Country Rights: Foundation of International Equality

PingPing Zhu Lincoln

［Abstract］ *Human rights* is a key principle of democracy and domestic peace to reduce the factors of inequality that cause disparities and fights among members in domestic societies whereas *country rights* is the foundation of international equality and interstate peace to reduce the factors of inequality that cause conflicts and wars among members in international society. In order to maintain the interstate peace, international society needs to reach a consensus on country rights and international equality. This article discusses the main principles of country rights, the different perspectives between country rights and other theories including realism, nationalism, and alignments, and the meaning of country rights to international equality. Country rights are to ensure all nations an equal share in participating and decision making in international affairs, an equal opportunity of economic development and fair trade, and enough resources and facilities to support their people's life while preserving the autonomy of individual countries and their traditional cultures. If every country advocates or respects others' country rights as well as its own ones, there would be a common ground to solve interstate problems and disputes rather than pursuing extreme nationalism and military alliances. This article considers country rights an important concept in international relations, the foundation of international equality, and thus the solution to world peace.

Except natural disasters, human has caused all its sufferings due to the negative elements in human characters such as subjectivity, selfishness, and untruthfulness. These negative elements or weaknesses in human psychology and mentality have led to the formation of military alliances, economic isolations, extreme nationalism, and terrorism that separate and alienate members in international society. There are disparities in principles and practices of people with different religious and cultural backgrounds among countries that have gone through different paths of history and development. However, *country rights* as a term, a principle, or an implementation, should be the premise of, or one of the fundamentals in international relations and global governance. Human societies have strived for human rights in both its broadness and depth, and have made it one of the important standards for being civilized nations with justice. Yet in our international society, *country rights* has not been a well recognized or a basic principle for international affairs although many regional organizations and various organs in the UN have been conducting courses towards that direction. It took many centuries for men to understand the importance of human rights and to spread the ideas and put them into practices domestically and internationally. It may take even longer for all countries to acknowledge the principle of country rights and to realize its importance due to the stereotyped theories on power and interests, nationalism, and ideological disparities. Nevertheless, as *human rights* is the premise of any democratic nations, *country rights* is the

premise of international equality and the basis of world peace.

Logical Starting Point of Country Rights

Human Rights is the lifeline to the existence of individuals and their motive to develop their motherlands. *Country Rights* is the lifeline to the existence of countries and their motive to participate in the global development. A state or a nation consists of individual human beings, men and women with different features. A wise and civilized nation has to treat its people equally to bring out the positive energy of every one. Many thinkers and philosophers have advocated and theorized on the equality among all people according to the basic human rights, natural rights or legal ones under laws. The globe or the international society consists of individual countries with different systems that are located in various continents and have come out of different paths in historical evolution. The keywords that theorists and ethicists used in interpreting the principles of international relations and global governance are among those of "power," "national interests," "rationality," "international law," etc. International relations involve all countries in the world, and world peace is their common wish. As the essence of the existence of all nations and world peace, *Country Rights* is the premise of international relations and global governance. International relations can bring reciprocal mutual benefits when *Country Rights* is respected and international equality is adhered, thus the world peace maintains.

１．Human Rights

The course of pursuing human rights has had a long history of philosophical and ideological advocacy along with civil and political movements. As a philosophical and ideological advocacy, it went through the stages of natural law and social contract, constitution and justice, and universal and diversified implications worldwide. The civil and political movements on human rights started from Ancient Greece and Rome, developed in Modern European and North American countries, and then spread to other countries. Human rights became one of the most important principles that ensures domestic equality and unifies almost all nations into the UN, although its interpretations vary among countries.

The universality and equality of human rights are that they apply to everyone regardless of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, and disability. Human rights involve many aspects of human life in a nation. Civil rights are the "rights that constitute free and equal citizenship," and "the rights to own property, make and enforce contracts, receive due process of law, and worship one's religion." While freedom of speech and press is considered part of civil rights, the rights to hold public office, to vote, or to testify in court are listed as items of political rights（SEP, 2012）that are more directly involved in politics. In terms of economic, social, and cultural rights（ESCR）, there have been diverse efforts to explicate the content and the meanings of ESCR. Milovanovich（2014）listed some key rights in ESCR as follows:

- The right to education;
- The right to health;
- The right to housing;
- The right to food; and
- The right to work.

It took more efforts in most countries for women and people from certain races, for instance, African-American in the US, to be granted civil rights than men of the dominant ethnic group. Nevertheless, the trend is that more people have been pursuing more rights in addition to civil rights. By the end of 2000 no major common law jurisdiction was without some form of constitutional protection of fundamental rights or human rights with the exception of Australia（Ewing, 2005）.

Human rights relate to many aspects of human privileges that are equally important with different priorities. As Milovanovich（2014）pointed that "the interdependence of all human rights is an inescapable reality in the world today." The processes and procedures of human rights are not identical in countries western or eastern, developed or developing. To those who cannot afford food and education, the rights to vote and freedom of speech have little value. Only when every aspect of human rights is respected will people truly enjoy human rights, and their governments become essentially democratic.

Strictly speaking, it is difficult for a single nation to protect the human rights of its citizens. The decision-making about people's basic welfare is often in the hands of transnational corporations, financial institutions, and governmental officials. They are not always fair and wise in making comments and taking actions on human rights related issues. The application of one aspect of human rights is inseparable from applying other aspects of human rights. Countries have to have the right to make the decisions on implementing human rights for their own people.

The principles and the protection of human rights are important because they are for the wellbeing of people who comprise individual nations, and the wellbeing of individuals is the fundamental motive for national development. A country to the global community is as a citizen to a state. When applying the same logic, it is to say that country rights to international equality and global governance is as important as human rights to domestic equality in individual nations and in all nations.

2．From Human Rights to Country Rights

Human rights is "a constitutive principle of contemporary international society"（Deng, 2008, p. 69）. However, human rights are for the equality not among countries but among individuals, and not for international relations but for human relations. Respecting human rights is the most important principle of human relations, thus the guideline of all governments despite their democratic, republic, monarchic, or aristocratic formalities. Respecting country rights is the most important principle of international relations, and the guideline of countries dealing with each other. International relations are fundamentally between countries through the leaders and officials as well as peoples. The legal status of human rights varies in different countries. As Ewing（2005）commented that the US associates human rights with international law whereas Australia and Canada consider human rights part of the currency of domestic law, and discrimination or equality law in the United Kingdom. But country rights are the basic rights to any states, and the equal and universal rights to all nations. Country rights belong not to a government or its leaders but to the country itself including its land and the people living on the land. According to the principle of country rights, all nations are equal in terms of the sovereignty on their land and people.

About two hundred years ago, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant（1795）presented a philo-

sophical sketch for a perpetual peace. In his essay, Kant raised a preliminary concept of country rights that "A state is not, like the ground which it occupies, a piece of property. It is a society of men whom no one else has any right to command or to dispose except the state itself." So country rights only belong to individual countries that owned, not by their governments or any individuals, but by all men of a nation as a unit. Both human rights and country rights aim for equalizing the basic rights, the former among individuals, and the latter among countries. While human rights protect people's individual interests country rights protect people's collective interests and nations' common interests. To respect a country's rights means to respect its people as a whole whereas to respect human rights means to respect every individual in the same country.

Human Rights is considered as a precondition of a democratic country and domestic equality, so as country rights a precondition of a democratic world and international equality. But can human rights to liberty, privacy, freedom of expression, and freedom of association be applied to country rights? How could nations comply with the principle of country rights? What are the main articles of country rights?

3．Country Rights

The triumphant democracies promoted human rights as a foundational principle of the post-cold war world order (Deng, 2008). However, human rights cannot be applied to judge all the problems in international relations, of which countries not individuals are the basic units. *Country Rights* concerns rights of all countries in the world, big or small, rich or poor, strong or weak, rising or declining, etc. In his *Making Globalization Work,* Stiglitz (2007) pointed out, "The current process of globalization is generating unbalanced outcomes, both between and within countries. Wealth is being created, but too many countries and people are not sharing in its benefits. They also have little or no voice in shaping the process… these global imbalances are morally unacceptable and politically unsustainable." Stiglitz named this phenomenon as "democratic deficit." While the key to a domestic democratic deficit is human rights, the solution to an international democratic deficit is country rights. However, there are some democratic countries that advocate human rights domestically while violating other countries' rights globally. Some international organizations do not focus on issues that are important to ordinary or poor countries. The UN does not have the authority to protect the interests of those countries whose needs are less heard and whose interests less represented. To change these phenomena, there are needs for a common ground and universal principles.

