Originalni naučni rad

*Dragan Lj. TANČIĆ**

Institute for Serbian Culture – Pristina, Leposavic

*Petar D. TANČIĆ***

Faculty of Political Science, European University Brcko Distrikt

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL – GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS DEFINING***

Apstrakt: Savremeni međunarodni, politički, ekonomski, ideološki, vojni, socijalni i drugi odnosi objektivno ne mogu da se na valjan način shvate i objasne bez naučnih saznanja o delovanju međunarodnih (vladinih) organizacija, koje u zavisnosti od moći, uticaja, značaja i članstva rešavaju bitna pitanja koja su nekada bila predmet nacionalne nadležnosti ili bilateralnih odnosa.

Ključne reči: međunarodne i vladine organizacije, međunarodni odnosi, subjekti međunarodnih odnosa, klasifikacija međunarodnih organizacija.

International organizations are important factors of international community and international law, and in that context, taking into consideration the title itself and the subject of this scientific paper, it is also essential to define some basic and derived terms, because in this paper many concepts, synonyms, toponymes and expressions are going to be presented; their meanings are mainly known to the ones who study this topic. The emphasis will be directed to defining the terms: international organization, international relations etc, which are comprehended in function of the content of this scientific research.

For the particular words-terms -international and organization(s)-, the *Serbo-Croatian Dictionary of Standard Language* offers the following definitions:

* Associate Professor, dragan_tancic@yahoo.com

** BA of Political Sciences, deimos_kod@yahoo.co.uk

*** The research paper was written within the Project *Material and Spiritual Culture of Kosovo and Metohija* (No. 178028), approved and financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

International – refers to the relationship between nations, refers to the community of several nations, common for several nations: international society, law, politics, solidarity, competition etc (*Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika* 1969: 331).

Organization – word of French origin, it has three basic meanings, in this paper it will be considered as a: group, community of people or human collective, joined by the mutual program, scope, interest etc. e.g. Organization of United Nations, European Union etc (*Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika* 1971: 183).

Term *international relations* has several meanings. In the recent world literature, particularly the one written by “Western authors”, who deal with this topic, the term international relations is more and more rarely used in titles and texts. Instead of it, the trend of using the term world politics prevails.¹ Although for neither of these terms exist widely spread definitions by which one could make a clear distinction between them, taking into consideration their explanations it is, however, possible to find that their essential difference lies in the width of their frame of use. A number of authors regards that the term international relations refers firstly to the relations between nations (countries), by which in the world business (politics etc), the participation and influence of other, also significant subjects, such as international, nongovernmental (private) organizations etc., gets minimized or excluded. For example, Henry Kissinger says, “the term international relations itself, has been only recently in use, and it implies that the state – nation inevitably has to be the foundation of their organization” (Kisindžer 2003:16). However, there are obvious objections to the adequacy of the term world politics. Simply because the world is not arranged as one supranational organization which could have its own unique “world politics”.

* * *

According to the “Western” theories on international relations, which are used in their analyses by Dimitrijevic V. and Stojanovic R., the subject of studies of international relations, and accordingly their essence, most often

1 In order to illustrate it, let us see some of the most important works originating from the beginning of the 20th century: Rosenay James N., *Turbulence in World Politics: A. Theory of Change and Continuity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990; John Baylis, Steve Smith, “The Globalization of World Politics” ed. University Press, Oxford, 2002; Bull Hedley, *The Anarchical Society: A. Study of Order in World Politics*, London: Macmillan, 1995; Charles W. Keggle, Jr., Eugene R. Witkopf, *Svetska politika: trend i transformacija (World politics: trend and transformation)*, Beograd: Centar za studije j-i Evrope, FPN, Diplomatska akademija, (edited 2002/translated 2004); Charles W. Keggle, Jr., Gregory A. Raymond, *The Global Future: A Brief Introduction to World Politics*, Belmont: Thompson, Wadsworth, 2005.

