

THE INDIVIDUAL IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE PARADIGM

ФАКТОР ЛЮДИНИ У МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИНАХ: ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ПАРАДИГМИ

Denysenko K.Yu.

PhD in Political Sciences, Associate Professor at the International relations and foreign policy chair of the Institute of International Relations of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. E-mail: mvi.dkyu@clouds.iir.edu.ua
ORCIDID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1032-1281>

Денисенко К.Ю.

Кандидат політичних наук, доцент кафедри міжнародних відносин та зовнішньої політики Інституту міжнародних відносин Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка E-mail: mvi.dkyu@clouds.iir.edu.ua
ORCIDID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1032-1281>

Abstract. *The article raises a whole complex of issues about the growing role of the individual in international relations. An individual in international relations is studied from the position of leaders and the political elites surrounding them, a mass person, a person as a stochastic factor in international relations, human qualities, self-identification, belonging to a particular socio-anthropological group, psychological and physical condition and much more. Due to the specificity of this new actor, it is proposed to develop a new discipline which is called anthropology of international relations. Some aspects of the institutionalization of this discipline are also analyzed by the author.*

Keywords: *individual, human factor, international relations, anthropology, anthropologization.*

Анотація. *Стаття розкриває цілий комплекс питань, які стосуються зростаючої ролі людини у міжнародних відносинах. Людина у міжнародних відносинах досліджується з позиції лідерів і політичних еліт, людина як стійкий фактор в міжнародних відносинах, людські якості, самоідентифікація, приналежність до певної соціо – антропологічної групи, самоідентифікація, психологічні особливості та інші фактори. Посилення ролі людини у міжнародних відносинах сприяє розробці нової дисципліни – антропології міжнародних відносин. Деякі аспекти цієї дисципліни аналізуються автором.*

Ключові слова: *людина, фактор людини, міжнародні відносини, антропологія, антропологізація.*

Introduction. Recently, there has been a growing interest to the individual in scientific research and practical activities in the field of international relations. This trend is followed, for example, in the academic call for the recognition of the importance of individuals in international politics. Similar changes have already occurred in other branches of knowledge, have been defined as the growing anthropologization of modern science.

Not all branches of knowledge immediately recognized such correlations. The science of international relations is very indicative in this context. In accordance with the primary tendencies, it was initially oriented toward the study of the role of statesmen as the main creators of foreign policy. In democratic conditions, the influence of public opinion on the formation and implementation of foreign policy was also taken into consideration (Bailey, 1948).

Despite the very early interest of some well-known specialists in the possibilities of anthropology and the study of the role of the individual, their undertakings did not receive recognition in the discipline. In the early 1980s, anthropologists themselves attempted to enter international relations, but this attempt was not particularly successful. Thus, competent European authors had to state in 1993: “It is quite legitimate to say that there is no anthropology of international relations between nation-states” (Eriksen, Neumann 1993). But, as they say, the message was received, and soon other authors recorded an important change in mood: “Specialists formed in the post-Cold War era seem to have intuitively grasped the idea that the study of international relations should be devoted primarily to people, and that the ways in which people are drawn into these relations are difficult to simplify” (Hudson, Vore, 1995). The emerging trend can also be linked to the discussion of the role of individuals in international politics that unfolded in the 1990s (Morgan 1994; Rosenau 1990).

Already at the beginning of the new century the anthropology of international relations in theoretical and practical terms as the discipline started to focus on the humanization of these relations themselves and the spheres of human life.

Definitions, methods, and research structure. The subject matter of the study is the status of the individual in world politics. The hypothesis of this paper is the following: individuals can influence the behavior of the international system. The purpose of the article is to examine a wide range of issues devoted to the role of the individual in international relations. The emergence of the new discipline – the anthropology of international relations in its theoretical and practical terms is also the subject matter of the study.

The methodological basis of the research is the systematic approach which helped the authors to study the growing role of the individual in international relations. The content analysis method was used for the analysis of a great number of textual and visual information from different electronic and non-electronic resources. The descriptive method helped to present the results of the study in the logical sequence. But, as we consider, the comparative method allowed us to obtain reliable conclusions that the problems connected with individuals have for a long time been given by the science of international relations to other disciplines and were poorly connected with the subject field of the analysis of international life.

