

Jahangir Jahangirli*Institute of Law and Human Rights Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences (Baku, Azerbaijan)*

Contradictions of Realism and Liberalism on Interstate Relations: in the Case of Russo-Georgian War

In the article, where contradictions of Realism and Liberalism on interstate relations are researched, approaches over the case of Russo-Georgian War are compared and argumentations of both approaches are presented. In comparison to Liberalism, which claims Russia intervened Georgia for the sake of protecting equality of individual rights, Realism, which guess Russo-Georgian War as a part of maintaining of continental interests of Russia is defended by author. After giving explanations to theories and providing facts about 2008 Russo-Georgian War theme of research is switched to comparison part of the article. The comparison is established over main theoretical nuances and multi-argumented claims of both views. According to findings of the research obtained from comparative analysis methods, Russo-Georgian War is a “product” of the policy “divide and rule” implemented by Russia in the post-soviet republics.

The research engages the results of war and harmony; therefore, it has useful significance. In any case, the adjustment by and by has created extensive disarray with respect to who is included as the chief on-screen characters; since there are various types of state and non-states entertainers. These on-screen characters lead to a wide scope of stakes, assorted objectives, complex methods of communication, and various organizations inside which the entertainers take activities. The old show which was the principal supporter of the verbalization of the meaning of universal relations was the differentiation between common society and the state. This qualification discovered money in the eighteenth century when it depicted two particular circles of human association and practice; the rising of the general public of individuals described by agreement and market relations, and an express whose chief capacity was to keep up interior harmony and outer protection. In the present age, in any case, the state and common society are interlaced that the global connection idea has gotten absolutely expository.

Keywords: *Interstate Relations, Liberalism, Realism, Russo-Georgian War, International*

Джахангір Джахангірлі*Інститут права та прав людини Національної академії наук Азербайджану (Баку, Азербайджан)*

Протиріччя реалізму та лібералізму в міждержавних відносинах: на прикладі російсько-грузинської війни

У статті, досліджуються протиріччя реалізму та лібералізму у міждержавних відносинах, порівнюються підходи до випадку російсько-грузинської війни та наводиться аргументація обох підходів. У порівнянні з лібералізмом, який стверджує, що Росія втрутилася в Грузію заради захисту рівності прав особистості, автор захищає реалізм, який розглядає російсько-грузинську війну як частину підтримки континентальних інтересів Росії. Після роз'яснень теорій та наведення фактів про російсько-грузинську війну 2008 року тема дослідження переходить до частини статті порівняння. Порівняння встановлюється за основними теоретичними нюансами та багатоаргументованими твердженнями обох точок зору. Згідно з результатами дослідження, отриманими методами порівняльного аналізу, російсько-грузинська війна є «продуктом» політики «розділяй і володарюй», яку впроваджувала Росія в пострадянських республіках.

У дослідженні аналізуються результати війни та злагоди; тому воно має корисне значення. У будь-якому випадку, різні коригування поступово створили значне непорозуміння стосовно того, хто є головними героями на сцені; оскільки існують різні типи державних і недержавних політичних акторів. Ці персонажі створюють широкий спектр ставок, різноманітних цілей, складних методів комунікації та різноманітних організацій, всередині яких діють ці актори. Старою позицією, яка була головним прихильником вербалізації сенсу загальнолюдських відносин, була диференціація спільного взаємодії суспільства та держави. Ця кваліфікація виявила гроші у вісімнадцятому столітті, коли зобразила два особливих кола людських асоціацій і практики; піднесення осіб, пов'язаних угодами та ринковими відносинами, і експрес, головною здатністю якого було підтримувати внутрішню гармонію та зовнішній захист. У сучасну епоху, у будь-якому випадку, держава і суспільство переплітаються, і ідея глобального зв'язку набула абсолютно зрозумілого характеру

***Ключові слова:** міждержавні відносини, лібералізм, реалізм, російсько-грузинська війна, міжнародний*

Introduction

There are some theories such as Realism, Idealism, Liberalism, Constructivism etc. to describe interstate relations. These theories have their own approach styles. In this article, approaches of the Realism and Liberalism are discussed. In order to fully perceive the situation in South Caucasus, it is necessary to have knowledge about the road to 2008 Russo-Georgian war, its causes and the goals of the actors. Both Realism and Liberalism have different approaches to these details. The article consists of two basic research questions: 1. What are the main differences in the views of Realism and Liberalism on this issue? 2. What was the purpose of Russia in 2008 Russo-Georgian war?

Comparative analysis methods are used in this article and some findings are obtained from these methods. One of the two main approaches (Realism) sees basic reason of this war as an effort of Russia to achieve its own interests in South Caucasus. The other (Liberalism) argues that the central Georgian government has violated human rights, and Russia has intervened in the region in order to protect human rights. According to the findings of the article, the first approach is much closer to reality.

Aim of article: According to the conclusions of the study, obtained by the methods of comparative analysis, the Russian-Georgian war is a “product” of the “divide and rule” policy pursued by Russia in the post-Soviet republics.

Classic-Traditional Views on Interstate Relations

According to the researches of Hasanov (2005), international relations is a field of study managing the interrelationships among countries and states during a time in which countries and states are the key holders of political power. The research engages the results of war and harmony; therefore, it has

useful significance. In any case, the adjustment by and by has created extensive disarray with respect to who is included as the chief on-screen characters; since there are various types of state and non-states entertainers. These on-screen characters lead to a wide scope of stakes, assorted objectives, complex methods of communication, and various organizations inside which the entertainers take activities. The old show which was the principal supporter of the verbalization of the meaning of universal relations was the differentiation between common society and the state. This qualification discovered money in the eighteenth century when it depicted two particular circles of human association and practice; the rising of the general public of individuals described by agreement and market relations, and an express whose chief capacity was to keep up interior harmony and outer protection. In the present age, in any case, the state and common society are interlaced that the global connection idea has gotten absolutely expository.