includes “the nature and elements of power of countries and other actors in international relations, the balance of forces, collective security, leadership and system of decision making in foreign affairs and factors which influence the basic movements in international relations” (Dimitrijević–Račić 1978: 15). However, among scientific theories’ writers from the “West”, we have different opinions. For example, J.W. Burton emphasizes the key role of state in international relations and explains that the theory of international relations pursues “the elucidation and explanation of relations among countries in any assembly of circumstances”, while E. Hass claims that “in the middle of international relations lies the phenomenon of international organization, integration and of functioning of international community as a certain form of a system.”² H. Kissinger affirms that the term international relations is a relatively new one, he adds that they arise from the foreign affairs policy of countries, “which has been making connections among nations since the congress in Vienna” (Kisindžer 1999: 717). Among the newest opinions of large number of American writers, there is a certain revision of comprehension of the international relations and a trend of their being interpreted within the frame of term world politics. Within those, the categories of actors in international relations are extended, also by other categories besides the state, such as influential, nongovernmental international organizations. At the same time, they explain that in the middle of the balance of relations between international actors are the policies, represented and led by individual actors in different areas, all together forming world politics. In the beginning of one of the latest books of Charles W. Kegley and Gregory A. Raymond, a certain literature hit on world politics “The Global Future: a Brief Introduction to World Politics”, the authors draw attention to the still present wrong comprehension of the international relations. They emphasize that “when people use the term international relations, they usually have in their minds a perception of the relations among autonomies, territories of countries which do not have higher authority of government” and they add that “such forms of state autonomy can be merely found in the history, in so-called state-cities, encircled by high walls with their constant defenders” (Kegley–Raymond 2005:5).

Besides the mentioned terms, it is also necessary to define the concept of actors in international relations. The actors in international relations include all the participants or the supporters of activities within the international relations. That is to say, if we consider international relations as dynamic processes and events (operations, activities) on the international scene, than the supporters of those activities are, nevertheless, the actors in international relations. That is why the term actors, instead of the subjects of international relations, are very

2 Read the notions of J. W. Burton and E. Hass according to V. Dimitrijević and R. Stojanović (Dimitrijevic–Stojanovic 1996: 12–13).

often used in the foreign scientific-theoretic fund. For example, Arnold Wolfers defines the actors in international relations as “the ones for which we can suitably say that they play on the international scene.”³

In order to define various kinds of actors, that is to say, in order to answer the question when some unit (the organized group of people, organizations, communities, entity etc.) becomes an actor in the international relations, it is essential to argue on several fundamental questions. One could ask oneself – when does one become an actor in the international relations and which are the required characteristics of actors in international relations. This way, the obligation is imposed to explain whether this is prescribed by someone, by who and in which way, or the aforementioned come to conclusion deriving from experience. We think, based on the up to the present notions and experience, that the international subjectivity of an entity is generally established by taking into account the comparison of the characteristics that provide the international subjectivity to a state, as an indisputable actor in international relations. That means that this refers to the characteristics which entitle the states to take part in international relations, and not to their other characteristics (Dimitrijević–Stojanović 1996: 84–85). It is indisputable that the state has still remained in all theories on international relations one of the most important actors in international relations, which is also confirmed by the Danish Institute for International Affairs.⁴ Today no one questions the existence of other actors in international relations (apart from the state), which often have similar, and not rarely more important influence and role in the international relations (Mansbach 1976).

Taking into account the general consent that the important factors of a state are its territory, population and organization, independent of another state, as well as the capability to govern according to the regulations of the international law, the notion can be accepted that the important characteristics of actors in international relations are organization, independence, international character and political importance, whereas it is necessary to emphasize that actors in international relations do not have to be a priori actors in international law, too.

The force or the power of influence of states in international relations is not reciprocally the same. For example, considering the individual force and relevance of the states in international relations, Daniel Nelson claims that: “we can say with certainty that the USA, China, Russia, Japan and the European Union

3 Wolfers A., “The Actors in International Politics”, cited according to V. Dimitrijevic, R. Stojanovic (1996: 83).

4 According to the notions of the Danish Institute of International Affairs, “the state sovereignty is still the foundation stone of international law and political constitution” (Danish Institute of International Affairs 1999).

are the only countries or unions of states, which entered the new millennium with the power of world actors, that is to say, they individually represent the so-called relevant factors of the international relations... Although their power is not reciprocally the same in all the key elements, every one of them has the capability to greatly influence wider surroundings" (Nelson 1998: 36–58). It is important to stress out Nelson's notion that there are also visible changes of the state's importance, i.e. the reduction and limits of the state's authority, inside as well as outside its borders. Partly, these changes and adaptations refer to the fact that certain rights of the states, until recently considered sovereign, are now claimed by the organizations which the states have joined. Good examples are the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) or the case of formation of the European Union, where its member states transferred a significant part of their own sovereignty, etc.