Literature review. In 1990, in the changing political climate at the end of the Cold War, James Rosenau published a book entitled “Turbulence in World Politics, a Theory of Change and Continuity” (Rosenau, 1990). This book looks at international affairs from a new perspective. The main focus of Rosenau’s analysis could be summarized as a change of actors. Rosenau studies the changes that are taking place in the post-Cold War era, influenced by the information technology revolution. In this constellation, one conspicuous factor in Rosenau’s view is the growing importance of the role of individuals in the conduct of international affairs.

Michel Gerard in his book “Les individus dans la politique internationale” clarified the role of individuals in international affairs. Girard argues that all kinds of theories from Grotius’s concept of international law to nineteenth century thinking ranging from Kant, Cobden, Proudhon, and even Marx have “contributed to keep open the question of the place and role of the individual in world politics” (Gerard, 1994).

The paper introduces constructivism as asserted by Alexander Wendt, observing that it gives individuals a greater place in international relations in his book “Social Theory of International Politics” (Wendt, 1999).

Michael Nicholson’s article “Individuals and Their Influence on the International System” in *Individualism and World Politics* (1999) also discusses the role of individuals in the changing situation after the end of the Cold War, clarifying the circumstances in which relevant individuals change history (Nicholson, 1999).

A number of works dedicated to the formation of political anthropology and the anthropology of international relations have already been published in Ukraine by: Kravets A (Kravets, 2012), Krysenko O. (Krysenko, 2009), Melnyk V. (Melnyk, 2012), but unfortunately the subject of the research still lacks study.

Main results of the research.

Despite the emergence of several works related to the discussion of the individual in international relations, it cannot be claimed that the anthropology of international relations has already fully developed. It would also be a mistake to claim that the human factor in international relations is already widely recognized in the professional field. Most publications of this kind so far demonstrate the beginning of the development of a new branch of knowledge with all the ensuing consequences. Therefore, the task of discussing some general issues and prospects for the integration of anthropology as a complex science of the individual and international relations studies remains relevant. Considering the scale of the task, in this article it is necessary to concentrate on the review of a few theoretical and methodological aspects.

It is obvious that the need to update the existing research toolkit is explained by the revealed inconsistency of previously used instruments and approaches. In the light of already presented studies, it is quite reasonable to underline that the problems associated with individuals, their communities and have for a long time been, in fact, given by the science of international relations to other disciplines such as socio-cultural anthropology, very weakly connected with the subject field of the analysis of international life.

Some scholars consider that the end of the Cold war gave rise to the transformation of the human factor in international relations. But it is not only the noted historical period that determined the relevance of the problem of the human factor in this area of knowledge. After all, it cannot be claimed that interest is exclusively an achievement of the present day. Already during the previous 19th-20th centuries, all possible studies of the individual were actualized in socio-political thought and practice. After the rejection of various kinds of teleological explanations, everything began with a general philosophical and liberal-idealistic orientation toward universal values and common human interests. Then Marxism developed its class approach, and conservatism placed on the first place the “heroic personality” - the statesman. Heroism in this case meant the endowment of subjects of power with moral qualities, including the specific sense of ethic and responsibility. Here it would be appropriate to recall the well-known formula of the classic realist G. Morgenthau: “Nations behave like people” (Morgenthau, 2005). It is noteworthy that the modern theorist of constructivism in international relations A. Wendt was also sure: “States are people too” (Wendt, 1999). The role of the individual was perceived as the central one, determining the development of the social system.

It is no less obvious that the emerging scientific inconsistency is often caused by the emergence of new realities that confront the scientific and political communities with previously unknown prospects, tasks and threats. Since the tendency to reassess the role and significance of the individual in international relations manifested itself in the 1960s-1980s, the general context of its emergence seems to be obvious. Here we have the beginning of globalization, the collapse of the bipolar world system, the human rights revolution, a new stage of democratic transition and several other moments. But the new actualization of the problem was largely conditioned, along with other circumstances, by the postmodernist challenge, which in the late 1960s-1970s of the last century posed its own “inconvenient” questions to the universalist and objectivist intentions of social and humanitarian knowledge. In the postmodern era, it is no longer possible to be satisfied with a simple statement of the fact that society, the state, the institutions, ideas and practices associated with them are created and maintained by people who have a certain unified “nature”. Now it is necessary to consider and understand the inevitable introduction of their limited “subjective” ideas into the same economy, politics and international relations (Devetak, 2005).