Galenskoy and Malinina (2003) have shown that interstate relations have been studied in various aspects in each period and therefore have played a role in the history of public and political thought. The first fundamental analysis of these relations is found in the works of Thucydides, who lived two thousand years ago. In his book “The Seven Books of the Peloponnesian War”, the author draws attention to the role of war in interstate relations and shows that the subjects of a long, tedious war are powerful and progressive nations, each of which seeks to dominate its rival. Thus, conflicts arose between the states, which subsequently turned into war. In his view, the Athenian’ behavior was perceived as dangerous to him and made him want to start the war. The Lacedaemonians recognized that peace was broken and that war was necessary.

As a result of studies of Aliyeva (2018), the Thucydidean view that the state is strong and powerful is not the end goal. The philosopher considers power and power as a means to protect the interests, authority, and security of the state. Thucydides highly appreciated the role of legal norms in interstate relations. However, he noted that while the powers of states are equal, legal norms are effective. If this is not the case, the law is weak and the strong state behaves as it wants, while the weak are forced to compromise. Thus, Thucydides laid the foundations for one of the most influential trends in modern political science. Later, the trend was renamed the classical and found in the views of Niccolò Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbs, Emerick de Wattel and others. This approach has taken its full form in the work of Austrian military theorist Carl von Clausewitz.

The research of Tsigankov (2007) has shown that Thomas Hobs thought that the main feature of relations between the states was war. As an independent, states are not bound by any restrictions. Each country has what it can afford. The only regulator of interstate relations is power. The participants in these relationships are in the form of gladiators. As they prepare their weapons, they watch closely for each other's behavior.

As it turns out, both Thucydides and Hobs prefer power and war in interstate relations. It is clear that they come to these ideas. Because at that time, other forms of interstate relations, except power and war, were not sufficiently developed. This can be seen by looking at the history of interstate relations.

Azimov (2011) has revealed that studies on these or other aspects of interstate relations are also found in the works of Niccolò Machiavelli. His ideas are attracted by the realistic aspect. Machiavelli says that he has the power and the tendency to war and that this is why war is inevitable. Because, according to Machiavelli, the historical situation may make it clear that the existence of the state is in danger. In a nutshell, Machiavelli thinks that the state must either continue to exist or destroy it: there is no other way to protect the state.

As a result of the research of Schischkoff (1991), in international politics, Machiavelli can be considered a successor of the realist tradition. He also argued that wars were necessary because of the tendency to use force in people. The thinker has shown the benefits and profitable relations in interstate relations. Machiavelli's political ideas about the state are central to the idea of political convenience or political utility. By its very nature, the meaning of this is very simple: the "law of state activities" in the maintenance of the state is above all interests. For any higher purpose, the state has the right not to pay the bill.

N. Machiavelli believed in the impossibility of peaceful settlement of interstate conflicts. In his view, the only means by which the state relies on is powerful and must be strengthened to achieve the state's objective.

According to the book of Tsigankov (2007), speaking about the role of war in inter-state relations, Carl von Clausewitz, a 19th-century thinker, argues that war is simply a tool of politics. War is a tool for achieving political goals. That is, Karl von Clausewitz believes that war is a continuation of politics.

Main theoretical approaches to interstate relations: Realism, Liberalism.

Results have been reported (James, 1989) which tell that in the order of worldwide relations there are fighting general hypotheses or hypothetical points of view. Realism (occasionally called political realism) is a perspective on universal legislative issues that burdens its serious and conflictual side. It normally appears differently in relation to idealism or liberalism, which will in general stress participation. Realists consider the vital on-screen characters in the global field to be states, which are worried about their own security, a demonstration in the quest for their own national advantages, and the battle for power. The negative side of the realists' accentuation on force and personal responsibility is frequently their incredulity with respect to the pertinence of moral standards to relations among states. National governmental issues are the domain of power and law, while global legislative issues are a circle without equity, described by dynamic or potential conflict among states. Realists can be grouped into three classes based on their view of the fundamental causes of interstate dispute. Classical realists assume that the conflict caused because of human nature; neorealists attach it to the anarchic state system's dynamics; neoclassical realists consider it results from both, in alliance with domestic politics. Neorealists are also divided between defensive and offensive realism. They trace the history of their ideas, starting with Thucydides, to classical antiquity (Antunes and Camisã, 2018).

Liberals at that time linked the conflict to poor social conditions and political systems, and leading policymakers focused on building a reputable international law and institutions to govern the international system. These ideas were criticized in the 1930s by realists who opposed utopian and idealist views on International Relations and doubted their ability to avoid conflict. After World War 2, Classical Realism gained popularity in an academic and foreign policy/diplomatic context. The inadequacy of the international system to deter from war and the Cold War conflict were an important contributory factor to this fame (Schuett, 2010, pp. 21–46).

As we have seen from the above analysis, although the roots of realism are associated with Niccolò Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes, a 17th-century English scientist, modern political science has succeeded in the development of Edward Carr, George Kennan, Reinhold Niebuhr, Henry Kissinger, Hans Morgenthau, and others. H. Morgenthau is considered the founder of political realism. He turned realism into a broad international relations theory. Inspired by the Protestant theologian and political writer Reinhold Niebuhr, also by Hobbes, he puts “selfishness” and “power-lust” at the heart of his understanding of human existence. The unsatisfied human desire for power, “timeless” and “universal”, which he defines with “animus dominandi”, “the desire to dominate”, is for him the central cause of dispute. As he states in his major work, “Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace”, first published in 1948, “international politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power”. Despite its uncertainties and gaps, Morgenthau’s Politics among Nations became a conventional textbook and inspired reasoning about international politics for a period or so. Meanwhile, there was an endeavor to generate a more methodologically precise approach to thinking about international affairs. In the 1950s and 1960s, a large number of scholars from different fields entered the International Relations discipline and sought to substitute the “wisdom literature” of classical realists with scientific concepts and reasoning. This led to the counter-response of Morgenthau and academics associated with the so-called English School, especially Hedley Bull, who advocated a traditional approach (Bull, 1962, pp. 361–377).