The existing political and legal literature emphasizes that the 20th century is the century of international organizations. Bearing in mind their number, expanse, authorizations and field of operation, the fact remains that international organizations are without question an important figure in international relations.

As with other terms, when defining the term international organization, there is also a lack of consent. Numerous definitions of the term "international organization" point out that, as in most other terms in social sciences, theorists often do not concur regarding its definition. As an example we may take several scientists' definitions of international organizations:

"International Law Commission of the UN has not assented regarding the definition of international organization, during the codification of contractual law. According to M. Hudson "the international organization is a body formed by several states with various organs, with capacity of taking actions in the name of the state, within the boundaries of its authority". M. Alfaro has defined it as "a community of states which has political or administrative functions regarding vital, common interests of the states, and which is constituted and recognized as an international figure" (Avramov–Kreća 2001: 176).

* * *

According to Smilja Avramov, the fact that there is no unique type of international organization, makes the defining of this term more difficult. She believes that "international organizations, in a wider sense, represent formal institutional forms of international relations, based on voluntary grounds", with the fact that the process of formation and degree of organization of these institutions is entirely pragmatic. "They are the means to simplify the cooperation of sovereign political entities or certain communities of different profile

in a wider worldly extent” (Avramov–Kreća 2001: 177). She states that international organizations are created by conclusion of a multilateral contract, whose aim is to achieve common interests. Important qualities of international organizations are their stability, continuity in acting within the boundaries of their authority, autonomous organs, independent of the states which form those organizations, free will, different opinions from the member states, coming into light through acts passed within the jurisdiction of certain organizations (2001: 177–178).

According to Kozevnikov “international organizations are founded by an international treaty ratified in accordance with constitutional action of the state and which have their own statutes”, according to Moravječki “international organizations are a form of cooperation between sovereign countries based on an international multilateral treaty, which include a stable circle of participants whose main characteristic are permanent organs with constant jurisdictions and authorizations in order to perform actions which lead to achieving a common objective”, according to Račić, Dimitrijević, “international organizations are permanent forms of institutionalized communication between three or more states, founded by multilateral treaties, with a special status and permanent organs within which there are processes of multilateral negotiation and common decision making by the member states, in appropriate areas of international co-operation, all in a way predicted by statutes and different documents passed by the organization” (Dimitrijević–Račić 1978: 16–21).

Willets states that “an international organization is every institution with a formal procedure and formal membership of three or more states. They form the structure of global politics; they have constitutional documents which state their aims, rules and procedures to limit actions, administrative departments, decisions which provide the rules (norms) for the future politics and interactive processes which include new participants. It is of great political significance that international organizations form a system which excludes the possibility to roll down global politics to mere ‘trans-national relations’” (Willets 2001: 356–381).⁵

5 On page 376, Willets classifies international organizations to: “1. intergovernmental organization – IGO – international organization whose members are states and government representatives, 2. international non governmental organization – INGO – whose members are, apart from the states, also transnational actors, companies or political parties, 3. hybrid INGO – joint organization of intergovernmental (IGO) and international non governmental organizations (INGO) and 4. international regime concept developed by neo-realistic school during the analyses of international co-operation which is founded in order to solve certain issues, despite the battle for power between states. According to neo-realists, regime is formed by and sustained by a dominant state and/or every state participates in the regime based on its own calculations”. See above, page 379, patterns of connection between governments and transnational (governmental or non governmental) organizations.

Bearing in mind the subject of this paper, it is essential to define the term Western European. This expression conveys the western part of European continent – European countries and their organizations to the west of the “iron curtain”, which ideologically and politically divided Europe after Cold War. We note that, when determined in this manner, the term western European encompasses European countries similar by their capitalistic political regime, bound by their common political, economic, security, cultural, legal and other social values. However, one should make a distinction between the term western European and the term proclaiming western European values, because accepting so called “western European values” by most of east European countries does not mean expanding the term western European to the whole continent.