Therefore, the notorious “human factor” as the direct participation of a person in various institutions and practices should nevertheless be separated for research purposes from the most complex socio-political reality of states, nations, etc. Failure to meet this methodological requirement inevitably affects an adequate analysis of this kind of reality. It is significant that the desire to “bring the problem of the individual in international relations to a properly scientific basis” was initially expressed in the active involvement of psychological approaches and concepts (De Rivera 1968, Tetlock, Goldgeier 2000).

Various authors also began to actively use the concepts of the unconscious, perception, and other psychological categories (Jervis 1986, Voss, Dorsey, 1992). The first initiatives in this field were already loudly praised as a “revolution in the study of the human element in international relations” (Mandel, 1986). One of the shortcomings of trying to solve all problems based on a psychological approach was noted by the famous Norwegian specialist I. Neumann: “The study of international politics by the criteria of perception, belief systems, operational codes, (images of enemies), and so on, has reached a dead end, since it has tended to begin and end with socially unconditioned “I” ...” [Neumann, 1993]. There is already an explanation of why this happens: “At its core, this problem is twofold: psychologists usually underestimate the complexity of the task of adapting psychological concepts to world politics, while specialists in international relations overestimate their ability to create convincing explanations that are based on psychology” (Tetlock, Goldgeier 2000). No wonder then that the “human revolution” in international relations has gotten stuck within the framework of political psychology.

Another revision of previous approaches to the problem of the individual, has become widespread, when scholars were too passionate in developing different types or models of man (manager, player, economic etc.). Political science, including international relations, did not remain aside from these new trends. As a result, a new definition appeared “political man” (Lane, 1972). An illustrative example of an attempt to conceptualize it was the detailed work of the famous American political scientist R. Lane. The author's attention was focused on the systems of basic human beliefs, in the formation of which an important role was assigned to political socialization. In accordance with such attitudes, the author believed that “political personality can be defined as an organized, dynamic response to political stimuli” (Lane, 2003).

It is noteworthy that the role of the individual in international relations was presented in a similar way by different authors. For some, modern man is truly a world historical individual along with the local social environment and traditions, factors of the global order, the dialogue of cultures and civilizations, and global spiritual production in the form of science, art, and mass communications in which he actively participates. Others consider personification of international relations is the flip side of the processes of “internationalization” and “globalization” of the world economy, reflecting the growing role of the individual in international relations and his transformation into a subject of international relations. The international individual is a person who associates the satisfaction of his needs not only with his state, but also with the world community in general. At the same time, the fact that the international individual is not only a person of the world, but to a significant extent is a person of the future is indicative. Thus, considering the number of factors, the international individual was given a significant role in the new discipline: as an independent social type. He was considered as the basis for the cultivation of an independent branch of humanitarian knowledge - the anthropology of international relations.

In general, the analysis of the main approaches to the problem of the individual in socio-political life and the concepts that have developed on their basis allows, despite some scientific inconsistency in relation to this object of research, to state the presence of a certain logic in their development and interaction. At the beginning, mainly general, purely abstract questions concerning the essence of the man and his existence were studied. Then the role and significance of political classes, social groups, etc. Gradually, the focus of research shifted to the development of various models of the individual for certain areas of activity or everyday life. Simultaneously, simple borrowing of psychological concepts into other branches of social and humanitarian knowledge, including international studies, was practiced. But over time, it became increasingly clear that universal models and excursions into psychology left no room for real individuals, including the science of international relations. As the French researcher M. Gerard, who studied this problem specifically, showed, over a long period: “...the question of individuals was reduced, mainly, to approaches based on psychological curiosity or ethical concern...” (Gerard, 1994). It is quite natural that today it is precisely real individuals that are receiving increasing attention in various branches of knowledge.

In the sphere of international relations, modern approaches to the individual began to be introduced somewhere in the last quarter of the twentieth century. Thus, in the early 1980s, the British theorist E. Linklater was only noting the contradiction between the ethical universalism of man and his civil-social particularism. (Linklater, 1984). “We are all representatives of the human race and feel that we have obligations to each other as people, but we are also citizens of separate states”. The presented situation can partly explain the emergence of debates about the problems that arose when trying to combine human rights with the rights of a citizen (Benhabib, 2004).