Nations should sign an International Social Contract that is inspired by the concept of *Social Contract* when they join the global society or assign the Chart of United Nations to join the UN in order to have their country rights protected. It includes articles on responsibilities and obligations that individual countries must follow. The most important article of this contract should be *Country Rights.* In signing the contract, individual countries give up their rights including the right of manipulating or violating others countries' rights. Within this contract, countries, strong or weak, rich or poor, are all equal in terms of what they give up and what they gain. Kant (1795) pointed out, "For states in their relation to each other, there cannot be any reasonable way out of the lawless condition which entails only war except that they, like individual men, should give up their savage (lawless) freedom, adjust themselves to the constraints of public law, and thus establish a continuously growing state consisting of various nations,

which will ultimately include all the nations of the world." According to Kant, the Law of Nations shall be founded on a Federation of Free States (the constitution conforming to the law of nations in their relation to one another); and The Law of World Citizenship shall be limited to conditions of universal hospitality (the constitution conforming to the law of world citizenship including men and states as citizens of a universal state and in their external mutual relationships). Kant presented the logic of constitutional development on human relations, national relations, and relations among all men and all nations, and his saying of that "there is no relations between them of master and servant," and his concepts of "world citizenship," and "universal hospitality" forecasted the ideal of country rights.

3. 1. Connotation of Country Rights

The connotation of country rights contains the basic elements of human rights since to protect the human rights of its people is the obligation as well as the right of any countries. Description of country rights has no acknowledged versions, however, based on the understanding of human rights, and rules of human society and international relations, a common ground can be set. Civil and political rights to a country mean its independence, its sovereignty on territory and people, its status as an equal member in international organizations especially in the UN, and the freedom of choosing its religion, ideology, and polity. Countries' civil rights are equal that must be respected not only among countries in the same organization but also among countries belong to different organizations. Stiglitz (2007) pointed out that the management of globalization is not democratic. "The developing countries do not have the representation that they should." A democratic global society ensures the country rights of all countries by maintaining and protecting relations among nations in which no single nation can show disrespect to another nation's country rights while its own country rights being respected.

A country's economic, social, and cultural rights (ESCR) include the ownership of its land and resources, the position to fair trade with other states, the right to maintain an adequate standard of living for its people, the adequacy to provide the needed education for everyone in the country, the right to have an equal excess to public information, and the opportunity to present and share its cultural traits, etc. However, many countries, especially the developing countries, cannot enjoy their ESCR. Stiglitz (2007) suggested the following important rules or reforms: increased transparency; improvements in conflict-of-interest rules; more openness; providing developing countries with assistance in assessing the impact on them of proposed changes; improved accountability; better judicial procedures; and better enforcement of the international rules of law.

One of the social rights is the right for nations, especially for developing countries, to form organizations. Maintaining an adequate standard of living and education for people in all countries needs international corporations and a deep understanding of country rights. To developed countries, helping poor nations to reduce and eliminate poverty, and providing them assistance and debt relief are important practices of country rights. Such practices, as Stiglitz suggested (2007), include agreements by the developed countries "to compensate developing countries for their environmental services," "to provide financial assistance to the poorer countries of 0. 7 percent of GDP," debt forgiveness "to more countries," etc. Every country should be able to ensure its people the access to basic knowledge and needed education. It is part of country rights for nations with a high educational standard to share their educational re-

sources with other countries.

The core of cultural rights is the equality among various cultures and the uniqueness of individual cultures. Systems and ideologies are closely related to the cultures in which they were born. Various polities are the forms of domestic management. In terms of country rights or international fairness and justice, it is difficult to vote for capitalism or communism. While capitalism advocates equality and freedom, the ideal of communism, according to Marx's original ideas, is to help the poor until when everyone is equal. The access to, and the involvement in international public opinion are part of cultural rights. According to Liu's view (2010), the main bodies of international public opinion are the public and the organizations with cultural identity and regional characteristics, and are subject to a certain country or an area. Countries' equal access to, and fair share in media will lead to a balanced and unbiased international public opinion that is more tolerant, inclusive, and closer to the truth. In conclusion, the key to harmonious international relations is not based on countries' systems or ideologies but on country rights. The definition of country rights implies the equality among countries or international equality.

3. 2. Denotation of Country Rights

Country rights are the foundation of global justice and democracy, therefore the premise of international relations. In respecting country rights, nations deal with others in the way to be dealt with, work for the common interests of, and keep peaceable relations among, all nations. There are three aspects closely related to country rights that are considered as the denotation: people, land, and system of the country, realization of country rights, and the impact of country rights. Country rights are rights of nations along with their people and land, and are protected by an international social contract that no country should wage a war on another country as it directly brings the damage to its land and people, so as to its country rights. Thus, in protecting its people and land, a self-defense war is considered a necessary action for complying with the principles of both human rights and country rights. While adhering to human rights, a country can make progress in self-improvement within its own system without interference from other nations, and thus protect its own country rights.

The realization of country rights is a long process. The courses towards country rights are not synchronous among individual nations, neither the degrees of their country rights' realization. Accepting the variance while aiming at the same goal is both the appropriate attitude to, and action of, country rights. Country rights can bring nations closer as human rights bring people together. Human rights ensure people's citizenship, so do country rights to world citizenship, which Kant (1795) considered "a supplement to the unwritten code of the civil and international law, indispensable for the maintenance of the public human rights and hence also of perpetual peace." We can assume that Kant's "public human rights" include both concepts of human rights and country rights.

The impact of country rights is overwhelming for it concerns the rights of all nations, and the equal relations among them. *Country Rights* never agrees to the nobility of a country or its privilege in international organizations. The validity of these inborn country rights is inalienable and belongs inevitably to all countries. Nations with the same rights do not lose their freedom of choosing their ways and priorities in realizing country rights. They can group themselves into different international organizations for the time being according to their similar goals and mutual benefits that do not conflict with other na-

tions' rights. There are mainly two types of international alliances or organizations. One is aiming at confronting or weakening certain nations or strategic enemies. All the military alliances belong to this type that are against the principle of country rights and world peace. Another type is aiming at, for instance, economic cooperation, regional integration, or cultural exchange. This type of international organizations is consistent with country rights in principle and purpose, and brings positive energy to world peace.

In conclusion, the logical starting point of human rights is that man is born equal with liberty. *Human Rights* is a collective concept implying its diversity and universality. Every right including civil, political, economic, social and cultural ones is an integral part of human rights, and human rights as a whole applies to men as a whole. To protect human rights of their people is the most important task and obligation of all national governments. As an international standard and globally acknowledged principle, *human rights* is also implemented by various international organizations and the UN. A country as a synonym for a territory and the people living there is found equal to other nations if it is established in a natural way. Ensuring its people's human rights is as important as protecting its territory. However, every country has the right to choose the way of implementing human rights and the priorities and procedures of the course as long as it does not violate the other parts of human rights of its citizens. To make decisions on human rights on their own is part of country rights. In pursuing country rights, it creates a healthy and positive environment for the realization of human rights in individual countries.

Country rights are to ensure nations to be independent and away from invasion and interference, to have an equal share in participating and decision making in international affairs, to have an equal opportunity of economic development and fair trade, to have enough resources and facilities to support their people's life including education, and to preserve their traditional cultures as well as absorbing elements from other cultures. Respecting the country rights of other nations leads to equal relations among all nations. If all members of the UN acknowledge country rights, respect others' country rights as well as their own, the UN would have the binding legal duties to provide protections to all countries as long as they abide by human rights law, regardless of their sizes and strengths, beliefs and ideologies, systems and polities. Country rights can provide a legal, political, and moral framework for international justice and fairness. It should be one of the important principles as well as the starting point of international relations, yet it was never emphasized or even thoroughly discussed. If every country advocates or respects country rights, countries would be together with harmony. Kant（1795）believed that the federation of republics under laws would lead to a perpetual peace, the author of this article views country rights as the key to the world peace. Almost all countries in the world including republics as Kant named joined the UN, yet it has not been able to stop wars. In certain areas, peace does not last longer than before the UN was found. The units of both the League of Nations and the United Nations are nations, which implies both unification and conflicts of interests among nations. But the interest-free global governance, or we can name it as the Council of Countries, should be based on country rights, which is the solution to world peace.

Theories With or Without Country Rights

There are various theories in international relations, yet none of them has a universal power of inter-

preting international equality. It is difficult for most scholars including those from the field of international relations to avoid Bacon's so-called "Four Idols," namely the subjectivity, limitation and one-sidedness, incoordination of languages and concepts, and a blind faith in authority and traditional theories. Concepts and theories are proposed on the basis of traditional ways of thinking and theoretical accumulation of that tradition. It is difficult for scholars to transcend the traditions and establish a theory that is compatible to different systems of thinking and concepts. Realism, nationalism, and liberalism are the main theoretical systems that have had impact on countries dealing with other countries in terms of alliances or non-alliances. However, none of them abides by the principle of country rights and respects international equality fundamentally.

