburgs of Spain. The Swedes, the Danes, the Poles, the Russians, the Dutch and the Swiss were all dragged in or dived in. Commercial interests and rivalries played a part, as did religion and power politics.

Among famous commanders involved were Marshal Turenne and the Prince de Condé for France, Wallenstein for the Empire and Tilly for the Catholic League, and there was an able Bavarian general curiously named Franz von Mercy. Others to play a part ranged from the Winter King of Bohemia to the emperors Ferdinand II and Ferdinand III, Bethlen Gabor of Transylvania, Christian IV of Denmark, Gustavus II Adolphus and Queen Christina of Sweden, the Great Elector of Brandenburg, Philip IV of Spain and his brother the Cardinal-Infante, Louis XIII of France, Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin and several popes. Gustavus Adolphus was shot in the head and killed at the battle of Lutzen in 1632. The increasingly crazed Wallenstein, who grew so sensitive to noise that he had all the dogs, cats and cockerels killed in every town he came to, was murdered by an English captain in 1634. Still the fighting went on.

The war was largely fought on German soil and reduced the country to desolation as hordes of mercenaries, left unpaid by their masters, lived off the land. Rapine, pillage and famine stalked the countryside as armies marched about, plundering towns, villages and farms as they went. 'We live like animals, eating bark and grass,' says a pitiful entry in a family Bible from a Swabian village. 'No one could have imagined that anything like this would happen to us. Many people say that there is no God...' Wenceslas Hollar recorded devastation in the war zone in engravings of the 1630s and starvation reached such a point in the Rhineland that there were cases of cannibalism. The horror became a way of life and

when the war finally ended, the mercenaries and their womenfolk complained that their livelihood was gone.

The peace conference to end the war opened in Münster and Osnabrück in December 1644. It involved no fewer than 194 states, from the biggest to the smallest, represented by 179 plenipotentiaries. There were thousands of ancillary diplomats and support staff, who had to be given housing, fed and watered, and they did themselves well for close to four years, despite famine in the country around. Presiding over the conference were the Papal Nuncio, Fabio Chigi (the future Pope Alexander VII), and the Venetian ambassador.

The first six months were spent arguing about who was to sit where and who was to go into a room ahead of whom. The principal French and Spanish envoys never managed to meet at all because the correct protocol could not be agreed. A special postal system handled reams of letters between the envoys and their principals at a time when it took ten days or more to send a communication from Münster to Paris or Vienna and twenty days or more to Stockholm or Madrid. Slowly deals were hammered out. Even then it took almost three weeks just to organise the signing ceremony, which commenced at 2pm on the afternoon of Saturday, 24 October 1648.

The treaty gave the Swiss independence of Austria and the Netherlands independence of Spain. The German principalities secured their autonomy. Sweden gained territory and a payment in cash, Brandenburg and Bavaria made gains too, and France acquired most of Alsace-Lorraine. The prospect of a Roman Catholic reconquest of Europe vanished forever. Protestantism was in the world to stay.

THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF THE STATE:

The Theory of Divine Origin: This theory holds that the state was created directly and deliberately by God. Man has not been the major factor in its creation, although the state has been made for man.'^" It was His will that men should live in the world in a state of political society and He sent His deputy to rule over them. The ruler is a divinely appointed agent and he is responsible for his actions to God alone. As the ruler is the deputy of God, obedience to him is held to be a religious duty and resistance a sin. The advocates of the Divine Origin theory place the ruler above the people as well law. Nothing on earth can limit his will and restrict his power. His word is law and his actions are always just and benevolent. The theory that the state and its authority has a divine origin and sanction finds unequivocal support in the scriptures of almost all religions in the world. In the Mahabharata, it is recounted that the people approached God and requested him to grant them a ruler who should save them from the anarchy and chaos prevailing in the state of nature.^ In the Bible it is stated: Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God". Thus, God is the source of royal powers. The ruler is the agent of God on earth.

The Force Theory: There is an old saying that 'war begat the king', and true to this maxim, the theory of force emphasizes the origin of the state in the subordination of the weak to the strong. The advocates of the theory argue that man, apart from being a social animal, is quarrelsome by nature. There is also lust for power in him. Both these desires prompt him to exhibit his strength. Craving for power and desire for self assertion are, according to the exponents of this theory, the two primary instincts of man. In his behaviour and actions man is governed by these twin forces. The physically strong man attacked, captured and enslaved the weak. The successful man began to exercise his sway over a sizeable section and this led to the emergence of clans and tribes. Jenks, an exponent of this theory, says, "Historically speaking, there is not the slightest difficulty in proving that all political communities of the modern type owe their existence to successful warfare.