Consequently, the IR discipline has been split into two main branches: “traditional” or “non-positivist” and “scientific” or “positivist” (neo-positivist). Later, the third branch: “post-positivism” has also been added. The traditionalists ask normative questions and interested in history, philosophy and law. The scientists or positivists stress a detailed and explanatory form of inquiry, instead of a normative one. They have built a solid presence in this domain.

In addition, Kenneth N. Waltz reformulated realism in international relations in a new and different way. He responded to the liberal challenge in his book, “International Political Theory”, published in 1979, and tried to address short comings of classical realism of Hans Morgenthau, which is also known as structural realism or neorealism. While Morgenthau’s theory was rooted in the struggle for power that he associated with human nature, Waltz sought to avoid any philosophical discussion of human nature, and instead began to build an international political theory similar to microeconomics. He claims that

states in the international system are similar to firms in the domestic economy and have the same basic-essential interests: “to survive” (Waltz, 1979).

Waltz argues that both traditional liberals and classical realists have made the same mistake, by focusing on the individual state and ideological, moral, and economic issues. They are unable to prepare a serious report on the international system, which can be taken from a broader socio-political perspective. Waltz admits that such an abstraction misrepresent reality and leaves out many factors that are important for classical realism. It does not enable the analysis of the progress of special foreign policy. However, it also has its benefits. In particular, it helps to understand the key determinants of international politics. Of course, Waltz neorealist theory cannot be implemented in domestic politics. It cannot assist to develop the policies of states on international or domestic affairs. His theory only aids to explain why states have similar attitudes despite different forms of governance and different political ideologies, and why the overall picture of international relations is unlikely to change despite their growing interdependence. To Waltz, the unified behavior of states throughout the centuries can be described by the behavioral restrictions forced by the international system. The structure of a system is determined first by the principle on which it is organized, then by the “differentiation of the units”, and finally by the “distribution” of abilities (power) between the units. Anarchy or lack of central authority is the order principle of the international system for Waltz. States are the units of the international system. Waltz accepts the presence of non-state actors but considers them relatively insignificant. Since all states want to “survive”, and since anarchy implies a self-help system in which each state must think of itself, there is no distinction of labour or functional difference between them. Although being functionally similar, they differ in their relative capacity (power represented by each) to accomplish the same function (Karpowicz, et al., 2018).

According to M. Lebedeva (2007), “realism is one of the oldest theoretical approaches in international studies that seek to describe the international relations as accurately and” realistically as possible, rather than what is acceptable or possible in the future.

As shown by Belova (2014) the core of realism is reflected in the Morgenthau trio: power, the balance of power, and national interest. According to the realists, gathering power is the main goal of the state. All the policies, ideologies and principles of the state serve to legitimize this aim, and any political action is intended to maintain, enhance and demonstrate power.

The concept of balance of forces plays an important role in realism. Thus, the balance of

forces is crucial to maintain stability and security in interstate relations. The balance of forces means the competition of states trying to maintain their current position and power with the states struggling to expand their capabilities. It is also can be seen in the Russo-Georgian war which will be explained further in the respective sections of this research. It is a fact that the South Caucasus is a vital region for Russia. And every chance is used by Russia to take control of the region against west and balance/stabilize the power there. Not surprisingly, while the USA tried Kosovo to be recognized by Russia, Moscow insisted not to recognize it. This can be understood as Russia's attempt to balance power with western countries that do not officially recognize Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

Result of academic researches of Mammadov (2013) show that one of the main ideas that realists make about interstate relations is the anarchy of those relations. According to the proponents of realism, the main actors in international relations are sovereign states, and there are no imperatives that they must adhere to. However, the decisions made within the sovereign states are necessary. It seeks to prove the anarchy of international relations and interstate relations with this analogy.

The second major factor that promotes anarchy in international relations is that every state in the system of international relations must rely solely on its own power and potential to secure or protect its interests. Linking this with the dispute among Russia and Georgia, it is clear that the latter was attacked by Russia. This was the genuine case of global turmoil since Russia sought to capture another sovereign state. As international law approves, they were territories of Georgia and, it was a domestic matter of Georgia. Russia, however, intrigued by this issue and began to battle against Georgia. As a result, once can say that internal anarchy led to the civil war, adding to this Russia used false internal ethnic policy carried out by Georgia as a tool for intervening Georgia's domestic affairs.

According to Valeev (2000), in general, serious reforms in the system of international relations are offered by realists. In their view, the reforms should be consistent with legal norms and the principles of collective security. At the same time, the realists state that the state is the most important factor in the effective security of international relations. According to the essence of their ideas, the highest level of security of a state is possible at the expense of the poor security of other states.

According to Stearns and Pettiford (2001), from point of view of realists, although there are ethics and rules in interstate relations, the main way to comply with these rules is force. Realists regard war as a must and say that the key to achieving peace is not disarmament, but to be ready to war.

Researchers such as Medyakov (2007) note there is the contradictory content of the theory of realism. O.V. Belova (2014) argues that the main contradiction of realism lies in what it assumes as its research object. Realists, on the one hand, take the state as the main actor in international relations, and on the other hand, carry out personality-level analysis, referring to human nature while investigating problems.

As we have seen, the trend of realism argues that the main factor in interstate relations is the power and national interests of the state. The widespread use of force in world wars and the present-day world reality, in interstate relations, further strengthens the positions of realism.