1．Realism, Nationalism, and Alignments

Realism is the major school of western theories in international relations. The first western realist in international relations, the author of *the History of Peloponnesian War,* Thucydides（431B.C.E.）believes that there always exists a state of war among countries. Therefore, survival and security are the primary considerations of countries. It is power not justice that controls a country's behavior; the weaker has no choice but accepts the reality. War, security, and power are important concepts in international relations put forward by Thucydides. Macchiavelli's theory（1514〜1519）has a tone of modern times. He politically defends the expansion and power struggles among modern monarchs. Extending state of nature from human being to international relations, Hobbes（1651）believes that sovereign states were under the condition of anarchical war like natural state of men. Going after advantages and avoiding disadvantages are human basic instinct; and fighting for power is the mainstream in international relations. Among realist theorists of international relations, Hans Morgenthau（2006）is the most influential one. Power is the core of his theory so as the basis of national interests and international political activities. He summarizes six principles of realism as follows: 1）Politics is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature; 2）The concept of interest defined in terms of power is the main signpost; 3）The concept of interest defined as power is an objective category that is universally valid, yet the kind of interest determining political action in a particular period of history depends upon the political and cultural context; 4）Universal moral principles must be filtered through the concrete circumstances of time and place; 5）It distinguishes between truth and idolatry, and refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe; 6）The difference between political realism and other schools of thought is real and profound, and political realism defines interest as power. Representative neorealist Kenneth N. Waltz（1979）considers international institutions and organizations a basic and lasting factor in international relations. However, the premise of his theory focuses on international conflicts out of an anarchic order where units act for their own sakes and not for the sake of preserving an organization.

The core concepts of realism are no more than anarchic order, power struggles and international conflicts, arms and wars, diplomatic and allied relations, national interests, international balance, and power politics. Wars and fights soil realism; and realist theory is often used as the footnote of war and hegemony. Realism theorizes, actualizes, and rationalizes the selfishness of human nature and its performance in national interests and international relations, but neglects human reason and its practices in

principles of freedom, democracy, and equality in international relations. Realism also overlooks the necessity of safeguarding and strengthening the U.N. as an international authority. International relations mainly consist of relationships among sovereign countries. There are no distinctions among countries on the layer of sovereignty. It has the same importance to defend one's own country as to respect other countries' sovereignty. Ensuring own national interests should not be preconditioned or resulted in harming other countries' interests. Monarchs or government officials should be responsible for their citizens. But their respect to humankind including peoples of other countries is of the same importance. They should be responsible to all people on the layers of life and liberty. In practice, their main task is to protect life and liberty of their own people. But at the same time, they have to respect or not to hurt life and liberty of other peoples. Hurting the interests of other peoples on ground of protecting own people is an action of injustice. Realism is a theory with "power" as its core concept, and it defends "power" and justifies the fights among powers. Realism considers power a lever in dealing with unavoidable conflicts and fights among nations, and power struggles the basics of national interests and international political activities. Powers play important roles in balancing and stabilizing the world order. Such a theory inevitably bears irrationalities in logic and hypocrisies in morality. Since the even balance among powers is the result of power struggles, its stability will not last because fights for power never stop. If powers have more power than other countries in international affairs, there is neither democracy nor equality in such an international society where some countries have more rights than others. Realism is radically against the principles of democracy, equality, and country rights.

As mentioned above, Morgenthau (2006) considers power the basis of national interests and international political activities. National interests are considered as the starting point of a country's foreign and domestic policies to ensure national survival and strength with a domestic policy of making the country rich and its army powerful and a foreign policy of even balance and alliance. Nationalism can be traced back to around the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century (Zhao, 2012). As the Chantal of the interests of Pope and Dynasty nationalism claims the independence and rights of the oppressed peoples in the age of colonialism. It contains the ideas of independence, unification, freedom, and development; and it pursues the external independence and internal cohesion of a nation (Ma, 1995).

Nationalism has many formalities and definitions. The formalities of nationalism include civic, ethnic, religious, territory, and economic ones and various definitions focus on perspectives of national royalty and feelings, principles and ideas, and slogan and symbolic respectively (Wang, 1995). Seton-Watson has simplified the definition of nationalism into two basic meanings: "One of these meanings is a doctrine about the character, interests, rights and duties of nations. The second meaning is an organized political movement, designed to further the alleged aims and interests of nations" (1977). On the one hand, "independence" and "national unity" as "the two most generally sought aims" of nationalism have played important roles for nations to gain their sovereignty and for a process towards international equality. On the other hand, the avocations of nationalism on the interests of individual countries have also caused disparities among nations and brought damages to international equality. Tagore (2008) saw the bloody side of this double-edged sward and commented, "When this organization of politics and com-

merce, whose other name is the Nation, becomes all powerful at the cost of the harmony of the higher so-
cial life, then it is an evil day for humanity."

According to realism, power and national interests are the two main causes to war. Conflicts be-
tween powers are fateful that wars are almost unavoidable. International relations are closely connected
to, or deeply affected by, national interests. Due to various individual and concrete factors of time and
space, scholars including masters in the field cannot avoid being influenced by their national interests,
nationalism or extreme nationalism, and fail to make objective comments on international affairs. They
have hardly broken free from a subjective standpoint, demarcation of time and space, linguistic frame-
work, and academic tradition. However, a new type of relations among powers should not be a hostile
one or that of military alliances since the international power structure has changed. Xia（2008）pointed
out that the strategic relationship among major powers has had significant changes including the interac-
tive modes between cooperation and competition, and between coordination and prevention. A stable
and secure relationship among powers is possible if they follow the principles of mutual trust, mutual
benefit, equality, and coordination. The new type of relationship among major powers will experience
unstable and developing stages, and become mature eventually. The new type of relationship among ma-
jor powers sets up a role model for international relations, and lays a solid foundation for security and
world peace. While the new type of relationship among major powers contributes to the democratization
of international relations through changing the environment of power rivalry, country rights have hegem-
ony lost its foundation and rationality.

２．Liberalism and Alliances

Liberal-idealism is another major school of western theories in international relations. Liberalism
considers individuals' reason and their self-realization the state of nature. Based on human reason, rela-
tionships among countries can enter a state of legality, and gradually realize the eternal peace（Kant,
1795）. Idealism attaches importance to educating people, and believes that mankind can radically put an
end to the causes of wars through promoting contacts among all people and establishing a world commu-
nity. Woodrow Wilson's advocacies on giving up secret diplomacy, removing all economic barriers,
supporting national autonomy, reducing national armaments, and establishing international organizations
aiming at defending world peace and security, and his emphasis on international law and principles of in-
ternational morality and justice are all completely antagonistic to realist views.

Facing new issues in the process of globalization and the integration of the world economy, neo-
liberalism puts forward concepts of interdependence, systems theory, and democratic peace, thus adds
connotations to liberal-idealism according to the new situation. Interdependence theory provides a brand
new elaboration on behavioral actors in international relations and the range of international relations. In
addition to sovereign countries, transnational and multinational organizations and companies are also be-
havioral actors of international relations; in an increasingly integrated world, there are more activities of
economic, environmental, and ecological interdependence than those with military and political purposes
in international relations. Systems theory accepts realist concepts of considering sovereign countries the
only important behavioral actors in international politics, and acknowledges the state of anarchy in inter-
national society, but emphasizes the function of systems in standardizing individuals' behaviors. Self-

interests are the highest pursuit of behavioral individuals. However, since people are full of reason, it is possible for them to work together to maximize the interests for all, even in a state of anarchy. This kind of cooperation is not necessarily based on idealism, altruism, joint objective, or common faith, but it could be a situation in which success comes naturally. Based on Kant's viewpoints on democracy and peace, the concept of democratic peace of neo-liberalism states that democratic governments conduct domestic political competition based on rules. They are unlikely to start wars with other countries rashly. Different from undemocratic governments, democratic countries generally do not resort to force to resolve the conflicts among themselves. In other words, democracy of sovereign countries is the basis to ensure the world peace.

The core concepts of liberal-idealism include reason, democracy, system, cooperation, dependence, peace, etc. Reason and democracy are the soil of liberal-idealism that considers reason the precondition of peace among countries, and regards globalization and economic integration as inevitability of cooperation among countries. Thus, liberal-idealism is often used as the footnote of peace and cooperation. It extends the concept of reason to international relations, and uses international law, principles of international moral justice, international cooperative organizations and systems as vehicles to deal with international affairs rationally. When common interests among countries exist, the role of reason is to look for cooperative points for the maximum benefits; when interest conflicts occur, reason seeks common ground while retaining independence. Under the guidance of reason, cooperation, dependence, and peace become the mainstream of international relations. However, it is not easy for countries to think beyond their own interests, rationally respect other countries' interests, and focus on common interests of mankind when taking actions. In addition, the core concepts of liberal-idealism, such as reason, democracy, and system mentioned above are frequently used as theoretical basis for interference in internal affairs of other countries.

As Kissinger（2014）states in his new book that the pursuit of world order has been always interpreted in western concepts. However, the western image of world order is facing challenges from the Islamic society and Russia and China as well. In the contemporary international relations, developing countries have become more involved; a large number of medium and small countries have more actively participated in world affairs. Therefore, international relations theories are no longer limited to traditional categories, specifications, and systems. New concepts, theories, and perspectives have been included in the process of theoretical development in the field. Opinions on international relations are no longer led or judged by western standards, or without western biases, which is a new and necessary element of international equity and fairness. For instance, China has put forward many concepts that are different from western ones including three worlds, nonalignment, democratization of international relations, diversity of developmental models, peaceful rising, harmonious world, five principles of peaceful coexistence, and new relations among powers.