Once the state came into existence, it was necessary to use force to hold down the power-impulses of men inside and of other states outside. The continued existence of the state, according to the advocates of this theory, demands permanent employment of force for maintaining internal order and external security. Hence force is the basis of the state. Bosanquet says, "The state is Necessarily force".

The Social Contract Theory : Whereas the theory of divine origin of the state postulates the deliberate creation of the state by God, the social contract theory holds that man deliberately created the state in the form of a social contract. Men got together and agreed upon a contract establishing the state. Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau are among those who discussed at length the social contract theory.

Thomas Hobbes, an English political thinker, in his attempt to justify the British Monarchy conceived of the state as originating in this manner. He described the period before states arose as a "state of nature" in which men lived like beasts in the jungle. In his word life in a state of nature was "solitary", poor, nasty, brutish and short". Such a life was too precarious. With man set against man, with might making right and the strong are the only effective law, some sort of government, Hobbes said was a necessity. To make life bearable, man created government and ultimately the state. Men got together and contracted among themselves to vest in some sovereign, ruler or king the authority necessary to bring order out of the chaos in which they lived. According to Hobbes's theory, the ruler to whom all authority was given was not a party to the contract. In a sense, the king was above the law.

John Locke also wrote about the state of nature, but in contrast to Hobbes he did not believe that men necessarily lived brutish live in this natural condition. Yet there was enough uncertainty to make life difficult and enough injustice to make it tragic. Thus again according to Locke, men decided to contract with one another to guarantee their rights more effectively.

Rousseau likewise did not look upon the state of nature as bad. In his view, natural man, unencumbered with the trappings of civilization and the accoutrements of government, lived in idyllic life. Although, life in a state of nature might be theoretically superior, nevertheless it eventually became obvious to man that government was necessary. Men are not equal in energy or intelligence. Inevitably any natural state, without the restraining influences of government, will change capriciously with the ambitions of the

various strong men. Ultimately, life in such a state of nature proved to be inconvenient and trouble some. Thus, like Hobbes and Locke, Rousseau presumes that a general contract evolving all men was made to establish government and the state for the advantage of all.

Sometimes the Mayflower compact (1620) is given as an example of a social contract. In the terms of the Mayflower compact the signers solemnly and mutually in the presence of God, and one of another, covenant and combining ourselves together into a civil body politick, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enacte, constitute and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meete and convenient for the general good of the colonies, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.

The Evolutionary Theory: This theory considers the state neither as a divine institution nor as a deliberate human contrivance, it sees the state coming into existence as the result of natural evolution. 'The proposition that the state is a product of history', says J.W. Burgess, means that it is a gradual and continuous development of human society out of a grossly imperfect beginning through crude but improving forms of manifestation towards a perfect and universal organization of mankind.

In the early society, kinship was the first and strongest bond; and government, as W. Wilson points out, must have begun in clearly defined family discipline. Such discipline would scarcely be possible among races in which blood-relationship was subject to profound confusion and in which family organization, therefore, had, no clear basis of authority on which to rest. Common worship was an other element in the welding together of families and tribes. This worship evolved for primitive animism to ancestor-worship. When ancestor-worship became the prevailing form of religion, religion was inseparably linked with kinship for, at the family or the communal altar, the worshipper did homage to the great dead of his family or group and craved protection and guidance. War and migration were important influences in the origin of the state. The demands of constant warfare often led to the rise of permanent headship. When a tribe was threatened by danger or involved in war, it was driven by necessity to appoint a leader. The continuity of war conduced to the permanence of leadership. Further, war and conquest helped to give the mark of territoriality to the state. And, finally, political consciousness. As Wilson says, in origin government was spontaneous, natural, twin-bom with man and the family; Aristotle was simply stating a fact when he said man is by nature a political animal' The need for order and security is an ever-present factor; man knows instinctively that he can develop the best of which he is capable only by some form of political organization.

States are of course today much bigger than they used to be, much stronger, certainly more complex. State also accept more responsibilities and thus affect the individual more markedly than did their earlier counterparts.

GLOBALIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

INTERNATIONAL RELATION AND GLOBALIZATION

As more nations, people, and cultures adapt to the ever changing international community, diplomats, politicians, and representatives must meet and deal with accordingly to the needs and wants of nations. Diplomacy can be exerted in many forms; through peace talks, written constitutions, field experiences, etc. Culture is a familiar term and remains unchanged by definition. However, globalization and international relations have constantly altered culture both positively and negatively.