The approach of Liberalism to Interstate Relations

The one of main the basic schools of international relations theory is liberalism. It comes from the Latin word freedom, meaning "free", originally referenced to the philosophy of freedom. Its roots stem from the broader liberal thought starting in the Enlightenment. The basic issues that liberalism attempts to address are the difficulties of achieving enduring peace and cooperation in international relations, and the numerous mechanisms that could contribute to their accomplishment. Liberals assume that human reason can win human fear and desire for power. Still, they do not agree with the enormity of the obstacles that stand in the way of human progress. At the same time, all liberals agree that long-term cooperation based on mutual interests will prevail. The reason is that modernization is constantly increasing the scope and demand for cooperation. For some, this is a long-term process with many failures; for others, it is on the verge (Von, 2016).

For liberals, states exist to guarantee the freedom of their citizens, so that people can live their lives and continue their happiness without undue interference. The state is a constitutional entity (limited by constitutionalism) that establishes as well as enforces the rule of law that respects citizens' rights to life, liberty and property. In the liberal view, constitutional nations will also respect each other and deal with each other according to the norms of mutual tolerance. In the field of economy, the state should facilitate the laissez-faire economy. It should also make possible the full religious expression that finds the most obvious example in the United States (Hobson, 2000, pp. 64-106).

While liberalists recognize that states are important, they believe there are other necessary actors, like intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), multinational actors, and multinational corporations (MNCs). Liberalists believe that these actors can have a significant influence in areas such as agenda-

setting. However, we tend to notice the neoliberals admitting realists' arguments that states are the most important unitary rational actors in world politics, where anarchy is a vital shaping force for state choices and actions (Grieco, et al. 1993, pp. 727-743).

The first turning point in the development of liberal thought in the modern period can be regarded as the emergence of the liberal state in Europe from the 17th century onwards, after the English Civil War (1642-1651). As Joseph Nye points out, the English Civil War respectively is an important reference point in the formation of ideas that outline realism and liberalism. The length and devastating effects of the Thirty Years War led to widespread war dislike throughout Europe. Intellectuals influenced by war, such as Locke and Kant, wrote about their experiences and pointed out that war is essentially unpopular and, man is born with certain rights (Jackson and Sorensen, 2010, p. 96).

John Locke discusses many of the ideas currently attributed to liberalism in "Two Treatises of Government" (1689). In his second study, Locke reflects on society and describes the significance of natural rights and laws. Locke assumes that humans are born as a blank slate without any predetermined ideas or notions. This condition is known as the "State of Nature", as it illustrates people in their most barbaric state. As people develop, their experiences begin to mould their ideas and actions. Then they will be naturally in the "State of Nature" until they choose not to be, that is to say, until something alters their barbaric nature. Locke states that civil government can solve this anarchy. As far as the "Law of Nature" is concerned, people are more prone to behave rationally if there is a government in place because there are laws and implications that must be obeyed. Locke argues that civil government can benefit people obtain basic human rights such as health, freedom and property. Governments that agree to give these rights and enforce laws benefit the world (Lock, 1680-1690).

Jeremy Bentham is not only one of the famous thinkers of the liberal tradition, but also one of the leading figures of the utilitarianism movement within this tradition. To understand whether something is right or wrong according to the principle of utilitarianism, it is necessary to look at whether it brings the maximum amount of happiness to the maximum number of people. In this framework, Bentham is one of the first to construct the idea of an "international law" and "international court" that will be superior to the interests of all nations. Because, according to Bentham, international law and the court will be more useful in resolving a conflict between nations compared to war. In short, social cohesion will be provided by the authority in realistic thinking, and in liberal thought, because the

human nature is viewed more optimistically, by the human being who wants to improve their welfare (Marguerite, 2007, p. 782).

In his "To Perpetual Peace", Kant sets the way by creating guidelines for building a peace program to be implemented by nations. The program will need cooperation between nations and a mutual quest to ensure freedom and common benefits. The Democratic Peace Theory was one such idea. "In To Perpetual Peace", Kant argues the idea that democratic states do not fight wars mainly because leaders are too concerned about re-election. Because of the natural unpopularity of the war, Kant believed that politicians would avoid burdening voters with its costs. After the success of the economic coalition of intertwining states, liberal followers started to believe that wars were not always an unavoidable part of international relations. Support for liberal political theory proceeded to increase from there (Shirayev, 2014, p. 80).

The theory of democratic peace can be assumed as one of the strongest contributions of liberalism to the theory of IR. It claims that democracies are unlikely to go to war with each other. There is a two-part interpretation of this phenomenon. First, democracies are determined by internal restrictions on power. Second, democracies mainly see each other as legitimate and non-dangerous and hence have a greater capacity to cooperate with each other than non-democracies. Statistical analysis and historical events greatly back up the theory of democratic peace, yet numerous questions continue to be debatable (Meiser, 2018).

The liberalist approach to interstate relations also differs with its peculiarities. Note that the classical representatives of liberalism are Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbs, I. Kant, C. Locke, J. J. Rousseau, and A. Smith. Although they form the basis of these or other aspects of their creativity, they have been applied to international relations by F. Hayek, M. Friedman, F. Fukuyama, and others in the modern era, especially in the twentieth century.

Mingst (1999) has fundamental research about the props of liberalism. According to his research, liberals contend that the widespread state of world governmental issues is globalization. States are, and consistently have been, implanted in a domestic and transnational society, which makes motivating forces for financial, social and social cooperation across fringes. State strategy may encourage or square such co-operations. Some domestic gatherings may profit by or be hurt by such approaches, and they pressure the government likewise for strategies that encourage acknowledgment of their objectives. These social weights, transmitted through household political foundations, characterize "state inclinations" – that is, the arrangement of substantive social purposes that inspire international strategy. State inclinations give



governments a hidden stake in the global issues they face. Since the local and transnational social setting in which states are inserted changes significantly across existence, so state inclinations. Without such social worries that rise above state outskirts, states would have no balanced motivating force to take part in world governmental issues by any means, however, would essentially dedicate their assets to an autarkic and secluded presence. To inspire strife, participation, or some other expensive international strategy activity, states must have adequately serious state inclinations. The subsequent globalization-instigated variety in social requests, and therefore state inclinations, is an essential reason for state conduct in world legislative issues. According to liberals, at the same time, wars and conflicts are not a major factor in interstate relations. Liberalism considers interstate interdependence and integration as an important aspect of interstate relations.