There are no distinctions between the East and the West in theories of science. A theory of science verified becomes a universal truth. Is it possible to establish an inter-East-West theory in social sciences that contains a universal power of interpretation? After a rough examination on the current situation of research in international relations theory in China, Singapore, and Japan, Inoguchi（2010）has raised the question of why there are no non-Western theories of international relations. Based on global and na-

tional situations, we can refine and abstract our concepts, formulations, and practices to establish a theory widely accepted in both Eastern and Western circles with a universal power of interpretation to international relations. This theory can be coexistent and compatible with other international relations theories, as well as being a complement and development to the existing theories. This theory can be based on non-Western terminology or concepts but written in an eastern routine and standards. However, it has to be logical and justifiable with concrete evidence. In conclusion, the universal explanatory power of a new theory can be heightened through increasing its internal logic and extensive examination on its applicability.

Both realism and liberalism support the interests-bearing alliances among nations. The former leads to national interests oriented alliances of a few nations such as military ones; the later leads to common interest oriented alliances of more nations such as the League of Nations and the United Nations. In the situation of being without a public power or legal and moral rules, unethical power struggles flood in international relations, and even balance and alliance are the only stabilizing factors（Hobbes, 1651）. Military alliances are based on certain interest disputes especially military confrontations, and share no fundamental common interests with their imaginary enemies；and military confrontations damage the global common interests while hurting the national interests of the adversary party. The common interests of members in an alliance should not hurt the interests of countries in the region, and the common interests of a region are not to hurt the interests of other regions. The interests of any groups should be consistent with the common interests in international relations. The common interests are the important elements in the development of international relations from the interests-bearing stage to the inevitable stage. And the final realization of the inevitable international relations arrives when the regional common interests expand to the whole world. If the element of interests in international relationship is excluded, the contacts between countries in the same region are the most elementary and natural international relations. When regions take global common interests as the norm of international relations instead of their regional interests, a regional organization is no longer an interest group but a district in global governance, or a family in the global society. International relationship moves to a higher level, namely the inevitable international relations based on the maximum magnitude of interests. Thus it completes the negation of interests-bearing international relationship and the double negation of natural international relationship.

International relations occur among nations. Nations try to find common interests or mutual benefits in dealing with others. However, conflicts of national interests among countries always exist, not to mention that the so-called common interests or mutual benefits are only between certain countries under certain conditions. The common interests of certain nations are different from the common interests of all nations. The League of Nations represented the common interests of winning countries. The representation of the United Nations is highly inclusive, but it is still an interests-bearing organization that cannot actually protect the interests of every member and realize the international equality. The logical starting point of conception and theory of international equality has to start from a new term other than state or nation in conventional definitions, or change the set of concepts of nation, national interests, and nationalism to Country Rights. The concepts of state and nation have accumulated many meanings in fighting and competing for their existence from history and tradition. The new meaning of "country" in

this article only indicates a piece of territory and its people, which implies the equality among all countries. While the alliances have been formed on the collection and balance of national interests of a few nations, the Council of Countries is based on country rights equally shared and owned by all countries. It is a huge project to establish a theoretical system based on generalizations of all reachable data and cases in international relations. It is a task that most people are not able to complete on their own. What the author wants to present here are some new concepts and perspectives of interpreting various relations among countries in a simple and understandable way, and hopefully they are acceptable by the majority of readers.

3．Country Rights, Non-Alignment, and the Council of Countries

There are two fundamental differences among the conceptions of country rights, nationalism, and alignment in their representations. First, the coverage of *country rights* includes all countries with their equal rights while nationalism focuses on individual countries' rights, and the alignment is based on the rights of a group of countries. Second, *country rights* is an interest-free concept or for the common interests of all countries while nationalism focuses on the interests of individual countries or is for the common interests of a group of countries.

The goals of international relations research are to explore the regular patterns of international relations, and to lay down the rules agreed and observed by all countries to avoid wars, to maintain peaceful coexistence, and to bring the joint developments. The rules for countries to follow are mainly those of protecting the equal rights of countries and those of implementing the duties of all countries. However, there are serious disagreement in formulating, interpreting, and carrying out those rules due to the diversity in international relations theories and believes followed by different countries. Some countries stress on national interests and politics of power, and others call for common interests and politics of rights. The cooperation among countries only occurs in the area combining both national interests and common interests. As the premise of international relations, country rights present not only an equal stand for every entity in international relations, but also the meeting point between national interests and common interests of all nations, thus the key point of international relations theory. In terms of academic discussion, scholars from various countries have to locate the common starting point for their research in the field.

As an exploration to international relations theory, the starting point of this article is a state of neither war or anarchy nor rational harmony, but a situation of anarchy-reason-coexistence in which countries were isolated from each other. By "anarchy" it means that there were no international organizations above individual and independent countries, not to mention any authoritative international institutes ever existed. By "reason" it means that without external pressure, these independent countries peacefully lived their lives, and kept natural contacts with their neighbors. This "reason" has the characteristics of non-interests and trans-interests. However, when international relations were at the state of nature, human society started breaking off the state of nature. When people broke off the state of nature, some of them gradually let selfish and power-driven desires erode their reason. When these people controlled the governments, their desires for power destroyed the natural state of international relations and the rational and peaceful life of other peoples in intruding their neighbors or other countries. Thus, the state of anar-

chy transferred to the state of war. Their desires for power could never be satisfied until other countries were defeated. There was not an international authority to restrain their desires for power. Their actions discarded reason, deteriorated the initial state of anarchy; inequality among countries thus occurred. When mobilizing the war, they told their people that it was for their national interests. But first, what they were doing was not for national interests but for their own interests. Second, to hurt another country's interests for own interests is an irrational conduct in dealing with international affairs. The establishment of the League of Nations and the United Nations, to certain extent, were to restrict the irrational behaviors of some countries. But they were unable to stop powers or hegemonies to infringe other countries' interests for own benefits under the pretext of reason.

The norms of international relations result from human reason thinking over irrational behaviors and making choices based on past experiences. However, these reflections and selections preserve the differences in the precondition of seeking common grounds. Discrepancies or behaviors of doing things at one's pleasure are often unavoidable in the process of understanding and executing. The underlying causes of such a phenomenon are: 1）There are areas and periods that countries are in a mutually beneficial and win-win situation, but the factors of interest conflicts among countries are omnipresent. The role of international relations rules is to inhibit those factors. 2）It is not abstract countries, but specific individuals and leader teams consisted of these individuals who are conducting international affairs. Their psychological behaviors affect international relations ubiquitously; and their irrational actions are ever-present challenges to the norms of international relations.

The composition of this article is a process of exploring a brand-new theory. The author tries to overcome a researcher's perceptional and rational subjectivity, limitation, and one-sidedness, break free from the influence and restraints, and rethink the terminologies and concepts of the subject. The goals are to eliminate various "idols" in the research of international relations theory, and to probe new norms and theories of international relations, which represent neither any schools of thoughts nor any countries or cultures, but a human-oriented and country-oriented theory with country rights as its core. The discussion range is limited to evolution, entities, and models of international relationship, psychological guidance to international relations, and hypothesis on the new patterns of international relations.

Categories involved in international relations theories are all-inclusive. Perspectives of international relations, therefore, are multidimensional and multi-laminar. When examining and analyzing the cases in international relations from multidimensional and multi-laminar perspectives, we can have a comprehensive understanding and an objective interpretation. These perspectives horizontally cover the areas of international relations including geographic location, political strategy, military security, economic interdependence, and cultural communication, and vertically present the three stages of evolution: natural, interests-bearing, and inevitable international relationships. Natural international relationship means nonpolitical and nonmilitary contacts among countries in natural environments, including occasional conflicts and fights between neighbors. At the stage of natural international relations, countries are equal with basic natural rights to their land and people, and their relations are mainly based on needs. Interests-bearing relationship refers to contacts among countries based on national economic, political, or military interests. Conflicts and wars on national interests occur according to the structure of interests-bearing relations among countries at a higher level for a longer term substantially than those conflicts at

the natural stage. Inevitable relationship indicates rational relations among countries based on their equal rights and global common interests. It is a natural relationship at a higher level among countries with rationality in an international society with justice. The connotation of countries as basic entities goes back to its natural elements: a piece of land and its inhabitants. Different from the preliminary countries or communities at the stage of natural "international" relations, the connotation of countries at the stage of inevitable international relations has rich meanings including equal rights accumulated from historical evolution and acknowledged not between neighbors or among a few nations but by all countries.

There should have no religious and ideological conflicts but cultural diversities among different human civilizations in essence. The differences between cultures do not prevent their contacts and communications. Ideological conflicts and attacks on other countries' religions and systems are not original but authoritative characteristics of a culture that aim for political interests. Culture starts at human interpretation, imitation, and improvement to environment for survival and various needs. The shared characteristics among different cultures are reactions to basic challenges in human life; differences occur because cultures produce different ways of interpretation, imitation, and improvement to their respective environments. With the expanding and strengthening of cultural communication, mutual influence and permeation continuously happen between cultures. Meanwhile, the material basis of survival, reflection, and reappearance of different cultures increasingly becomes closer. Especially in the age of information, electronic technology including computers and Internet becomes the common media of cultures, and the common vehicle for cultural mergence. Cultural integration is a developmental inevitability among countries, and is negating the negation of natural contacts between cultures in the initial stage of mankind.

