UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY
U S T
M
MEGHALAYA
* *
Unveiling Excellence

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

MPS 103- INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

w.e.f Academic Session: 2023-24

CENTRE FOR DISTANCE AND ONLINE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY MEGHALAYA

nirf India Ranking-2023 (151-200)   Accredited 'A' Grade by NAAC

Techno City, 9th Mile, Baridua, Ri-Bhoi, Meghalaya, 793101

SELF-LEARNING MATERIAL

MA Political Science
MPS-103
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Academic Session : 2023-24

Centre for Distance and Online Education
UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY MEGHALAYA

Self Learning Material
Center for Distance and Online Education
University of Science and Technology Meghalaya

Edited by : Dr. Md Nazeer Hussain, Dr. Mary M. Kurbah & Mr. Dwaipayan Choudhury,

_____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents   **Page Nos.**

CHAPTER-1

INTRODUCTION TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

LEARNING OUTCOME: After going through this lesson, students will be able to-

- **Understand the evolution and meaning of International Relation**
- **Learn the nature and scope of International Relations**
- **Identify the differences between International Relations and International Politic**

1.1 International Relations: Meaning and Evolution

The world that we live in is in a flux. The change, whether in technologies telecommunications or travel, affects our daily lives. Our everyday choices get influenced by such changes. In this fast-moving globalized world, from the time we vote in an election or work on a political platform or simply purchase commodities or even trade services in the world market, we become part of the international community. Whether it is the rules of world trading system or war or catastrophes or increased people-to-people contact, our perspectives about world are shaped by the contemporary world events. The discipline of International Relations makes an endeavour to encapsulate such international politics and processes.

International Relations (IR) represents the study of foreign affairs and global issues among states including the roles of states, inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and multinational corporations (MNCs). It is both an academic and public policy field, and can be either positive or normative as it seeks both to analyse as well as formulate the foreign policy of particular states. It is often considered a branch of political science.

Apart from political science, IR draws upon such diverse fields as economics, history, law, philosophy, geography, sociology, anthropology psychology, and cultural studies. It involves diverse range of issues including but not limited to: globalization, state sovereignty, ecological sustainability nuclear proliferation, nationalism, economic development, global finance terrorism, organized crime, human security, foreign interventionism, and human rights. Since global developments touch upon the lives of every individual, the domain of

International Relations cannot be the sole right of the Presidents, Prime Ministers or Diplomats. It becomes relevant for every single person living under the Sun. The evolution of this discipline which began after the First World War is still in a developing stage and its scope is expanding every day. It becomes a challenge for academicians and students to master the discipline in this fast-changing world.

Meaning of International Relations

It is not an easy task to give the precise meaning of international relations which when capitalized and reduced to the acronym IR', specifies a field of study taught in universities and colleges as a 'subject' or a 'discipline'. The difficulty increases manifold because of the tendency to use the terms 'international relations and 'international politics' interchangeably. Often it is taken for granted that IR is the study of international politics only. Morgenthau and others viewed the core of international relations to be international politics and the subject matter of international politics to be struggle for power among sovereign nations. Padelford and Lincoln also opine that, when people speak of 'international relations', they are usually thinking of the relationships between states. They further contend that such relationships between states constitute international politics' which is the interaction of state policies within the changing patterns of power relationship.

But international relations means more and, as Palmer and Perkins point out, international relation is related to not just politics of international community centring on diplomacy and relations among states and other political units, it means 'the totality of the relations among peoples and groups in the world society'. Therefore, the term 'international relations' is not only broad but means more than the official political relations between governments on behalf of their states. As Hoffman suggested, the discipline of IR "is concerned with the factors and activities which affect the external policies and the power of the basic units into which the world is divided".

Palmer and Perkins observe that IR "encompasses much more than the relations among nation-states and international organizations and groups. t includes a great variety of transitional relationships, at various levels, above and below the level of the nation-state, still the main actor in the international community".

Wright contended that international relations include "relations between many entities of uncertain sovereignties" and that "it is not only the nations which international relations seek to relate. Varied types of groups -nations, states, governments, peoples, regions, alliances,

confederations, international organizations, even industrial organizations, cultural organizations, religious organizations-must be dealt with in the study of international relations, if the treatment is to be realistic".

A more convincing definition has been provided by Frankel, "This new discipline is more than a combination of the studies of the foreign affairs of the various countries and of international history-it includes also the study of international society as a whole and of its institutions and processes. It is increasingly concerned not only with the states and their interactions but also with the web of trans-national politics".