It is significant that soon the American specialist J. Rosenau raised the question of the need to study the role of ordinary individuals in international politics. This author explained his position precisely by the violation of previous norms regulating this area (Rosenau, 1990). Other researchers expressed concern that “interest in the role of individuals in international politics almost inevitably leads to a rejection of the interstate approach...” (Gerard, 1994).

Moreover, it is obvious that the recognition of ordinary individuals as subjects of international politics inevitably “grounded” its former creators — statesmen, including security professionals. Michel Gerard, already known to us showed: “The irony of fate is that the high politics of national interest and discussions of sovereignty, despite their solemn appearance and deliberate monumentality, are in many ways connected by the strongest threads with the most ordinary behavior of the most ordinary individuals” (Gerard, 1994). So, despite all the fears, the idea of the significance of individuals in international relations should have received wide recognition. Now, for many experts, it has become self-evident that “...although they may accidentally forget this fact, or try to persuade us to forget it, political figures are still human beings, and they all have too much of the human in them” (Tetlock, Goldgeier 2000). It is no coincidence that, when presenting one of the first projects on the role of individuals in international relations, its initiator emphasized: “The individuals in question here are, according to the authors’ intention, primarily ordinary individuals, with trivial perceptions and behavior, no different from other members of their society and their environment” (Gerard, 1994).

However, the wider implementation of the postmodern strategy of deconstruction has forced us to pay attention to the fact that the “elementary individual/person” is not as unambiguous as it might seem at first, if only because of its different gender affiliations. Therefore, the emergence of various kinds of feminist projects, including in the field of international relations, was a natural consequence of the criticism of previous universalist ideas. In fact, according to the followers of this trend, such constructions reflected purely “masculine positions and views” (Sylvester, 1994). It would also be appropriate to recall the studies of the influence on the formation of the individual of various factors that turned out to be outside the traditionally understood socio-political field. At first it was race, and more recently - belonging to various minorities, including diasporas. Thus, the most conscientious authors now considered it their duty to warn: “The individual whom the reader will encounter in this work appears either as an empirical subject... or as a generally accepted analytical construct, which, depending on the cases and authors, appears either as an ideal-typical individual... or as a modal individual, called upon to accurately reproduce the most frequently encountered characteristics of a given group of individuals” (Gerard, 1994).

Thus, the recognition of the importance of the individual has become not just a tribute to some fashion but has become a necessary requirement of the modern stage of research into socio-political life and its international sphere. However, the desire to understand the role of this subject in a rapidly changing world has encountered an obstacle, expressed in the focus of science on individual stages of its development on different aspects of man. As a result, very often there has been an unjustified exaggeration of these individual aspects to the detriment of a holistic perception of the problem itself and the real difficulties in its development.

It is no coincidence that in the desire for “anthropologization”, the introduction of man into the study of various phenomena and entities, we fall, as already noted, into the sin of “anthropomorphization”. It consists in likening the proposed creations (artifacts, models) to a real person/individual, including in the study of the person himself, while endowing them with only those human properties that are considered the most significant “here and now” (Hale, 2008). The

further development of such a methodology was accompanied by the reduction of individuals to their psychologization, professionalization, naturalization, etc. At the same time, the remaining uncertainty with the distinction between specific individuals and "ideal-typical" constructions of a person, on the contrary, made it possible to hypertrophy the individual, replacing him with various communities and associations. Unfortunately, given the desire of the majority of authors of modern theoretical developments in the field of international relations (in fairness, it should still be added, as in all social and humanitarian knowledge) to solve all anthropological problems with the help of the concept of identity, it must be noted that the presented negative practice is still widely used (Guillaume, 2014).

Consequently, it can be stated quite definitely that the recognition of the significance of the man not only as some abstract model, but also as a real individual in international relations and the science that deals with them, is even a somewhat belated step. However, even in the light of a very schematized presentation of the current state of the problem of recognizing a man, it can be concluded that its very formulation, as some authors have warned, cannot but affect the state of this branch of science. On the one hand, the inclusion of individuals in the sphere of international relations definitely puts forward the requirement for the formation of new competencies in order to develop this area of research. It is no coincidence, for example, that at one time the same R. Lane made a call: "to protect political science from itself." He still assigned the role of savior to psychology, which was supposed to protect the branch in question from errors, for example, associated with the judgment that such an important category as interests are purely rational and materialistic (Lane, 2003).

On the other hand, the newly emerging dimension of the international relations sphere has clearly highlighted the remaining gaps in the existing foundations of their study. One of them was noted by M. Gerard as a kind of duel between the supporters of the specificity of international political analysis and their opponents, who consider it as part of political science or social sciences (Gerard, 1994).

