Yuliya Senyuk
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine

THE CULTURES OF ANARCHY OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON EUROPEAN INTEGRATION PROCESSES

The article presents the problem of the research of the cultures of anarchy of the international system, in particular, their influence on the intensity of European integration processes in the historical retrospective. The study determines the basic tenets and peculiarities of social constructivist theorizing of the cultures of anarchy of the international system. Also, it illustrates the differences between classical conceptualizations. It reveals that within the framework of the social constructivist approach, the anarchy of the international system is considered for the first time as a social rather than autonomous phenomenon. In this context, in the article is evaluated the influence of social and intersubjective factors, in particular, collective knowledge (ideas), rules and norms, as well as interests and identities on the formation of the cultures of anarchy of the international system and on the actors. The peculiarities of the integration processes at the European regional level considering the type of anarchy of the culture of the international system are characterized.
Keywords: social constructivism, the Hobbesian culture of anarchy, the Lockean culture of anarchy, the Kantian culture of anarchy, internalization, the European Union.

An important notion of contemporary postmodern studies in the science of international relations is the interpretation of anarchy in the international environment. It differs from the others proposed earlier by neorealists and neo-liberalists because shifts the emphasis of the research from the structural conditions of the anarchic system into social relations and constructions in it. In particular, within the social constructivist framework anarchy is interpreted as a structure created by states through interaction. Therefore it is not an autonomous phenomenon. States can behave or not behave selfishly and such fluctuations in behavior can modify the nature of anarchy[1]. Ergo, states influence the formation and evolution of anarchy which can acquire different forms. Thus, the representatives of social constructivism criticize the assertion that an anarchic system inevitably leads to the rivalry and war. The threat is a phenomenon of social construction and interstate conflicts are conditioned by the features of the anarchic system. Consequently, the substance of anarchy and the consequences of its existence in the international environment are formed by actors, in particular, by their interpretation of the system, which can change over the time. Intersubjective and institutionalized ideas, collective knowledge as a set of norms, rules, institutions, conventions, ideologies, customs, laws form one of the types of the culture of anarchy of the international system. The trends in such culture of anarchy develop due to the dominant social roles existing in the society. The social role of the actors is important because every time it changes, the cultural forms are transformed.

The founder of the social constructivist approach in the theory of international relations – A. Wendt distinguished three types of the anarchy of the international system which differ in key ideas in the formation of interstate relations. This thesis implies the possibility of the existence of diverse types of communities which can be based on different social relations within the formal anarchic structure of the international system[2].

At the core of the anarchy of the international system is, mostly a cultural, not material structure, formed on objective roles – friend, rival, and enemy. Their behavior is determined by the distribution of identities of the actors, each of which represents its own positioning towards counteragents and intentions regarding the use of violence. Having the identity of the enemy, actors do not adhere to any restrictions on the use of violent methods towards the others. The rivals use some elements of violence

[1] Wendt, A. (2003). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 18.
[2] Reus-Smit, C. (2008). *The Oxford Handbook Of International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 303-304.

to achieve their own interests, however, refrain from the mutual destruction. The friends try not to resort to the violence methods in the process of conflicts resolving[1]. Each of the types of behavior mentioned above leads to the emergence of one of the three types of the culture of anarchy of the international system and causes the nascence of hostile, competitive or friendly mutual perceptions between states which reflect the nature of interaction at the macro level. It is formed on the basis of subjective perception and subsequently transformed into general representations which are the foundation of the international system, thus creating a particular type of culture. Consequently, the nature of the international system is determined by the existing general ideas of its actors. At the same time, the latter determines the parameters of the behavior of the states. For example, in the case when most participants of the system consider each other as rivals, the Lockean culture will prevail. The rivalry becomes not only the property of individual actors but also the system as a whole. Thus, each actor positions himself and others as rivals.