According to Zhang & Zhang（2000）, the main characteristics of the relationships among ancient countries were accidental, simple, loose, and local. The military relationships such as territorial annexation, plundering wealth, and conquest did not happen at the stage of natural relations or at least not at the beginning of this stage but at the stage of interests-bearing international relations. It can be seen that international relations have gone through a process based on natural reason to non-natural interest competition and balance, and then to interdependent, integrated, and harmonious inevitable relations. Philosophization of this process is like what Hegel's triadic structure of positive, negative, and synthesis of them. Interests-bearing relationship gradually emerges in the process of negating natural relationship. Inevitable international relationship finally appears during its negation of interests-bearing international relationship and its twice negations of natural international relationship. The triadic structure of twice negations generalizes the evolutionary process of international relations in various areas as the following chart shows.

General	Economic	Political	Cultural
Non-interests-bearing contacts between neighbors, contacts for national and regional interests, regional integration and development towards world integration.	Transitions with characteristics of natural economics, political economics, mutual benefits and win-win mechanism, and the deepening process of economic interdependence.	Conflicts and fights between neighbors or wars within small ranges, military alliances out of security concerns and aiming at adversary parties or imaginary enemies, and common actions of all countries facing natural challenge and improvement of global governance.	Natural contacts between cultures, coexistence of cultural communication and ideological attacks, and integration of various cultures in the world.

The chart above explains the whole process of the evolution from natural to inevitable international relations with both horizontal and vertical perspectives. In this process mankind has paid, and is still paying a huge price. Natural and rational relationship here means rational international relations in natural environment that are based on free will of individual countries, not for hurting other countries' interests. Countries have gains and losses in fighting for, and balancing of interests. In history, there were people who could see these irrational selfish behaviors cool-headedly and stayed objective through examining and reflecting human activities from time to time. Inevitable reason is the wisdom with abilities of reflection, decision-making and operation towards countries' common interests. This wisdom is to examine closely the interdependent and integrative trend of international society in politics, economy, and culture; to see clearly various disadvantageous, selfish, irrational, unfair words and actions against positive development of international relations; to overcome the interests and perspectives of any single country; and to ascend to yearn and chase for the harmony of trans-natural international society.

In addition to realism and liberalism, there are other western international relations theories. After the Cold War, new theories appeared to challenge the old ones and to interpret the trend of world politics afterwards. Zhao and Ni（2007）briefly introduced the "theory family" of Reflexive theories that includes critical theory, post-modernism, feminism, constructivism, and historical sociology. The main characteristics of these new theories are as follows: the role of concepts and discourse, the mutual construction between structure and behavior, the immaterialism of power, and relativity of truth. These theories have raised new issues and variables of international relations in the age of information and globalization, but are still at the stage of discussion and trial period. Nevertheless, they are more or less within the system of western international relations theory. Aforementioned various theories with related concepts and interpretations are only the most well-known and dominant ones in international relations received and adopted, to certain extend, by some western scholars. There are other western scholars who do not necessarily share the western theories and concepts mentioned above. There are even more eastern scholars disagree with those dominant western theories and ideas. Due to the differences in academic tradition, conceptual system, and thinking logic, eastern scholars have their own theories in international relations with starting points and core concepts that are very different from those of western ones.

Country Rights, International Equality, and the World Order

One of the subtitles Deng（2008）uses in his book is *Human Rights and the World Order.* This article, however, considers country rights the premise of international equality and the basis of the world order. As mentioned above, international relations in natural state were relatively simple. Contacts among different groups of people were much fewer except intermarriages, country fairs, religious and productive activities conducted through common practices between neighbors. The simple interaction and association in peaceful and harmonious atmosphere at the early stage of international relations were soon replaced by those with characteristics of interests bearing, and thus adding many variables to international relations. Rulers or leaders of countries cheat with, or scheme against, each other for one piece of land, a place with mineral deposits, or even a woman due to their irrationality or selfish desires. Wars and peace treaties continuously start and end; allies and enemies are regrouping or mixed up. Simple international relations become complicated, and reputations among countries are deteriorated. However,

the general trend of international relations is controlled neither by one or two countries, nor by one or two rulers of a country. In general, human beings and their leaders do not lose reason completely or forever, especially when the interests of the rulers and their countries suffer from a huge loss or face threats, the strength of reason forces them to accept reasonable suggestions, and to abide by the provisions and peace treaties they have committed to.

Some scholars in the field of international relations have applied the concepts of the state of anarchy and power-driven as the starting and key points to interpret international relations. They consider an even balance and alliances important means in dealing with international affairs, and then establish a theoretical system based on these ideas. Even balance and power playing were, and still are strategies for some countries to protect self-interests and compete with other countries in world politics. However, nowadays international relations are no longer in a state of anarchy; and the situation of powers' determination on weak countries is improving. In other words, there are public opinions, rules, and international organizations as "deterrent force" above individual countries. Meanwhile, a trend towards international democracy has been an opposition to powers. Although the state of anarchy was the initial condition of international relations, it is not a comprehensive elaboration of original international relationships. In addition to the trait of "anarchy", the initial international relations had many other important characteristics that later on became prime factors of the development in international relations. The majority of countries are not pursuing power except very few powers with the mentality of hegemony. International relations include relations in various fields at different levels among all countries in the world. Contacts among many countries in the same fields at the same levels are not aiming at getting power, or even without the slightest connection to power. As a theory, it must possess certain farsightedness, namely hypothetic quality of scientific theory. This farsightedness serves the theories and practices of international relations as an introduction or a guideline. It can be verified by the developmental facts of international relations in the future. There are no authorities but valid attempts and potential reassurance. The theoretical proposal here consists of three parts concerning country rights as: the principle of national autonomy; the premise of international relations, and the foundation of global governance and international equality.

1. Country Rights: The Principle of National Autonomy

1.1. Country-oriented

Along with the geographical and historical evolution, the world is divided into territories with different sizes and natural environments that gave birth to various cultures and systems. These countries exist as natural grants, and as a return to the nature, they are to treat the land and the people living on the land well. The only standards to judge the rationality of a country's existence are its protection to people's lives and its effort to improve people's living, namely putting its people first, or "people-based" and "people-oriented." "Ben Wei" in Chinese means the basis of monetary system or calculation norm for the value of currency. The Chinese equivalence of "people-based" or "people-oriented" is "Min Ben Wei," meaning that the criterion of rationality and the success of a society or a country depend on the index of people's security and happiness. Development of societies should aim at people's needs; and governments' job is to protect people's lives and property, and to improve the quality of people's existence in-

cluding both spiritual and material existence. From the same logic and the same reasoning, "country-oriented" means that the criterion of rationality and the success of the international society depend on the index of countries' security and welfare. Moreover, the term of "country-oriented" contains the universality and objectivity of every country while the term of "nation-oriented" connotes the individuality and subjectivity. "Country-oriented" focuses on common interests of all countries whereas "nation-oriented" emphasizes special interests of certain nations. According to Stalin's classic definition（1913）, a nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture. In other words, Stalin empowers "nation" five elements: a community of people, a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up. In the theory of country rights, there are only two natural elements for countries: a piece of land or territory, and the people on this land.

Up to now the democratic government is an enlightened and humanized administration representing the greatest majority of people in a country. The connotation of democracy implies that every citizen enjoys equality and freedom with the same quantity and quality, which include material equality and economic freedom as well as political equity. Material equality does not mean equalitarianism but the satisfaction of normal material needs for every person. The present world does not have the material basis to equalize the whole world according to rich countries' standard, and it is not appropriate and applicable to equalize the whole world according to poor countries' standard either. Even in the future when materials are extremely abundant, there is no need for a material equalitarianism. This is because that the material needs vary among individuals based on the characteristics of individuals from different traditions, their different desires for materials, and the standards of their satisfaction. There are two meanings of material equality. First, every citizen gets essentials for living through own income, family's support, or government's help; and ensuring citizens' material equality is the primary task of a democratic government. Second, every citizen enjoys the same right to buy goods relying on his/her own ability; producing sufficient materials and eliminating privileges are the two aspects of government in satisfying citizens' material needs. Citizens' economic freedom is mainly the freedom of investing and doing business. Citizens play important roles in country's economic development according to their economic situation, interest, and specialties. Economic freedom also implies that every citizen has the opportunity to be rich as other citizens or become richer than others. The most important element of political equity is equal citizenship, of which every citizen has an equal access to political activities as human rights imply. The principles of material equality, economic freedom and political equity can be extended to international society for international equality.