Mathiesen gives a much broader definition of international relations and suggests that "International Relations embraces all kinds of relations traversing state boundaries, no matter whether they are of an economic, legal, political, or any other character, whether they be private or official", and "all human behaviour originating on one side of state boundary and affecting human behaviour on the other side of the boundary".

Goldstein opines that the field of IR primarily "concerns the relationship among the world's governments". But defining IR in such a way, he argues, may seem simplistic, and therefore, to understand IR holistically, the relationship among states is to be understood in relation to the activities of other actors (international organizations, MNCs, individuals), in connection with other social structures (including economic, cultural and domestic politics), and considering historical and geographical influences.

Jackson and Sorenson observe that "the main reason why we should study IR is the fact that the entire populations of the world are divided into separate territorial communities, or independent states, which profoundly affect the way people live'", This definition points to the centrality of states and state system in the study of IR but there are other issues as well in contemporary IR. Jackson and Sorenson thus reflect that "at one extreme the scholarly focus is exclusively on states and inter-state relations; but at another extreme IR includes almost everything that has to do with human relations across the world. Therefore, IR seeks to understand how people are provided or not provided, with the basic values of security, freedom, order, justice and welfare".

According to Lawson "in the simplest and narrowest senses, IR is taken to denote the study of relations between states". She contends that, in a broader sense, "R denotes interactions between state-based actors across state boundaries" meaning thereby that, besides the

intimate concern with the state system as a whole, there is an equal concern with the activities of a variety of non-state actors.

A somewhat standard definition of international relations has been provided by Frederick S. Dunn 1948. He is of the view that international relations may "be looked upon as the actual relations that take place across national boundaries or as the body of knowledge which we have of those relations at any given time. It is considered to be a comprehensive definition because it does not limit the subject to official relations between states and governments.

Thus, it may be observed that there has been a tremendous effort on the part of the IR scholars to come out of a state-centric thinking and embark on a perspective, recognizing the presence of other actors as well. Therefore, summing up the above viewpoints, it may be ascertained that IR is a vast field encompassing the relationships among states in all their dimensions, including interactions with various other political and non-political groups along with the study of international history, international law, international society and international political economy.

Evolution of the Study of IR

The First World War resulted in unparalleled destruction and devastation of almost every country involved, with millions of lives lost perhaps a proper estimate can never be done. Total economic collapse, widespread famine, and rampant disease continued to add to the death toll, many years after the fighting had ended, even for the winning side, the victorious nations. It is from this awesome and traumatic experience of the First World War that the inspiration to study IR, as a separate academic discipline, grew.

The origin of IR can be traced to the writings of political philosophers such as, Thucydides, an ancient Greek historian who wrote the History of the Peloponnesian War and is also cited as an intellectual forerunner of realpolitik, Chanakya's Arthashastra, and Niccolò Machiavelli's Il Principe (The Prince) However, IR as an academic discipline in its own right only came to be studied after the horrifying experiences of the First World War. Before that, IR had always existed as a branch of history, law, philosophy, political science and other related subjects. But World War I, resulting in a loss of 20 million lives, proved the bankruptcy and limitations of traditional European diplomacy as a method of maintaining world order, and there grew an urge for alternatives.

This gave birth to the liberal approaches to IR which is often collectively referred to as idealism or sometimes as utopianism. Their focus was on the ills of international system, and, "what ought to be done" to avoid major disasters in the future and to save the future generations from the scourge of wars. There were many strands of liberal thinking, but the basic assumption, running throughout the many liberal writings, was that human beings were rational and, when they apply reason to international relations, they can set up organizations for the benefit of all. Therefore, emphasis was laid on outlawing war, disarmament, international law and international organizations during this phase of evolution of liberal thinking. The chief advocates of post-World War I (WW) idealism were Alfred Zimmern (1879-1957), Norman Angell (1872-1967), James T. Shotwell (1874-1965), and Woodrow Wilson (1856-1924). In particular, Wilson's "14 Points speech, delivered before the US Congress in 1918 is an expression of the sentiments of the idealist exposition. He made a pledge to the world community for:

- Making the world safe for democracy.
- Creation of international organization for promotion of peaceful cooperation among nation-states.

In fact, Wilson's points were adopted in the post-War peace settlement. The birth of the League of Nations and the Covenant, which was finally drawn in 1919, were the final expressions of Wilsonian principles. The main line of thinking was that realpolitik is like a "jungle, where dangerous beasts roam and the strong and cunning rule, whereas under the League of Nations the beasts are put into cages reinforced by the restraints of international organization, i.e., into a kind of zoo".