It is a fact that before the 2008 Russo-Georgian war, in 1992 and 1993 it was Russia which brokered the agreements both in South Ossetia and Abkhazia and in some way drew the attention of the international community to the issue. While Georgia rejected negotiations with the separatists, Russia attempted to make cooperation among actors. After the agreements, this made IO's such as OSCE and UN start to watch the conflicted region.

As researches of Gulmammadova (2017) tell, in liberalism, the key actors of international relations are not only the states but also international and non-governmental organizations of an international character. The international activities of the states include the reconciliation of interests of different groups, including civil and military systems, and the achievement of compromises. In general, liberals who do not fully deny the anarchic nature of international relations does not agree with the great powers within the system and believe that the creation of international organizations and their increasing authority, the improvement of international law and the democratization of international relations will ultimately lead to ensure equal participation of States in the processes.

The priority of universal values and democratic principles, despite the presence of many international actors, promotes the formation of a new world order that is consciously regulated. Conflicts can be resolved by democracies peacefully, through legal means, and create a collective security environment, with the help and influence of the public. According to the liberals, anarchy like international relations can be eventually overcome by all of this.

The development of liberal views began to draw more attention in the post-Cold War era. Thus, Fukuyama's articles "End of History" and "The End of History and the Last Man" should be considered

a product of liberal views.

According to Fukuyama (2007), the collapse of the communist front line is also characterized by the end of the ideological conflict in the world and the triumph of liberal values. Noting that all countries have been forced to develop through liberal democracies, the author points out those liberal democracies prefer peace and cooperation rather than conflicts.

Possibility of building a healthier world, a safer world is stressed by Fukuyama that if democratic values take precedence over interstate relations.

However, it is not long before Fukuyama (2006) had to make a change in his views on democracy. In one of his other works, it is concluded by the author that democracy cannot be the best regulator of interstate relations: "The democratic majority can make decisions about other countries and do terrible things, violating human rights and morals based on their democratic rules".

Historical Background of Russo-Georgian War. Processes Carrying Relationships to The War

Historical start of the conflict lies until early 90s. So immediately after the breakdown of the USSR, Zviad Gamsakhurdia started to hold authority. In the midst of rising ethnic pressures, local war started and military skirmish happened in January 1991, and continued until June 1992. Approximately 2 000 people lost their lives during the war.

There were two main fronts of the war: central Georgian government and the separatists with Russian forces. In total, 123 000 people left South Ossetia that 100 000 of that were Ossetians. War finished with Sochi Agreement on 24 June, 1992. Local regions started to be dividedly controlled by the participants of the war. (Toal and O'Loughlin, 2013, p. 137) Russia secured a ceasefire in 1992 and established the Agreement. The agreement not only settled a ceasefire between both Georgian and South Ossetian forces but it also represented a conflict zone around Tskhinvali, the capital of South Ossetia, and created a security corridor along the border of yet not recognized South Ossetian territory. It additionally generated a Joint Control Commission as well as the Joint Peacekeeping Forces group, a peacekeeping body. The Joint Peacekeeping Forces was placed under Russia's command and consisted of peacekeepers from Russia, Georgia and North Ossetia (since the separatist South Ossetian government was not recognized; however, South Ossetian peacekeepers served in the North Ossetian contingent). Besides, OSCE also accepted to observe the ceasefire and to promote negotiations. The OSCE endeavoured to reduce causes of tension, maintain the current ceasefire, and build a wider

political framework to alleviate long-term discord (Bloed, 1993, pp. 976-978).

About at the same time, Abkhaz population, one of the biggest ethnic minorities living in Georgia started to protest the internal policy with double standards of the Georgian government. Although Gamsakhurdia's pro-Georgian movement started to suppress the events, the Abkhaz Supreme Soviet declared itself a union republic within the Soviet Union on August 25, 1990. This declaration faced with the rejection of the central government. Followingly, March 1991 referendum showed that the Abkhaz wanted to remain in the Soviet Union. In August 1992 the war ended with the triumph of the Georgian army. One year later, in July 1993 sides came to agreement with the Sochi Agreement. (Adigozelov, 2013, p. 112)

Yet again, in 1993 a Russian brokered an agreement on a ceasefire in Abkhazia, also on a tool to guarantee its observance, providing a cessation on the use of force, the removal of conflicting parties from the war territory within fifteen days, placing a Russian-Georgian-Abkhaz control group to control and watch the ceasefire.

Moreover, the agreement also included the returning the Abkhazian parliament to Sukhumi, the deployment of UN observers in the region, and the starting of talks to resolve the dispute. In the same year in August, UNOMIG was fulfilled as the UN monitoring force. The ceasefire was disrupted on September 27, when Abkhaz forces captured Sukhum and announced victory. The pro-Georgian forces then departed to Tbilisi, when Georgia joined the CIS and altered Russia's stance versus Georgia's on the matter. Following this, another Agreement on a Ceasefire and Separation of Forces, also referred to as the 1994 Moscow Agreement, was agreed (The UN Security Council Report, 2003).

Details of 2008 Russo-Georgian War

Until August when the war started some events happened that increased tension between Russia and Georgia. An international diplomatic crisis between Georgia and Russia started in 2008 as Russia declared that it would no longer engage in the Commonwealth of the Independent States economic sanctions forced on Abkhazia (1996) and built direct connections with the separatist officials in South Ossetia and Abkhazia. The diplomatic crisis was related to the push for Georgia to obtain a NATO Membership Action Plan and, obliquely, the unilateral declaration of independence by Kosovo. Rising tensions paved the way to the disruption of the Russo-Georgian War in 2008.