The Hobbesian culture of anarchy is characterized by a struggle for dominance and the presence of hostile relations between actors who do not restrict their purposes and form interests depending on the current situation taking into account the possibility of its negative change and act to outperform the opponent's behavior in order to achieve relative benefit. The basic foundations of the functioning of this type of anarchy are egocentricity, rationality and the possibility of the use of power component in the foreign policy strategy of the actors. In the Hobbesian culture of anarchy the formation of the role of enemy occurs through the modeling of the image of the "Other" as an actor who does not recognize the right of autonomy and freedom of the "Self", therefore, the use of violence in relation to the latter is unlimited. Any restrictions may exist only because of inability of the actors (the existence of a balance of forces, exhaustion) or external constraints[2]. The role of the enemy is symmetric because the "Self" adversely reflect the "Other" and for survival and self-preservation begins to treat them hostile.

Military power becomes decisive. Within this type of anarchy between states exists a general understanding that the actors with which they interact have the same intentions as themselves, namely, they are enemies that contain a threat to the existence and freedom. The logic of the Hobbesian culture of anarchy can be illustrated by the statement "the war of all against all" in which actors actions are based on the principle of destroying or be destroyed. This is a self-sustaining system where nobody can rely on the help of the others in the self-preservation issues and survival depends solely on military power. The Hobbesian culture of anarchy does not provide the possibility for the formation of neutrality.

The basis of the Lockean "deterrence culture" of anarchy is competition. In the Lockean anarchy, actors play the role of rivals. The relations between them are formed on the basis of the principles of balance of power, neutrality and conflict management. It affects the limitation of their goals in the international environment. The rivals create an impression of themselves and others within the category of violence but they are less threatening than in the previous type. Unlike the general representations of the enemies, rivals expect from each other to pursue a behavior aimed at recognizing the sovereignty and freedom of the others where the desire for domination in the international environment is absent. Regardless of existing controversies, the states respect the status quo regarding the issue of each other sovereignty. That is precisely the factor which reduces the risks in security issues. The presence of high military potential is an important factor and rivals can use force methods to resolve disputes, however, the value of the force differs from that one described in the previous type of anarchy, because compliance with the principle of sovereignty changes the "balance of threats". War is allowed but it is very limited. It is not aimed to stop the existence of the state as a separate unit. Hence, the balance of power is the main factor in the formation of an anarchic system of this type, which, moreover, implies the probability of proclaiming neutrality or non-alignment.

According to A. Wendt, the domination of legal values forms the Kantian system of "eternal peace" in which the states construct a common notion of "We", adhering to the general rules and norms conducted in the international environment. Within the Kantian culture actors are positively identified by each other but sometimes they can use force to settle disputes. Attempting to reproduce collective security practices they are simultaneously relying on themselves in security issues. The friends expect from each other to settle disputes without the threat of a war (the principle of non-use) and also that they will act collectively if any of them is threatened by a third party (the principle of mutual assistance). States are in the frames

---

[1] Wendt, A. (2003). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 258-259.
[2] Wendt, A. (2003). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 261.

of Kantian culture when they are aware of the external restrictions imposed on them by the others. They are capable to impose self-control on the use of violence, which is not a permissible way of managing relationships with the other actors.

General rules of behavior typical for each of the types of culture are recognized by the actors at least at a minimal level. A. Wendt identifies three levels of internalization of norms within each of the three types of cultures of anarchy of the international system. The first level assumes that the established norms are followed because of the threat of the use of force as punishment for violations and is exclusively a function of coercion. At the second level, actors perceive observance of the norms as an element of their own interests. Permanent compliance with the norms can lead to the third level of internalization when states consider them as legitimate and as a part of their essence[1]. Only at this level, the norms really "construct" the states, shaping their main interests and identities. However, the Hobbesian culture of anarchy may be the result of a common ideas and the process of social construction at the third level of internalization, not solely conditioned by material factors, as well as the Kantian culture of anarchy may arise because of the presence of interests caused by the threat of punishment (first level) or benefits from cooperation (second level). The degree of cooperation between actors depends on the third level of the internalization of roles (their legitimacy) in accordance with which states subjectively identify the role structure of the existing culture of anarchy of the international system, and not the type of culture, as a set of general knowledge about the relationship of states directly[2].