Globalization increases worldwide technology, and the readability of fast, effective communication and consumption of popular products. Globalization links cultures and international relations on a variety of levels; economics, politically, socially, etc.

International relations have used globalization to reach its goal: of understanding cultures. International relations focus on how countries, people and organizations interact and globalization is making a profound effect on International relations.

Understanding culture, globalization, and international relations is critical for the future of not only governments, people, and businesses, but for the survival of the human race.

In today's increasingly interdependent and turbulent world, many of the leading issues in the news concern international affairs. Whether it is the continuing impact of globalization,

Globalization – the process of continuing integration of the countries in the world – is strongly underway in all parts of the globe. It is a complex interconnection between capitalism and democracy, which involves positive and negative features, that both empowers and disempowers individuals and groups.

From the other hand Globalization is a popular term used by governments, business, academic and a range of diverse non-governmental organizations. It also, however, signifies a new paradigm within world politics and economic relations. While national governments for many years dictated the international political and economic scene, international organizations such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization have now become significant role players. In this "Global Village" national governments have lost some of their importance and perhaps their powers in favour of these major international organizations.

As a process of interaction and integration among people, companies and governments of different nations Globalization is a process driven by the International Trade and Investment and aided by Information technology. This process on the environment on culture, on political system, on economic development and prosperity, and on human physical well-being in societies around the world.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF GLOBALIZATION

Globalization has a range of advantages while it has also disadvantages.

The Advantages include GDP Increase; statistics shows that GDP in developing countries has increased twice as much as before. Unemployment is reduced.

Education has increased. Competition on Even Platform: The Companies all around the world are competing on a single global platform which allows better options o consumers. It increased fee trade between nations;

The Corporations have greater flexibility to operate across borders. Global mass media ties the world together.

Increased flow of communications allows vital information to be shared between individuals and corporations around the world. It increases in environmental protection in developed nations. Spread of democratic ideas to developed nations. Reduced cultural barriers increases in the global village effect.

The Disadvantages are considered to be Uneven Distribution of Wealth, Income Gap Between Developed and Developing Countries, where the wealth of developed countries continues to grow twice as much as the developing world.

Next disadvantage is Different Wage Standards for Developing Countries, which is explained by the following fat that the technology worker may get more value for his work in a developed country than a worker in a developing country thus there are in the later many dynamic, industrious and enterprising people who are well educated and ready to work with rigor.

To reveal of Globalization is also considered as a disadvantage which is explaining by future factors such as war that can be demand the reveal of the globalization and current process of globalization may just be impossible to reverse.

There is also another aspect of disadvantage of globalization in media sphere. The threat that control of world media by a handful of corporations will limit cultural expression.

And the final in my estimation is the chance of reactions for globalization being violent in an attempt to preserve cultural heritage.

EFFECTS OF GLOBALIZATION

With the roster of the mentioned disadvantages and advantages Globalization culminates also effective facts. The following are considered the Effects of Globalization;

- enhancement in the information flow between geographically remote locations
- the global common market has a freedom of exchange of goods and capital
- there is a broad access to a range of goods for consumers and companies
- worldwide production markets emerge
- free circulation of people of different nations leads to social benefits
- global environmental problems like cross-boundary pollution, over fishing on oceans, climate changes are solved by discussions
- more trans border data flow using communication satellites, the Internet, wireless telephones, etc.
- international criminal courts and international justice movements are launched
- the standards applied globally like patents, copyright laws and world trade agreements increase
- corporate, national and sub-national borrowers have a better access to external finance

- worldwide financial markets emerge
- multiculturalism spreads as there is individual access to cultural diversity. This diversity decreases due to hybridization or assimilation
- international travel and tourism increases
- worldwide sporting events like the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup are held
- enhancement in worldwide fads and pop culture
- local consumer products are exported to other countries
- immigration between countries increases
- cross-cultural contacts grow and cultural diffusion takes place
- there is an increase in the desire to use foreign ideas and products, adopt new practices and technologies and be a part of world culture
- free trade zones are formed having less or no tariffs
- due to development of containerization for ocean shipping, the transportation costs are reduced
- subsidies for local businesses decrease
- capital controls reduce or vanish
- there is supranational recognition of intellectual property restrictions, i.e., patents authorized by one country are recognized in another.