Country puts its people first while international society puts all countries first. They are very similar in concepts and logic. The unification of people-oriented and country-oriented is the amalgamation of individual countries' democracy and democracy of international society. Democratic, equal and free international relations embody the principle of country-oriented. Democratic international society treats every country as an equal member; each member country enjoys the freedom of engaging in activities of various kinds while satisfying its citizens' needs; and organizations in international society should represent interests of the vast majority of countries. As mentioned above, countries are entities in international relations. Protecting each country's core interests including its tradition, belief, and system endorsed by

most of its people is the premise of international relations. Attaching importance to each country's basic needs including territorial integrity and people's security is the norm of international relations. In a country, if some people have more power, wealth, and right to express opinion than the majority of people, the democracy, equality, and freedom of this country should be called into question. This principle can be extended to international society and international relations. Western scholars extremely stress human rights when discussing issues concerning individuals, family, and society. Similarly, the equal right of countries is the theoretical starting point of international relations. Providing every citizen enough living space is the basic responsibility of the government. No countries have the reasons to attack another country's soft power, or to seize the "living space" from another country. Otherwise, it is to violate the "country rights" of other nations. *Country Rights* is the counterpart of human rights in international relations. When under the pressure of overpopulation, a country can rationally resolve the problem of living space with certain systems and policies such as "family planning" and immigration, but definitely not through invasion and expansion. Invasion of a country is the same as invasion of that country's equal right no matter what the purpose of this invasion is. In doing so, it damages the democracy of international society.

Countries should have unanimous understanding and interpretation on the concept of freedom. Not hurting other countries' freedom is the premise of any countries' freedom. In international relations, countries can contact each other out of their own free will, and determine the ways and areas of their connection by themselves. Undermining other countries' economy and political freedom by economic means or political games, putting pressure on other countries when they are making choices, and forcing other countries to give up some of their freedom are not the free behaviors that departed from the idea of "country-oriented." Even if this renouncement is a transaction with a repayment, it does not change its essence of non-freedom. Freedom is an important connotation of the concept of "country-oriented," and giving up freedom equals to renouncing the principle of "country-oriented" in international relations. It shares the same characteristic as despotic state's depriving individuals' freedom or exerting political pressure on citizens. Relations between countries should be rational; and rationality embodies in respecting other countries. The mutual respect between countries is the starting point for mutual benefits as well as behavioral rationality. In order to balance the interests among countries, the interests of weak countries should be fully considered and supported whereas the interests of strong countries must be restrained and directed to a certain extent. Playing power on weak countries shows disrespect to these countries, which obstructs the realization of their mutual benefits and an equal relationship.

In conclusion, the principle of "people-oriented" in democratic countries is to protect every citizen's rights of democracy, equality, and freedom. Similarly, the principle of "country-oriented" in a democratic international society is to protect every country's rights of democracy, equality, and freedom. Countries' these rights in international relations embody in respecting the same rights of other countries. This article advocates the practices and popularization of the concepts of democracy, equality, and freedom in international society and international relations. Attaining to this goal is the necessary and primary condition for international relations to reach at the inevitable stage.

1. 2.   Country Rights and National Autonomy

Autonomy is the premise of survival and development for any countries, thus the essence of country rights. Without an autonomic right, countries cannot maintain their security, freedom, order, justice, and welfare. However, without country rights, autonomy of a country is easily damaged or destroyed. Equal international relations exist among autonomic countries. The autonomy of any countries must be protected. When all countries have their autonomic rights, security will not be a problem in international relations. It is better to have all countries abide by the principle of country rights than to have an international authority to guide the process to international equality. International authority does not depend on power but on its protecting equal rights of all countries. International authority is an undividable entity not manipulated by any powers but working for all nations.

Territory is one of the important connotations of sovereignty, the platform of all activities for a country, and also the premise and material basis of national autonomy, which belongs to all citizens of this country. Territory is an inseparable part of sovereignty that belongs to people and that nation as an entity. Sovereignty should not be infringed; neither should the people and their countries be punished; and no territory should be cut apart by other countries. Sovereignty and the rights of defeated countries should be respected. But since long time ago, nobody upholds sovereignty of defeated countries and their people, and victorious nations can infringe on interests of another country and its people with an consideration absolutely for their own interests. No government has the right to sell or transfer its territory to other countries, or to occupy and seize other countries' territory. Occupying other countries' territory through wars or occupying the territory of defeated country according to the peace treaty drafted by victorious nations are violations to the principle of country rights.

Do treaties drawn by powers as a balance between their gaining interests and the sacrifice of other countries' interests equal to fair verdicts by international authority? Should we reevaluate these so-called peace treaties？ Many territory issues in nowadays-international relations are left from wars including East-West Germany（solved）, South-North Koreas, Northern Four Islands between Japan and Russia, Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands between China and Japan, and the Taiwan Strait issues. Deals on these territories are usually not the results of discussion between countries involved, but the judgment and compromises made by victorious countries based on their own interests. These so-called peace treaties are often a way of interest distribution between victorious countries without reasonable consideration on the long-term interests of defeated countries and their people and the consequences of territory division in these countries. World War Ⅱ has finished for two thirds of a century, but the territory issues it left behind are still hidden troubles of conflicts and wars. They have caused suffering to countries and their people in regions, and often become hot lands where powers compete. Some peace treaties have planted seeds of conflicts and imbalance while dispute resolution and interest balance were made. International laws and international authority should forbid using territory as an item of punishment, because it is fundamentally an action of violating the sovereignty of a country and its country rights as well. To a certain extent, this is to deprive of living right of people in the countries involved. An international authority with a true meaning has its duty to correct these wrong practices while respecting the national autonomy of all countries, victorious or defeated ones.

Territory issue is very complicated, yet no countries are willing to give up their territory for it is the

most important part of their rights. Territory, especially that with rich resources and at a special strategic location, is most countries' long-cherished dream. At present, when most countries have not reached the highest level of rationality, we can search for an objective and universal relevant standard to resolve territory disputes as far as possible. This objective standard should be natural and historical. From the angle of nature, territory boundaries are usually divided according to important geographic marks such as mountains, rivers, and seas. Territory dividing among islands is more complicated. It should be divided according to the middle line in livable islands between neighbors, but excluding unlivable rocks（Lincoln, 2014）. The natural and objective dividing of territories should be detached from any other artificial and interests-bearing standards. It can save the time for searching the respective supports countries use for their own interests, and avoiding those endless, ineffectual, and subjective arguments. From the aspect of history, territory belongs to the people who have exploited it and the country it has establishment on it. But in the real world, it is far from so simple. There have been many cases in history, due to the lack of rationality and international authority, in which strong countries or powers took advantage of small or weak countries in territory, and many of these cases have become accomplished facts. There are some territory disputes that were temporarily resolved through negotiation or signing documents between countries, but are nondeterministic and doubtful in final dividing of territory because of too many artificial and interests-bearing factors involved. In theory, if the boundaries between countries are accepted and satisfied by the countries involved, then maintaining the current situation is the best choice for every one. In terms of existing territory issues due to certain historic reasons, countries involved should try to solve them based on historic roots and documents, give up the attitude of self-interests oriented, and look for rational solutions accepted by all parties.

The importance of territory lies in the definition of "country" for it is one of the two natural connotations of country. Without the sovereignty on its territory, a country cannot protect the right of living for its people, not to mention the other rights of its citizens. Countries have the right to make decisions on systems, the process towards democracy, religious and cultural policies, etc., which is part of their autonomy with a goal of protecting their own country rights. Any military or political factors should not, and will not affect the ontological position of any countries, thus the autonomy of that country. The core of national autonomy is of country rights. Only when a nation enjoys its country rights, will it be autonomous. The support from all autonomous nations with country rights ensures the existence of international authority and success of international equality.

2．Country Rights: the Premise of International Relations in Globalization

There are historic imprints in reality. Various models in the evolution of international relations have their present forms in contemporary international relations. In other words, concepts and forms of international relations appearing in contemporary world affairs can find their original formality in old times. Every country is a member of globalization, and plays a certain role contributing to international relations. A country can also play different roles in a few bilateral or multilateral international relations at the same time. Different combinations of international relations are based on factors concerning geographical locations, governmental systems and countries' ideologies, complementation in economic development, dependence in strategy, and mutual supports in international affairs.

2. 1. Models of International Relations

International relations established according to different intentions can be divided into mature model, developing model, unstable model, and antagonistic model. Relations between countries take different models due to the characteristics and the depth of their national interests involved and related. And models change when the important factors of these interests-bearing relations change. Only international relations based on country rights could last.

Partners in international relations with a mature model respect each other's country rights to the largest extent. In a region where there are no fundamental interest conflicts or the conflicts can be properly and institutively handled, it is possible to establish a mature model of international relations that combines mutual non-interference in politics and reciprocal division of labor in economy. If all countries in the region respect each other's country rights including sovereignty, territory integrity, political system and ideology, keep mutual exchange of needed products, and deal with all transactions fairly, they can adopt the mature model of international relations even though they bear many differences. This mature model may have more perspicacity and universality since more regions are moving towards this direction. The inevitable relations among countries lie in a condition in which countries with different cultures and institutions at different levels of economic development can participate in international division of labor equally. This international division of labor without interests involved reflects an inevitable relationship among countries. Provincialism is the final plate of international relations. In the future, economic and political relations among countries are interlocked. Regional interests replace the interests of individual countries; and international division of labor gradually replaces the interests of individual regions. Every region exchanges its resources and products with other regions in the world, and enjoys resources and products from other regions at the same time. However, military alliances based on political strategies that consider the third party as an imaginary enemy do not fall into the mature model of international relations even if they are regional and share common interests among the allies.