Nevertheless, today it is no longer possible to avoid recognizing the fact that international relations and world politics are ultimately implemented by people. Consequently, we must understand who and why makes specific decisions or prepares certain events here. However, the whole point is that people also analyze these areas of politics. Therefore, it would be quite fair to say that we should also know who and why offers us specific assessments and conclusions about the activities of politicians. And, if the "creators" of international politics, one way or another, become the object of research, then their "evaluators" still much less often fall under this kind of control. But it is also necessary to engage in such research, and this should be done by the anthropology of international relations.

A broader view of the problem of the individual in the international sphere has also forced us to pay attention to the significant differences between the modern or postmodern individual participating in them and the representative of the so-called traditional and generally "other" societies (Gerard, 1994). In part, differences of this kind began to be recorded through the use of the concept of civilization, which again became popular thanks to S. Huntington. But the limited list of civilizations clearly could not accommodate the entire diversity of existing variants of communities. The concept of identity is also actively used for the same purpose. As is known, for a long period of time, "traditional societies" remained the object of research primarily in socio-cultural anthropology. In the late 1960s, they also began to be studied by a new discipline - political anthropology (Balandier, 2013). The inclusion of these communities in modern international relations because of globalization, due to their persistent characteristics, is another argument in favor of creating a discipline — the anthropology of international relations.

At the same time, having recognized the significance of man as an individual in international relations, it was impossible not to notice their different capabilities in this area. After all, the powers of the heads of the main branches of government, the heads of foreign policy departments, and the leaders of non-governmental organizations are still not comparable with the capabilities of an individual ordinary citizen. Consequently, the discussion of the problem of the role of individuals in

the formation of international politics and the relations associated with it can only be correctly carried out considering the nature of the socio-political system in which they operate.

Therefore, one should not confuse the international man as a theoretical category with specific individuals who occupy different positions in relation to the institutions, channels and networks for implementing international relations.

Conclusions and discussions. Thus, the recognition of the individual in the field has clearly demonstrated serious shortcomings in the existing theories of international relations. First of all, it touches upon the concerns that the non-strict definition of the terms man and individual are applied. This allowed actively practice anthropomorphization of various actors in international relations, which led to a distorted perception of the essence of the problem of the role of the individual in the international sphere. The way out of the dead end lies in a strict methodological distinction between the level of real individuals and their various associations, including social strata, political nations and humanity, as well as foreign policy institutions, international organizations, etc. Therefore, considering this requirement, we must consider not only and not so much the role of abstract individuals in international relations as such. Now it should be understood that we are obliged to analyze the same institutions, associations and communities, both from the position of the people who make them up with the real qualities and properties of the latter, and from the point of view of the organization, rules, norms and functions of institutions of various kinds. Of course, all of this was also created by people who continue to ensure the existence of institutions and communities in accordance with the laws, rules and requirements of the time.

The fundamental point in this situation is the methodological distinction between the characteristics of real, living individuals and the heritage of previous generations, representing transformed characteristics of previously living people and their environment, which we have already received in a removed form and most often characterized by the same poorly defined term culture. Therefore, the emerging interest in the analysis of the role of culture in international relations seems very indicative (Reeves, 2004).

It is also clear that, despite their anthropological nature, in the first and second cases we have a different kind of reality, which must be studied in accordance with its features. Consequently, along with the same familiar psychology, there is its second, transformed version (“external psychology” according to the definition of the famous American anthropologist C. Geertz) (Geertz, 2000). Now we must understand that, accepting the importance of the individual for modern international relations, we undertake to consider him in our research as a certain conceptual continuum. At one side is an individual, at another – all the humanity. And between them there is a certain number of different groups, communities and associations of individuals included in various institutions, connections and interactions. Only in this case, despite the emerging multidimensionality of the sphere of international relations, we will be able to avoid previous mistakes in determining the place of the individual in it. Taking into account all the above-mentioned circumstances, it can be stated that the position put forward by a number of authors about the international individual as the main object of a new discipline - the anthropology of international relations, is unjustifiably limited. Rather, here we should talk about the study of the human dimension of international relations or the influence of the individual on international relations and world politics. The presented dimension includes the individuals directly related to the formation of international policy and those who analyze it. At another level, the subject of study is the psychological, mental and other properties and qualities inherent by the individuals. Another level of the discipline is associated with the analysis of the participation of individuals in the activities of various international institutions, organizations and associations.