Since April 16, 2008, non-military interventions of Russia and NATO to the region had been supposed as the marks of future war. The events occurring

between these dates are the tension and preliminary preparation period. The tension of the events peaked between 1-7 August, 2008 and prepared the war that started on 8 August, 2008. On August 8, 2008, Georgian forces carried out operations on the territory of South Ossetia, which declared its independence. Artillery fire, which started from night hours, caused severe damage and civilian deaths of the city. According to Ossetian sources, 2 thousand people, according to Russian sources, 1600 people died. Georgian troops took control of 8 settlements around the capital Shinvali, claiming they had shot down two Russian planes and injured three Russian soldiers. Russian sources, on the other hand, claimed that 12 soldiers working under the Peace Force were killed and 150 were injured. Russia entered South Ossetia with a powerful unit of about 150 tanks and armored vehicles and began fighting the Georgian army, after which a mobilization was declared in Georgia. (Light, 2010, p. 1581)

Russian Su-24 bombers bombed the police station in the city of Kareli in the South Ossetia region, where Georgia's clashes continued. The planes dropped 2 bombs. Marat Kulakhmetov, the commander of Russia's peacekeepers in the region, said that 5 Russian-made Su-25 aircraft were involved in the airstrikes against the positions in the village of Tkverneti. 5 people lost their lives and many were injured in the incident.

The Georgian government has decided to withdraw two thousand of its troops in Iraq to assist troops in South Ossetia. Eduard Kokoity, the South Ossetian separatist leader, claimed that at least 1400 people died as a result of the Georgian bombing and clashes that began on August 8, 2008. After this claim, Russia cut off the electricity of Georgia. (Allison, 2009, p. 188)

On 10 August, The United Nations Security Council convened upon the urgent call of Russian President Dimitri Medvedev, although the USA and many councilors pressured Russia to accept a ceasefire at the meeting, but the latter refused it. No ceasefire decision was taken at the meeting. Only on 16 August, the ceasefire negotiations between Russia and Georgia concluded and a ceasefire signed (Traynor, 2008).

The Approach of Realism and Liberalism to Russo-Georgian War

As per the realist point of view, there are four primary explanations of the contention among Russia and Georgia indeed. These are anarchy, Georgian shortcomings, level of influence, security dilemma. (Karagiannis, 2013, p. 77)

The most significant reason for the contention is anarchy, as indicated by realism, in light of the fact that there is no world government (or

organizational power) to keep states from utilizing power, states may seek after arrangements of war in their endeavors to endure and seek after some other objectives they may have. Anarchy can be inside or remotely. Outside disorder implies that worldwide turmoil. In the event of the contention among Russia and Georgia, Georgia was attacked by Russia and this is a genuine case of global turmoil since Russia tried to capture another sovereign state: Abkhazia and South Ossetia were to be controlled by Georgia. As international law recognizes, they were territories of Georgia and this was a local matter of Georgia. Russia, however, intrigued by this issue and Russia began to battle against Georgia. "Internal anarchy causes civil war, Abkhazia and South Ossetia wanted to be independent countries and they revolted against Georgia so it wanted to control their territories and attacked." (Sterling-Folker, 2016, p. 19)

Furthermore, in terms of politically, economically and military, Georgia was a weak state. In this case, political maneuvers and diplomacy must be superlative. Therefore, if an external policy of a state or government is partial, it can lose some (or full) of its territory. Although the Georgian Republic lost Abkhazia and South Ossetia, a piece of its territory, it does not recognize their independence, because of the situation that Russia established a buffer zone around Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

The second explanation of realism connected to the challenge the Georgian government faced is false internal ethnic policy. Georgian ethnic policy the government ran had the marks of ethnic dominance of Georgians. Moving of government of the period by not considering the authority of other ethnicities was a result of using ethnic minorities living in Georgia by Russia.

In term of the realistic approach, another important factor of conflicts is the power balance which is being seen almost in every regional problem. In this case, a comparison can be made: first element of this comparison is Kosovo and the second one is Abkhazia and South Ossetia. The more the USA tried Kosovo to be recognized by Russia, the more Russia insisted in order not to recognize it because of the case it was politically supporting Serbia. It can be understood as revenge that the USA doesn't officially recognize Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

As regarding security dilemma, which is last factor of the realist point of view, desire of the Georgian government related to joining to NATO's expansion was "punished" by Russia due to the latter's continental security precautions. In general, South Caucasus is one of the "sensitive" regions in the World for both superpowers. If the same situation was formed, for example, in the Gulf of Mexico by any Russian-support state, the reaction of the USA wouldn't be different in term of security "fears." Moreover, in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, where the

Georgian army organized military attack, thousands of Russians lived. It created another "excuse" in the name of Russia to defense its ethnicity in the mentioned places.