Non-antagonism in political system, ideology, and strategy is the necessary condition of the developing model of international relationship, and the complementation in economic development is the sufficient condition of this model. The economic complementation brings positive energy to international relations, particularly to those with a developing model in the age of globalization and informationization, and increasingly becomes a condition both necessary and sufficient for this model to be maintained. If two countries share positive energy in political system, ideology, strategy, and economic development, their supporting each other in international affairs is more likely. The bilateral or multilateral relationships established against this backdrop can be in a developing model, and geographical location provides this model a convenient condition. But in the contemporary international relations of interests-bearing, geographical location plays less important role than it had in the natural state. Yet geographical location often becomes both a natural factor to the conflicts between neighbors and an obstacle in a developing model between distant partners. The developing model of international relations can also be adopted between countries that are not strongly complemented in economy but harmonious in other aspects, and often support each other in international affairs. For instance, the partners are similar in systems and ideologies, and have cultural connections; or they never had serious conflicts or wars in history but affable feelings between their peoples. The two sides keep a traditional friendship, move towards the

same direction, and continuously add new contents and development to this traditional friendship. In conclusion, in cases of international relations with a developing model, the relationship does not necessarily keep a perfect harmony all along without any interest conflicts, but the common interests exceed the contradictions between the two parties in a direction of moving forward in general. More importantly, partners have to respect each other's country rights. Without this basis, the relations will stop developing.

An unstable model refers to those of international relations in which conflicts between the two sides often occur, the developmental trend is not always moving forward, and serious crises and backward phenomenon happen periodically. This model can be divided into two types based on its characteristics: the macro–unstable model and the micro-unstable model. A macro-unstable model indicates those of international relations with a long duration and a wide range of instability, and possibility of drastically retrogression. This situation is often caused by strategic conflicts, fierce political disputes and intense economic competition between the two sides. A micro-unstable model refers to those of international relations with the instability of a short duration or within a small range that does not affect the overall situation between the two sides. It is mostly caused by certain policies of the two parties. The policy factors include countermeasures to the new situations in international political economy, involvement of a third party, changes of their governments and policies, and disputes on territory. Unstable international relations can occur between neighbors, or two countries that are seriously antagonistic at any one of the areas mentioned above, for instance, hostility and exclusion in political system and ideology including religion, the fierce fights for resources including territory with newly discovered resource, and the market for investment and products, the severe opposition in strategy, and the long-term confrontation in world affairs. In conclusion, the interest factor decides the characteristics and conditions of the unstable model. Geographical location often contributes to an unstable model in international relations. It provides the environmental conditions for fights between neighbors with economic, strategic, and military conflicts as well as the convenient circumstances for economic contacts and cultural communications. When the two neighbors are in a harmonious, friendly, and allied situation in the above-mentioned four areas, a close geographical location brings great convenience and profound force to the political and economic development of this bilateral relationship. But if there are differences and confrontations in core interests between the two neighbors, a close geographical location adds the chances and causes of intensified conflicts between them.

An antagonistic relationship is an extreme manifestation of interest conflicts among countries, and the origin of a world disturbed. The key elements in the formation of antagonistic international relations are prejudices in areas of political system, ideology, and religion, competition for resources and markets, and confrontation in strategy. Geographical location has little impact on antagonistic model of international relations. But when the coefficients of other aspects of international relations are all negative, geographical location can provide both sides the excuses for intensifying their contradiction, and turn the relationship much worse. In general, one side of a hostile relationship is more aggressive, or has a clear aim: to bring the adversary to its knees and do things according to its standards and desires, or to achieve its aim through compulsory means. The two sides of a hostile relationship usually do not want to make public at the early stage but to wait for a due time. Meanwhile, they will respectively strive for more

supporters, prepare for public opinions, or conceal the real intention. One of the two sides or both sides may show the real pictures just before declaring war. The formation of hostile international relations goes through a process, and there are differences in the range and extent of hostility. The antagonistic relations among countries are not everlasting. In history of international relations, the cases of former enemies becoming today's partners are not unusual. The Middle and Modern ages of Europe witnessed many relations in a hostile model, including fights for overseas markets, territory and resources, authority in Europe and hegemony in the world. In order to scramble for power and profits, main countries in Europe went through many wars in history, between Britain and France, Germany and France, and Britain and Germany. During the two world wars, interest conflicts and hostile relations among main European countries developed into confrontations between groups that they could only take the form of war. However, the antagonistic model of international relations can change; the key action is to consider more on the common interests among countries and in regions and the public interests of the whole world.

2. 2. Family Value

The world is like a family with countries as its family members. Advocating and practicing principles of democracy, equality, and freedom are not to uniform the patterns of international relations, but to ensure the inevitability of international relations. Diversity of international relations is the form itself. To avoid the transition from diversity to adversary, and to promote the transition from interests-bearing international relations to inevitable international relations, the term of *Family Value* is implied in this article to analyze the international relations in addition to the concepts of country-oriented and country rights. *Family Value* as a term of international relations theory has two meanings: 1）variety of non-interests-bearing international relations at the stage of inevitable international relationship; 2）harmony of international relations at the stage of inevitable international relationship. They are the two major characteristics of inevitable international relationship and the two distinctions between the inevitable and interests-bearing international relationships.

Different types of international relationship are like various relations between people, including those between lovers, husband and wife, parents and children, siblings, relatives, friends, colleagues, and neighbors. The formation of these relations has various causes and characteristics, but they all can participate in international affairs in a similar active posture, affect each other in the big family of international community, and play different roles in connections. However, these forms of international relations at the stage of interests-bearing international relationship are different from those at the stage of inevitable international relationship. At the stage of interests-bearing international relationship, there are relations like those between lovers, friends, or neighbors, but there are also international relations between enemies. Even in those close relationships within the international family, interests based disputes often occur because pursuing self-interests is an important factor or the cause to maintain these relations. For instance, marriages break because one side of the couple has a financial problem, or family disputes because parents unevenly distribute money among children. At the stage of inevitable international relationship, these relations within the international family are not interests bearing. Countries show their harmonious relations in different forms, and the core is for interests of every member in the international society. In other words, no matter what kinds of relations between individual countries, the ultimate goal

is to defend the common interests and the harmonious coexisting of the great international family.

Thus, how can we add the principle of *Family Value* to all bilateral and multilateral relations to make sure that none of the international relations is established at a price of sacrificing the interests of other family members and that of the whole family? How can we make every country realize that hurting other countries is hurting other family members, and thus its own family, which will eventually hurt that country itself? In concerning the core principles of *Family Value*, first, every family member or country realizes that the interests of all family members are connected. When having this consciousness, countries will voluntarily share interests among themselves, gradually water down the idea of natural interests until entering the stage of inevitable international relations when the implication of interests is for the benefits of the global family. Even in an interests-bearing society, the possibility of sharing interests among "family members" is higher than that among other members. Second, every family member or country must realize that since the interests of all countries are connected, protecting the interests of other side should be one of the goals for international contacts. At the stage of inevitable international relationship, protecting partner's interests and protecting own interests are unanimous, and contacts among countries are for the common interests. Third, when countries establish a family-like affection among them, the contacts among them are like mutual visits between family members. Countries provide what the other family members lack and exchange feelings with them. Thus, international relations are back to a natural situation at a higher level. It is an inevitable natural situation that transcends any pure national interests completely. And it is based on a global economy, convenient transportation, cross-cultural communication, regulation, persistence, and a high-level civilization.

However, orderly and persistent contacts and communication among countries worldwide need a systematic guarantee. This guarantee in system is pure administrative, and different from the mechanism of nowadays international politics. The basis of the establishment and final formation of this pure administrative body is at the unification of international authority and national autonomy. In this unification, every country voluntarily accepts any international organizations' arrangement and management that are entirely out of their indispensability and rationality without any prejudice, discrimination, and interests-bearing factors.

3. Country Rights: the Foundation of Global Governance and International Equality

Country Rights should be an important law of international relations with the power of uniting all countries. Country rights can bring the positive energy out of all countries so that every country plays an appropriate role in global governance. "Global governance is a process of managing international affairs without a world government" (Lincoln, 2014). Government has had different forms such as autocracy and democracy, and has its governance with more or less control on people governed. However, global governance has only democratic form functioning not as a world government but as a world system of many institutions in which all countries participate. With country rights, nations actively participate in various global institutes and work together towards a more democratic global governance. With country rights, the management of international affairs is no longer under the manipulation of a few powers, and develops into a new system that is run by all countries.

3. 1. Elements of Global Governance

Global Governance means a collective management of common problems at the international level. The three elements of global governance are collective management, common problems, and international level. Each of these three elements has a necessary relationship with country rights. In other words, *Country Rights* is the fundamental basis of the three elements of global governance.