* * *

Starting from the very subject of this paper, in this part it is essential to determine the meaning of the term *strategy*. Strategy is one of the most common terms which, when used explicitly, in politics, economics, commercial politics etc, can be derived into a number of individual and special meanings. The term strategy is defined through the subject area, the scientific and theoretic (and ideological) point of view, and the intended purpose to which the term is to be used. Therefore, different definitions of the term are the result of not only objective scientific perception and contemplation of authors, but also of different conditions of their creation and evolution, tradition and stereotypes of certain countries. Since this thesis speaks of the phenomena which appear mainly in the West (the European Union, and the USA as well) then, in order to understand it, we must determine the “western” interpretation and apprehension of the term strategy.

In American literature, the general term strategy is connected to the state and the force, and it is used to denominate the approach and the conception (science, theory, concept, programmes). Certain American authors often use the expression Grand or High Strategy. For example, E. M. Earl defines the Grand Strategy as “the skill to rule and utilize all means of which a nation or a coalition of nations disposes at a certain moment, including the armed forces with the purpose to sustain the important interests and protect national interests from: enemies, the real, the possible or the probable” (Earl 1952: 2–3). A bit different determination is that of Colin S. Gray, also American theorist, who says that “the Grand Strategy is unique, synthetic and multilateral and it includes, among other, politics, economics, technology, ideology and geography as well” (Gray 1991: 323).

British theorists, also, often use the term Grand or High Strategy and many equalize it with the national war politics or the politics of the government which

commands the war. According to Liddell Hart, “the task of High Strategy is to coordinate all resources of one nation and to direct them towards the achievement of the political goal of the war: the goal defined by the national politics. High Strategy is supposed to calculate and develop economic resources and manpower of one nation in order to breed military services” (Hart 1952: 199). According to the British Defence Doctrine (year 1996), strategy is defined as “the systematic plan of action to apply national resources in order to achieve objectives of national politics (including objectives of an alliance or a coalition). Its sense is to direct and secure the unity of all aspects of national politics.” (British Defence Doctrine 1996: 1–8) So, both according to European and American authors, strategy is mainly defined in the context of nation’s political, economic and security interests.

Judging from the above, it remains fact that international organizations are relevant factors of international community and international law; that not even the UN have so far assented regarding the definition of international organization, that international organization is a body formed by several states with permanent organs, and the capacity of action which is performed in the name of the states within its authority; that they represent formal institutional forms of international relations based on discretionary basis; that they are created by conclusion of multilateral treaties and their purpose is to achieve common interests. Important characteristics of international organizations are their persistence, continuity in performing actions within their authority, free will, different viewpoint from the member states, expressing itself through acts reached within the legal power of certain organizations.

* * *

International organizations can be classified based on different criteria, but those starting points of classifications have to comply with some general and specific methodological principles of social and economic studies. This implies our obligation to start from the orders that every classification has to deal with a subject, that has to be systematic, multi-member and that all the members of classification must have one common characteristic-qualification, according to which they make part of the volume and content of the term. Generally speaking, the classification has to be connected with the essence, content, form, quality, quantity, space, time or with several qualifications at once. The primary goal of classification in the methodology of social, economic, political and other studies and scientific disciplines refers to the scientific notion of members reciprocally and to the whole.

Respecting the aforementioned general and basic methodological principles of classification, it is possible to make a valid classification of international organizations in the already existing scientific fund.

Based on that, international organizations can be classified according to several criteria (more on: Avramov–Kreća 2001: 176–183).

Taking into consideration the most common classification, international organizations can be, according to the criterion of generality, classified into: universal, regional and organizations of especially involved states, e.g. the Organization of United Nations (OUN). The regional include all or great majority of states of a specific region, e.g. the European Union (EU), the Organization of African Unity (OAU) etc. According to the criterion of permanence they are divided into: permanent or temporary, according to the criterion of aptness to becoming a member into: open and closed, according to the sphere of action into: general and specialized, according to the criterion of authorization which they have at disposal into: deliberative, operative, and supranational international organizations.

On the other hand, bearing in mind the contemporary international practice, key areas within the state policy, which concern management and division of national values and resources, which are more and more entangled into responsibilities of multinational and global financial institutions and nongovernmental organizations, what generally leads to the fragmentation of states – in a way that more and more circumferential economies are born, primarily dependent on dominant multinational economies, and not on the state from which they originate, it is possible to classify international organizations into:

1. *International nongovernmental ("private") organizations* – association of groups and individuals from different countries, whose objective is not lucrative, instead they are interested in a general welfare. This sort of international organization is most numerous in the world today. According to some data their number rises up to 150.000. Of course, the most influential are those which have consultative status within the organs and bodies of international public (trans-national) organizations, e.g. within the councils of the UN, such as Amnesty International, in the field of specific professions, such as International Organization of Chemists or in the field of sport – International Federation of Football Association (commonly known as FIFA) and many others.