The cultures of anarchy of the international system depend on discursive practices and social historical processes that reproduce or change the target representations of each actor about himself and others. The states form anarchy. The Hobbesian system will be maintained only when actors continue to interact taking into account selfish and militaristic considerations. If they involve new practices, then over the course of time the Hobbesian culture can be transformed into another. Each of the cultures of anarchy of the international system can also be in transitional period. Then it will acquire features of the other types of cultures. In this case, states can pursue goals and use methods typical for actors, who are in the structures of another level.

The culture of anarchy of the international system, which is an important element in shaping the identity and behavior of the actors in world politics, has a decisive influence on the course of international interactions, in particular at the European regional level, contributing to the construction of conflicts or cooperation.

The reasons for the appearance and the degree of cooperation differs depending on the internationalization and behavioral model typical to an appropriate culture of anarchy of the international system, which, from the standpoint of A. Wendt, affects the dynamics of cooperation, transforming the interests of actors by external incentives and constraints[3]. Considering that the states are in several social contexts, the calculation of cooperation between them has to be carried out according to their mutual perception, which influences the formation of the interests. Social constructivists argue that the ways of interaction between actors influence the change of their expectations and, at the same time, determine identity, and hence interests. It is important to notice that the change of identities under certain conditions can lead to the redefinition of interests, and this cause the emergence of structural changes in the culture of anarchy of the international system.

During a long historical period, European states coexisted in the conditions of the Hobbesian culture of anarchy of the international system being in a position of war all against all. At that period of time, the main problems of multilateral relations between European countries were the issues of the protection of national sovereignty, as well as territorial disputes. Survival was the main goal of every actor, and it was conditioned by the presence of a sense of insecurity, in particular in the process of socialization. This influenced to the country's egocentric foreign policy with the elements of the use of force component. The foreign policy of the European states of the pre-Westphalian period corresponded to the idea of „war to the victorious end".

---

[1] Foreman, A. (2005). Social Theory, Europe and Politics: European Integration and the Transformation of the State in Alexander Wendt's Social Theory of International Politics. *Brussels Journal of International Studies, 3,* 18.

[2] Guzzini, S., Leander, A. (2006). *Constructivism and International Relations. Alexander Wendt and his critics.* London and New York: Routledge, 160.

[3] Lebow, R. (2007). *Coercion, Cooperation, and Ethics in International Relations.* New York and London: Routledge, 299.

From the XVII century, the period of the Lockean culture of deterrence began and it reduced the level of conflicts. The institutionalization of sovereignty marked the change of the Hobbesian anarchy in which states treated each other as the enemies who were struggling in order survive to the Lockean deterrence culture in which states recognized the right of each other to exist.

Before the beginning and during the First and Second World Wars, there was observed a process of transition from the Lockean to the Hobbesian culture of anarchy of the international system again. On the basis of endogenous signs of corporate and immanent identities (type of political and economic systems, representations about the others), features of the collective knowledge, existed at that time, and under the influence of exogenous factors (the role of the enemy formed within the framework of the system existed at that time) between the European countries arose the hostile type of relationship, which contributed to the returning of the Hobbesian culture of anarchy of international system. The consequence of that process was a global armed confrontation. It is obvious that at that time it was impossible to create the prototype of the integration association because the European nation-states were threatened by the possibility to lose sovereignty. However, aimed to destroy the enemies and establish a balance of power temporary military alliances were created.

The devastating consequences of the Hobbesian culture of anarchy caused serious shifts and Europeans feel the urgent need to introduce s strict wars regulation system. In addition, it can be assumed that vulnerability, as one of the modalities of socialization between European countries, was at a high level, thereby it provoked a change of collective identity as the first step towards Kantian anarchy. The primate of common destiny and self-control institute played an equally important role in the process of the European Union creation. This led to the transformation of the Hobbesian culture of anarchy, stimulated countries in the region to create an integration project that contributed to the emergence of the features of the Kantian type of the culture of anarchy and elements of collective security system on the European continent.

Thus, from the beginning of the XXI st century, in the countries of the West Europe the Kantian culture of peace (collective security) has begun to form. This culture was aimed at the formation of "We"-understanding between the states and the emergence of a wider range of opportunities to implement collective action, despite the existence of obstacles. Within the Kantian culture of anarchy member states of the European Union begun to accept the external constraints that were formed by the community or other states individually and to control the use of violence. They began to form an embryonic collective identity, common norms, values and rules and so on. States recognized each other as equal and established friendly relations. Despite the lack of a common position on foreign and security policy still within the European Union was observed the high ability of the states-members of the association to establish communication and cooperation.