In addition to the above, Russia's military intervention in Georgia is considered by some authors such as Karagiannis (2013) as a realization of offensive realism. In this context the Russian military intercession in South Ossetia was an anticipated, not unconstrained, response to conceivable NATO venture into Georgia. The way to comprehend Russia's international system is history and geology. Russia has been attacked a few times since the thirteenth century; a reality that has incited its pioneers to look for the foundation of support zones around the Russian heartland. So obviously from the Russian perspective, the South Caucasus means a vital region. For instance, the security of monetary interests, and especially command over Azerbaijan's oil industry, has been a significant worry for Moscow in the South Caucasus. The transportation of Azeri oil through a Russian area could have given a chance to Moscow to win a lot of income and, given Russia's financial troubles during the 1990s, such an issue before long turned into a matter of public security. Moscow additionally stressed that such fares could corral affect Russia's own capacity to make sure about expanded oil and gas fares to European business sectors. Given its own reliance on oil and gas sends out for the main part of its hard currency income, the Kremlin couldn't bear the cost of a diminished piece of the pie. Hence, Moscow endeavored to limit the progression of Azeri oil through the Russian-controlled Baku-Novorossisk pipeline however at long last the development of the BTC pipeline shut down Russian desire. Besides, the policy of "divide and rule" is always implemented by Russia in the post-soviet republics. Not surprisingly, many experts believe that twenty-seven years of security domination in the Caucasus proved to be not a factor of stability, but an element of control based on consolidation of the Soviet legacy - expressed in conflict narratives, paradigms, institutions as well as governance - has to be neutralized (Aliyeva, 2020). For instance, the Nagorny Karabakh conflict was referred as one of Russia's frozen conflicts, aimed at keeping the countries and the region and thus also the West off balance. Now suddenly Russia deploys "peacekeepers" in the conflict region. A strong security logic points to a strong Russian interest in hindering a war that could change the regional status quo. Maintaining a positive status quo is - by strategic logic - the primary security interest of a regional hegemon like Russia. The war has been interpreted as weakening the control of Armenians over Nagorno-Karabakh, which has been going on for more than two decades, only because it assisted

Russia's interests (Minzarari, 2020). While this conflict is not the subject of this research, it also implies that the tragedy will likely to continue until Russia is convinced that peace in Caucasus is more in its interest than is the provoking of crisis among its neighbors.

Moreover, Moscow's interests over the eventual fate of post-war Kosovo were nearly overlooked. In spite of Russian protests, the Republic of Kosovo proclaimed its freedom on 17 February 2008. The recently settled republic was perceived quickly by the USA and various European states. Washington guaranteed that the Kosovo case was stand-out; in this way it won't set a trend for other existing or expected breakaway locales. With the de jure recognition of South Ossetia, in the behavior of resurgent Russia, revanchism manifested itself for the recognition of Kosovo. Yet, this is, according to Karagiannis, "more than just tit-for-tat action". Since the Kremlin could have never been sure about the US expectations in Georgia, it looked to restore authority over the South Caucasus to achieve "security" (Karagiannis, 2013).

In this context, as a result of the paragraph, it can be said that regardless of what were the elements at first convincing Moscow to assume a functioning part in the Georgian-Ossetian strife, Russian contribution in the 2008 war pointed principally at the damage of Tbilisi's endeavors to join NATO. The extension of NATO eastwards has been seen by the Kremlin as an incredible danger to Russian security.

Approach of Liberalism to Russo-Georgian War

Liberalism is basically becoming pragmatic approach. This is emphasized in the researches of Selezneva (2002). Liberals at present advertise based monetary frameworks, and worldwide organizations not out of idealism but since they accept these game plans are more qualified to acknowledging human interests in the advanced world than any other options. To be sure, in considering world request, the variable that issues most for liberal scholars is association. Without precedent for history, worldwide organizations are currently important to acknowledge fundamental human interests; extreme types of relationship that were once present just for a little scope are currently present on a worldwide scale.

On the contrary to Realistic approach, as a perspective, liberalism approaches to the abovementioned war more positively and optimistic. According to liberalism, Russia intervened Georgia for the sake of protecting equality of individual rights. From liberalistic point of view, Georgia organized military actions to south Ossetia and Abkhazia, which were result to death of innocent

people who did not want to stay under the control of Georgian Republic. Followingly, Georgia was interfered by Russia to maintain peace and local citizens' individual rights.

In addition, Georgia's attack on South Ossetia and Abkhazia imposes some bans on free trade as well as the economy. If Georgia did not initiate this conflict, Georgian ports would not be closed. Thus, this conflict not only prohibits people's right to free trade, but also affects the economy of the Caucasus States as a whole.

Moreover, ethnic minorities faced with aggressive and humiliating policy of government of the period. Beneath Saakashvili's authority new ethnic domination of Georgians started to be formed in Georgia. And also, according to liberalism, Georgian government did not behave equally with people who live in Abkhazia and South Ossetia. This discrimination of the Georgian government fired protests of local resident to central authority.

Liberalism also supports basic human rights and also, the right of self-determination for ethnic minorities. According to this approach, Abkhazia and South Ossetia had right for become independent. However, the Georgian government did not allow them to be independent peacefully. This was the main cause which created major protestation and outcry, and followingly war in the large scale.

In liberal thought, communication has a big role in term of providing basic human rights. Because the Georgian government did not agree to go to negotiations with the local governments the liberalistic approach to this war condemns central government of the period. For liberalism, it means destroying private rights of local people.

Generally, liberalism condemns using hard power first. That is why this approach suppose Russia right in this case. Because according to liberalism, military intervention of Russia was the answer to the Georgian government's running military power to unarmed people who did not want to be a part of Georgian Republic.

Conclusion

As a result of the research studying comparative approaches of Realism and Liberalism to Russo-Georgian war, according to Realism, the war is a regional power demonstration of Russia, continental superpower. The exact opposite to this point of view is presented by Liberalist supporters. According to them, the main reason of 2008 Russo-Georgian war is the reaction of Russia to human rights violation in Abkhazia and South Ossetia by the Georgian government. As it seems, Realism has a more comprehensive and more balanced approach in this regard. The policy of "divide and rule" is always implemented by Russia in the post-soviet republics. This does not only appear in Georgia, but also in countries such as Azerbaijan

and Ukraine. Like any continental state, Russia has its own strategic interests in certain regions. In the context of these interests, Russia has an intention to prevent NATO's expansion towards the East, especially to the South Caucasus. 2008 Russo-Georgian war was a phase of this strategy of national security.

Russia is trying to keep as many states as possible dependent on itself. Armenia, Georgia and

Azerbaijan are at the forefront of these states, and when any of them intend to engage in independent foreign policy, Russia undergoes military intervention in this way or another.