Collective management in global governance has historically related to colonialism, imperialism, polarity, and globalization from manipulating by a few powers towards more countries participating and from control towards management（Lincoln, 2014）. The basic characteristic of colonialism, imperialism, and polarity is the unequal relationships among countries. While multi-polarity starts the redistribution of power globalization aims at collective management. According to general definitions from a few resources including Wikipedia, Dictionary.com, Merriam-Webster, New World Encyclopedia, Stanford Encyclopedia, and Oxford Dictionaries, colonialism is the establishment of a colony in one territory by a political power from another territory, and the subsequent maintenance, expansion, and exploitation of that colony; and imperialism is a policy of extending a country's power and influence through colonization, use of military force, or other means. Polarity means the various ways such as unipolarity, bipolarity, and multipolarity, in which power is distributed within the international system. Unipolarity in international politics is a distribution of power in which one state exercises most of the cultural, economic, and military influence, for instance, the American Primacy. Bipolarity is a system in which two states have the majority of economic, military, and cultural influence internationally or regionally, and they aim at expanding their spheres of influence. For example, in the Cold War, most Western and capitalist states fell under the influence of the USA, while most Communist states fell under the influence of the USSR. Multipolarity is a distribution of power in which more than four nation-states have nearly equal amounts of military, cultural, and economic influence. The current world is at the age when multipolarity and globalization coexist. The difference between the two is that the former is exclusive and the later inclusive to all countries in global governance. Collective management implies involvement and coordination. All countries share the responsibilities in global governance through equal participation and managerial cooperation. In joining the collective management in global governance, nations have realized and implemented their civil and political rights. The process of more countries participating in collective management and the realization of country rights are synchronized.

Common problems are the problems that human society faces together that are of the same importance to all countries. Comparing with regional or local problems, the common problems are either haunting most of the countries now or affecting the whole world in the future. Countries face common problems related to natural, economic, and social situations in different times at different extents. The current common problems the world faces are shortages in food, resources, and energy, epidemics and infectious diseases, terrorist threats to human lives and property, and environment related issues such as global warming and pollution. All countries have to consider these problems their own problems even if they are not yet haunted by some of these problems for the time being, because the impact and tendency of these problems will be global. In respecting countries economic and social rights, all countries have to work together on these common problems. In doing so, countries are protecting others' rights as well as their own.

International level can simply mean any transactions beyond domestic range or between more than two countries. The implication of international level varies from those between neighbors within a region or among a few countries, to those of interregional and world organizations participated by more or most of countries towards world integration. There is a tendency of international level enhancement towards globalization. Collective management focuses on the quantity part of equal participation in global governance, whereas international level focuses on the quality part of equal participation in global governance. International level also indicates the degree of collective management, common problems, and the combination of collective management and common problems. In other words, the more countries join the collective management, and the more common problems dealt by more countries, the higher degree the international level is at. So the highest international level equals maturity of global governance as well as completion of world integration with a full participation of all countries. At this level, *Country Rights* becomes the core and the goal of any international affairs. Meanwhile, the concept of country is replaced by a concept of entity that includes all areas in the world.

3. 2. Elements of International Equality

International equality is based on domestic equality of all countries. There are three basic elements in international equality: １）democracy, equality, and freedom or human rights of every country in international relations are embodied in the concept of "country-oriented" or country rights; ２）harmonious affection among countries born with interests is like that between family members without conflicts in fundamental interests; and ３）individual autonomous countries with equal country rights play different roles in global governance. When these three principles are realized in international society and international relations, relationships between countries will reach the highest stage, namely the stage of inevitable international relationship. With double negation to its original state, international relationship passes the initial natural condition and the interests-driven supernatural condition, and finally returns to a trans-interests rational condition based on inevitable relations among countries at the global level.

While a democratic country is people-based or people-oriented, or "of the people, by the people, for the people," a democratic international society should be country-based or country-oriented, or of the country, by the country, and for the country. As the concept of "people" includes the most majority of people in one country, the concept of "country" should include the most majority of countries in the world with autonomy and equal participation in decision-making. The fully involvement of international affairs by all countries in the world will take a long process and many steps from an equal right to express opinions in decision-making to caring each other between rich and poor countries, and to all countries with an absolute autonomy. Let us first, acknowledge and agree on the principle of country rights, and then advocate and accomplish this ideal in practices of dealing with other countries. Country rights should be the most important principle of international relations, global governance, and international equality.

Conclusion

The logic from human rights to country rights can be understood from two perspectives: individual

human beings as the basic unit of any societies and individual countries as the basic unit of international society; "country" connotes the sameness of countries and denotes all countries just as "human" connotes no difference among domestic members and denotes all members of a society. Realism, nationalism, and alignment are all interests-bearing theories although there are differences in terms of the entities of interests concerning powers, individual nations, or a group of nations. Nationalism has fulfilled its historic mission for oppressed nations to fight for sovereignty and autonomy. In the age of globalization, the basic units of the global society are no longer states or nations with ethnical, religious, economic, or political implications but countries with only natural implications of land and people. *Country Rights* is a theory based on the natural definition of country and the same rights of all countries. Thus, *Country Rights* is both necessary and sufficient for a globe with international equality. It has been a long process for countries to provide their people all aspects of human rights. The realization of country rights will not come until its principles are admitted and agreed, devoted and developed, implemented and institutionized by all countries in the world.

References

Deng, Y.（2008）. China's struggle for status: the realignment of international relations. pp. 69-73. Cambridge University Press.

Ewing, Keith. Tushnet, Mark & Cane, Peter（eds.）（2005）. Human rights: The Oxford handbook of legal studies. Oxford University Press.（Online Publication Date: Sep 2012 at DOI: 10. 1093/oxfordhb/9780199248179. 013. 0015）

Hobbes, Thomas.（1651）. Leviathan, or the matter, forme, and power of a common-wealth ecclesiastical and civil.（EBook #32071at http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3207/3207-h/3207-h.htm）.

Inoguchi, Takashi.（2010）. Why are there no non-western theories of international relations? ----The case of Japan, in Acharya, Amitav, & Buzan, Barry（ed.）, Non-western international relations theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia, 2010, pp. 51-68.

Kant, Immanuel.（1795）. To perpetual peace: A philosophical sketch, Hackett Publishing.（EBook at www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel**kant/**kant1. htm）.

Kissinger, Henry（2014）. World order, Penguin Press HC. In Dong Bo（Ed.）（2014）. Kissinger: Three challenges the western-dominated world order faces. Retrieved from http://global. dwnews.com/news/2014-09-04/59607118.html

Lincoln, PingPing Zhu.（2014）. "Islands" between Japan and China, NUCB Journal of Commerce and Business, pp. 189-205, Vol. 58, No. 2, 2014.（2014）. Conquest, contest, and consent: Evolution of global governance, NUCB Journal of Commerce and Business, pp. 179-196, Vol. 59, No. 1, 2014.

Liu, Xiao.（2010）. Reason and prejudice: International public opinion of contemporary west concerning China. Beijing: Social Sciences Press of China. pp. 25-29.（刘肖：《理智与偏见：当代西方涉华国际舆论研究》，北京：中国社会科学出版社，2010）

Ma, R.（1995）. Nationalism: Concept and reality, p.140, Journal Shanxi Normal University, No. 4, 1995.

Milovanovich, Zoran.（2014）. Human rights issues in criminal justice, Retrieved from www.lincoln.edu/criminaljustice/hr/ESCR.htm.

Morgenthau, Hans J.（2006）. Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace, pp. 4-16. McGraw Hill: Higher Education, 2006.

Seton-Watson, H.（1977）. Nations and states: An enquiry into the origins of nations and the politics of nationalism, pp. 1-13. Methuen.

Stalin, J.（1913）. Marxism and the national question, *Prosveshcheniye,* Nos. 3-5, March-May 1913. Retrieved from https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1913/03.htm.

Stiglitz, Joseph E.（2007）. Making globalization work. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. pp. 8, 276.

Tagore, R.（2008）. Nationalism. p.23. BiblioBazaar.

Thucydides（431B.C. E.）（Translated by Crawley, Richard）. The History of the Peloponnesian War. Retrieved from http://

classics.mit.edu/Thucydides/pelopwar.html.

Waltz, Kenneth N.（1979）. Theory of international politics. pp.194–210. McGraw Hill: Humanities/ Social Sciences/Languages.

Wang, Y.（1995）. Theories of contemporary international politics, Shanghai: Shanghai People's Press. pp.96–97.（王逸舟：《当代国际政治析论》，上海：上海人民出版社，1995）

Xia, Liping.（2008）. Contemporary international system and strategic relationship among major powers. p.72 Beijing: Current Affairs Press.（夏立平：《当代国际体系与大国战略关系》，北京：时事出版社2008）

Zhang, Lidong, & Zhang, Qianming.（ed.）（2000）. An introduction to contemporary international relations. pp.22, 54–59. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Press.（张丽东、章前明主编：《当代国际关系概论》，上海：上海人民出版社2000）

Zhao, Kejin, & Ni, Shixiong.（2007）. On international relations theories of China, Shanghai: Fudan University Press. p.24.（赵可金、倪世雄：《中国国际关系理论研究》，上海：复旦大学出版社2007）

Zhao, L.（2012）. Contemporary nationalism in East Asia and the inter-state relations: Conflict and integration of nationalism in China, R.O.K. and Japan since 1990s. p.25, Beijing, Social Sciences Academic Press.