2. *Trans-national economic organizations* – in the first place include multinational firms or multinational companies, corporations, which have their departments in many countries. According to data brought by V. Dimitrijevic and R. Stojanovic, multinational companies from the USA make one third of this kind of international relations' actors (1996: 138).

3. *Trans-national political movements* – which gather around people and political organizations (parties of similar convictions from different countries with the purpose of wider influence on political and economic relations).

4. *Trans-national religious organizations* – as we have the case with Holy See or World Council of Churches, or some radical religious groups, mixed with the national movements, which because of their aggressive doctrine of intolerance towards other religions and people cannot be accepted as actors in international relations.

LITERATURE

- Avramov–Kreća 2001: Smilja Avramov – Milenko Kreća. *Međunarodno javno pravo*. Beograd: Savremena administracija.
- British Defence Doctrine 1996: *British Defence Doctrine*. London: Joint Warfare Publication.
- Daniel 1997: Nelson N. Daniel, "Threats and Capacities: Great Power and Global Insecurity". In: Michael T. Klare – Yogesh Chandrani. *World Security: Challenges for a New Century (Third edition)*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Danish Institute of International Affairs 1999: *Humanitarian Intervention: Legal and Political Aspects*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute of International Affairs.
- Dimitrijević–Račić 1978: Vojin Dimitrijević – Obrad Račić. *Međunarodne organizacije*. Beograd: Savremena administracija.
- Dimitrijević–Stojanović 1996: Vojin Dimitrijević – Radoslav Stojanović. *Međunarodni odnosi*. Beograd: Službeni list SRJ.
- Erl 1952: Evdard Mid. *Tvorci moderne strategije*. Beograd: Vojno delo: Kultura.
- Gray 1001: Colin S. Gray. "Geography and Grand Strategy". *Comparative Strategy*. Vol. 10, No. 4, 311–329.
- Hart 1952: Bazil Henri Lidel Hart. *Strategija posrednog prilaženja*. Beograd: Vojno delo.
- Kegley–Raymond 2005: Charles W. Kegley Jr. – Gregory A. Raymond. *The Global Future A. Brief Introduction to World Politics*. Blemont: Wadsworth Publishing Co Inc.
- Kisindžer 1999: Henri Kisindžer. *Diplomatija*. Beograd: Verzal press.
- Kisindžer 2003: Henri Kisindžer. *Da li je Americi potrebna spoljna politika*. Beograd: BMG.
- Mansbach 1976: Richard W. Mansbach. *The Web of World Politics: Nonstate Actors in the Global System*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Mitić 1999: Miodrag Mitić. *Diplomatija: delatnost, organizacija, veština, profesija*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika 1969: *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika*, knj. treća (K–O). Novi Sad: Matica Srpska.
- Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika 1971: *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika*, knj. četvrta (O–P). Novi Sad: Matica Srpska.
- Willets 2001: Peter Willets. "Transnational Actors and International Organizations in Global Politics". In: John Baylis – Steve Smith. *The Globalization of World Politics- An Introduction to International Relations*, II Edition. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Dragan Lj. TANČIĆ

Petar D. TANČIĆ

METODOLOŠKI PROBLEMI DEFINISANJA MEĐUNARODNIH
– VLADINIH ORGANIZACIJA

REZIME

Generalno uzevši, možemo izvesti opšti zaključak da na početku dvadesetprvog veka država i dalje ostaje najvažniji subjekt međunarodnih odnosa, osnovna organizaciona jedinica ljudskog društva i ključni činilac globalnog mira i prosperiteta. Međutim, s druge strane, postoji izražena tendencija prema redukciji uloge države, dok je istovremeno rast uticaja ostalih subjekata međunarodnih odnosa nesporan u savremenoj političkoj i ekonomskoj praksi.

Ključne reči: međunarodne i vladine organizacije, međunarodni odnosi, subjekti međunarodnih odnosa, klasifikacija međunarodnih organizacija.