The features of the Kantian type of culture that pre-existed in the European Union arose not as a result of the transformation of the Lockean culture of anarchy but from the Hobbesian, as a result of complex conflicts, formed by it when the society felt the urgent need for a rigid system of regulation of violence. In Europe, such a key point was the experience of the Second World War, the Holocaust, victimization and, to a lesser extent, the feelings of guilt of individual countries, which resulted in the transition from hostile to the post-national type of culture in the shortest time possible.

A radical approach to the transformation of relations between European countries has led to the development of a post-national community – the European Union – a regional element of the Kantian culture of anarchy. This caused a deep reconstruction of identities of the member states of the European integration organization[1].

In general, at the present phase, the Lockean type of the culture dominates at the global level as the states continue to compete among themselves and can resort to the use of force. However, they do not try to destroy each other. In the European Union, the process of returning from the Kantian to the Lockean type of culture is also observed, which is conditioned by current social, political, institutional, migration and economic crises.

So, the significant contribution of the representatives of the social constructivist approach to the theory of international relations, especially to the study of the cultures of anarchy of the international

---

[1] Lacassagne, A. Cultures of Anarchy as Figurations: Reflections on Wendt, Elias and the English School. *Human Figurations: Long-term Perspectives on the Human Condition.* <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/humfig/ 11217607.0001.207/--cultures-of-anarchy-as-figurations-reflections-on-wendt?rgn=main;view=fulltext> (2018, January, 04).

system is that they reject the traditional way of its interpretation and offer an alternative understanding of the peculiarities of its essence. The main assertion of the theorists is to emphasize the importance of the interactions of states in the process of its formation, and therefore in recognition of the equality and mutual constitutionality of the anarchy of the international environment and actors. The researchers distinguish three types of anarchy of the cultures of the international system which differ in their logic and trends – Hobbesian, Lockean and Kantian, and are based on the types of roles that are characterized by hostility, competition and, cooperation, respectively. However, this list is not exhaustive. The culture of anarchy of the international system may also be in the transitional period and contain the features of the various types. In this case, the actors can pursue the goals and use the methods typical for the countries that are embedded in the structures of another level.

For a long period of time, European states were the parts of the Hobbesian culture of anarchy which made it impossible for the integration processes to emerge.

Subsequently, the process of transition to the Lockean type of culture took place, which, however, did not prevent from returning to the conditions of the hostile culture of the Hobbesian anarchy during the period of two world wars. Only the devastating effects of total armed confrontation caused the transformation of the behavior of European states and, accordingly, the culture of anarchy of the international system on the regional level, which began to acquire features of the Kantian type. It contributed to the formation of an integration organization of supranational type – the European Union. However, taking into account existing problems caused by the social, political, institutional, migration and economic crises that have embraced the European community it is possible to confirm the thesis about slow returning to the features of the Lockean type of the culture of anarchy of the international system, which causes weakening of the intensity of integration processes between the member states of the European Union.

References:

1. Foreman, A. (2005). Social Theory, Europe and Politics: European Integration and the Transformation of the State in Alexander Wendt's Social Theory of International Politics. *Brussels Journal of International Studies, 3.* [in English].
2. Guzzini, S., Leander, A. (2006). *Constructivism and International Relations. Alexander Wendt and his critics.* London and New York: Routledge. [in English].
3. Lacassagne, A. Cultures of Anarchy as Figurations: Reflections on Wendt, Elias and the English School. *Human Figurations: Long-term Perspectives on the Human Condition.* <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/humfig/ 11217607.0001.207/--cultures-of-anarchy-as-figurations-reflections-on wendt?rgn= main;view=fulltext> (2018, January, 04). [in English].
4. Lebow, R. (2007). *Coercion, Cooperation, and Ethics in International Relations.* New York and London: Routledge. [in English].
5. Reus-Smit, C. (2008). *The Oxford Handbook Of International Relations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in English].
6. Wendt, A. (2003). *Social Theory of International Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].