The necessary work should be first of all performed by the general anthropology which aim is to study the associations of individuals and all of humanity in their general and specific diversity ways of life. On the other hand, if the selection of the anthropological data necessary for a qualified solution to problems in a particular socio-political sphere is the task of the anthropology of international relations. For the presented subdiscipline, an important condition for

its effectiveness is the requirement not to lose the real scale and capabilities of the individual in its special tasks.

References

1. Bailey A. (1948). *The Man in the Street: The Impact of American Public Opinion on Foreign Policy*. New York: Macmillan Publishers.
2. Eriksen T., Neumann I. (1993). *International Relations as a Cultural System. An Agenda for Research. Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 28 (3), 238–255.
3. Hudson V.M., Vore Ch.S. (1995). *Foreign Policy Analysis Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow*. *Foreign Studies Review*, Vol. 39((2)), 209–238.
4. Morgan P.M. (1994). *Theories and Approaches to International Politics. What Are We to Think?* New Brunswick: Transaction Pub.
5. Rosenau J. (1990). *Turbulence in World Politics. A Theory of Change and Continuity*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
6. Gerard M. (1993). *Les individus dans la politique internationale*. Paris: Economica.
7. Wendt A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Nicholson M. (1999) *Individuals and their influence on the international system*. In Michel Girard (ed.) *Individualism and World Politics*. London: Macmillan.
9. Kravets A. (2012). *Politychna antropolohiia*. Dnipro: Aktsent.
10. Krysenko O. (2009). *Politychna antropolohiia: kontseptualne pole ta instytutsionalizatsiia doslidzhen*. *Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V. Karazina. Pytannia politolohii*, Vol. 839, 6–12.
11. Melnyk V. (2012). *Psykhologichni aspekty sotsiokulturnoi antropolohii*. *Visnyk Vinnytskoho natsionalnoho medychnoho universytetu*, Vol. 16 ((2)), 518–529
12. Morgenthau H. J. (2005). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: McGraw-Hill Professional.
13. Devetak R. (2005) *Postmodernism*. Burchill S., Linklater A., Devetak R., Donnelly J., Paterson M., Reus-Smit Ch. and True J. *Theories of International Relations*. London: Palgrave, 2005, 161-187.
14. De Rivera J. H. (1968). *The psychological dimension of foreign policy*. C. E. Columbus, Ohio : Merrill Pub. Co.
15. Tetlock F. G. G., Goldgeier G. (2000). *Human Nature and World Politics: Cognition, Identity, and Influence*. *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 35((2)), 87–96.
16. Sylvester C. (1999) *Feminist Theory and International Relations in Postmodern Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Jervis R. (1986). *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. *Oxford Handbook on Political Psychology*. Oxford: Ed. by D.O. Sears.
18. Voss J., Dorsey E. (1992). *Perception and International Relations: An Overview*. *Political Psychology and Foreign Policy*. Boulder: Ed. by E. Singer and V. M. Hudson.
19. Mandel R. (1984). *Psychological Approaches to International Relations*. *Political Psychology: Contemporary Problems and Issues*. San-Francisco: Ed. by M. Hermann.
20. Eriksen T., Neumann I. (1993). *International Relations as a Cultural System. An Agenda for Research. Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 28, ((3)), 61–187.
21. Lane R. E. (1972). *Political Man*. Los Angeles: The Free Press.
22. Lane R. (2003). *Psychology's Role in Rescuing Political Science from Itself*. *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. Ed. By D.O. Sears, L. Huddy, and R. Jervice. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
23. Linklater A. (1982). *Men and Citizens in the Theory of International Relations*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
24. Hale H. E. (2008). *The Foundations of Ethnic Politics: Separatism of States and Nations in Eurasia and the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

25. Guillaume X. (2014) *International Relations and Identity (New International Relations)* 1st Edition. London: Routledge.
26. Balandier G. (2013) *Anthropologie politique* (6e édition). Paris: Puf.
27. Benhabib S. (1999). *The Rights of Others. Aliens, Residents and Citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
28. Reeves J. (2004). *Culture and International Relations Narratives, Natives and Tourists*. London: Routledge.
29. Geertz C. (2000). *Local Knowledge Further Essays In Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.