To sum up, it is not difficult to say that the Realist approach on 2008 Russo-Georgian War is a more systematic and more accurate approach. This approach is the theory that best describes today's world politics and interstate relations.

REFERENCES

- 1 October. Retrieved from <https://carnegieeurope.eu/strategieurope/82838>.
- Aliyeva M., (2018). Formation and development of international relations. Public administration: theory and practice, 4 (64): 203-210.
- Aliyeva, L. 2020. Judy Asks: Is Peace Possible Between Armenia and Azerbaijan?
- Allison, R., (2009). The Russian case for military intervention in Georgia: international law, norms and political calculation. *European Security*, 18(2): 173-200.
- Antunes, S. & Camisão, I. (2018). Introducing Realism in International Relations Theory, [online] Retrieved from <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/27/introducingrealismininternationalrelationstheory/>.
- Azimov, K., (2011). Machiavelli On State Thought and the Principle of Political Success. Baku State University, Faculty of Theology, Proceedings, № 15: 93-109.
- Belova O. V., (2014). Realism, Neorealism and Postclassical Realism: Evolution of Basic Categories. *Actual problems of politics*, V. 52: 45-59.
- Bloed, A., (1993). The Conference on Security and Co-Operation in Europe: Analysis and Basic Documents, 1972–1993. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Bull, H., (1962). International Theory: The Case for Traditional Approach, *World Politics*, 18(3): 361–377.
- Fukuyama, F., (2006). A Strong State: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century, Moscow: ACT.
- Fukuyama, F., (2007). The end of history and the last person, Per. from English, Moscow: AST.
- Galenskaya, L. A., & Malinina, C. A. (2003). Encyclopedia of International Organizations: in 3 volumes. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of St. Petersburg State University.
- Grieco, et al., (1993). The Relative Gains Problem for International Cooperation. *The American Political Science Review*. 87(3): 727-743
- Gulmammadova, Sh., (2017). Theoretical and Conceptual Framework of International Security. *Strategy*, [online] 7 December. Retrieved from <http://az.strategiya.az/news.php?id=107991>.
- Hasanov, A., (2005). Modern International Relations and Azerbaijan's Foreign Policy. Baku: "Azerbaijan" Publishing House.
- Hobson, J. 2000. The State and International Relations. [online]. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511612442.003>.
- Jackson, R., & Sorensen, G. (2010). Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches, Oxford. New York: Oxford University Press.
- James, A., (1989). The realism of Realism: The state and the study of International Relations. *Review of International Studies*, 15(3): 215-229.
- Karagiannis, E., (2013). The 2008 Russian–Georgian war via the lens of Offensive Realism. *European Security*, 22(1): 74-93.
- Karpowicz, K. et al., 2018. Political Realism in International Relations. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, [online]. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/realisminrelations/>.
- Lebedeva M., (2007). World Politics, Moscow: Aspect Press.
- Light, M., (2010). The Russo-Georgian War of 2008: A Conflict Announced in Advance? *Europe-Asia Studies*, 62(9): 1579-1582.
- Lock, J. 1680-1690. Of the State of Nature. LONANG Institute, [online] <https://lonang.com/library/reference/locke-two-treatises-government/loc-202/>.
- M. Adigozalov, E., (2013). The Abkhazian conflict in the aftermath of the 2008 Georgian-Russian war. *Scientific works of the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of ANAS*, 2 (21): 112-119.
- Marguerite, La Caze., (2007). At the Intersection: Kant, Derrida, and the Relation Between Ethics and Politics. *Political Theory*. 35(6): 782.
- Medyakov A. S., (2007). History of International Relations in Modern Times. Moscow: Enlightenment.
- Meiser, Jeffrey W., 2018. Introducing Liberalism in International Relations Theory. Retrieved from <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/18/introducing-liberalism-in-international-relations-theory/>.
- Mingst, K., (1999). Essentials of International Relations, New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Minzarari, D., 2020. Russia's Stake in the Nagorno-Karabakh War: Accident or Design? 11 December. Retrieved from <https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/publication/russias-stake-in-the-nagorno-karabakh-war-accident-or-design/>.
- Mises, Ludwig von, & Bettina Bien Greaves. (2016). Liberalism. The Classical Tradition. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Schischkoff, G., (1991) Philosophisches Wörterbuch, Stuttgart: Auflage.

- Schuett, R., (2010). Classical Realism, Freud and Human Nature in International Relations. *History of the Human Sciences* 23(2): 21-46.
- Selezneva, L., (2002). Post-Soviet Russian Foreign Policy: Between doctrine and pragmatism. *European Security*, 11(4): 10-28.
- Shirayev, Eric B. (2014). *International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stearns, J., & Pettiford, L., (2001). *International Relations: Perspectives and Themes*, London: Longman.
- Sterling-Folger, J., (2006). *Making Sense of International Relations Theory*, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- The UN Security Council Report., 2003. Abkhazia: Statement by the National Security Council of Georgia (S/2003/569). Retrieved from <https://reliefweb.int/report/georgia/abkhazia-statement-national-security-council/georgia-s2003569>.
- Toal, G. (Gearóid Ó Tuathail) and O'Loughlin, J., (2013). Inside South Ossetia: a survey of attitudes in a de facto state. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 29(2): 136-172.
- Traynor, I., (2008). Georgia and Russia declare ceasefire, *Guardian*, 16 August. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/aug/16/georgia.russia2>.
- Tsygankov, P. A., (2007). *International relations: theories, conflicts, movements, organizations: textbook*, Moscow: INFRA
- Valeev R., (2000). International control in international poison law. *Moscow Journal of International Law*, No. 2: 182-204.
- Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*, Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill

Jahangir Jahangirli

Ph.D., <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7180-7416>, ccahangirli@yahoo.com

Стаття надійшла / Article arrived: 02.11.2021

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 29.11.2021