International Relations, which emerged against such a backdrop, soon made its way into the American universities. The first University Chair that formally established the discipline was the Woodrow Wilson Chair of International Politics at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth in 1919. It was endowed by philanthropist David Davies. Sir Alfred Zimmern was the first holder of the prestigious chair. Simultaneously, Montague Burton also endowed chairs of international relations in Jerusalem (1929), Oxford University (1930), the London School of Economics (1936) and the University of Edinburgh (1948). Their firm belief was that by promoting the study of international relations it would be possible to bring about peace, that is, the systematic study of international relations would lead to increased support for international law and the League of Nations. Despite several shortcoming is

acknowledged that Zimmern, Wilson and Davies laid the foundation of the study of IR as an academic discipline.

As the leading academicians were still reeling under the shock and awe of the First World War, they adopted a legalistic-moralistic approach and were highly descriptive and prescriptive, unable to satisfy the need to understand the complex nature of international relations as they tried to establish ideals to be achieved while ignoring the harsh realities of international relations. The optimism and ideals of the liberal thinkers therefore, got a rude shock with the outbreak of the Second World War (WWII) in 1939. The idealists' failure to answer the questions regarding the failure of the League of Nations to prevent the war and also the behaviour of certain states with respect to some others, which aggravated conflict-like situations in the inter-War period ultimately culminating in the Second World War led to severe criticisms.

Contrary to Wilson's hope to spread democracy, Fascism and Nazism grew in Italy and Germany and coupled with this was the rise of authoritarianism in Central and Eastern Europe. The League of Nations proved to be too weak an international organization to control aggressive states. Russia and Germany always had strained relationship with the League. Germany joined the League in 926 and left in the early 1930s. Following its invasion of Manchuria, Japan left the League. Russia joined the League in 1934 but was expelled in 1940 following its attack on Finland. Britain and France never had regards for the principles of the League. USA, though a forerunner in the creation of the League could not join it because of the Senate's refusal to ratify the Covenant of the League as well as their intention to pursue their age-old policy of Severe isolationism. economic crisis of the 1930s again forced the states to follow zealously the policy of protectionism rather than interdependence. As some scholars put forth, the situation was like each country for itself, each could country trying as best it to look after its own interests, if necessary, to the detriment of others-the jungle rather than the 'zoo'. Therefore, the stage was critical and ready for a more in-depth understanding of IR.

When the Second World War (1939-1945) finally broke out, the idealists were blamed for their utopian thinking and their legalistic-moralistic assumptions were alleged to be far from the realities of power politics. IR came soon to be occupied with a critique of liberal idealism and out of this new emerged a paradigm-Realism, sometimes also known as of Realpolitik--an anti-thesis Idealism. The principal advocates of this worldview were E.H. Carr George F.

Kennan (1939), (1954, 1956), Hans J. Morgenthau (1948), Reinhold Niebuhr (1947), Kenneth W. Thompson (1958, 1960) and others. This was the of the first emergence 'Great Debate' in IR in the post-World War II period.

The realist paradigm puts singular importance to states as the actors and principal their activities, guided by their interests to be the only reality. To the realists, conflict of interest is inevitable, which results in an anarchical international system and it is this situation of world politics that shapes the choices of the states where each state defines its interest in terms of power. Interest, defined in terms of power devoid of any moral consideration, according to the realist, gives meaning to international politics. Realism with its forceful exposition soon became the dominant paradigm of understanding IR. Nevertheless, dissatisfaction also arose about the shortcomings of the realist paradigm around 1960s and 1970s.

The discontent was more with the language and the method of studying IR. This was largely because of the behavioural revolution in the whole gamut of social sciences. The main emphasis was on application of scientific methods of study. Thus, emerged the second Great Debate in IR. But this 'new' Great Debate was different from the first in the sense that the first Great Debate was related to the subject matter or the content of IR, whereas the second was purely a methodological movement focusing on the mode of analysis in IR. As Kegley and Wittkopf point out that the central focus was on "theorizing about theory rather than "theorizing about international relations". They tried to replace subjective belief with verifiable knowledge and wanted to supplant impressionism and intuition with testable evidence along with an endeavour to substitute data and reproducible information for mere opinion. The major works which tried to incorporate scientific methods were Quincy Wright's *A Study of War,* Morton A. Kaplan's *Systems and Processes in International Politics* and Charles McClelland's *Theory of the International System*.

The methodologies of theorists like Morton Kaplan and Karl Deutsch repudiated the moralism and legalism of the traditional approaches. Kaplan conceived the international system as an "analytical entity" for explaining the behaviour of international actors and the "regulative", "integrative" or "disintegrative" consequences of their policies. Deutsch understood international system as "clusters of settlement, modes of transport, centres of culture, areas of language, decisions of caste and class barriers between markets, sharp regional differences in wealth and interdependence". Said states that "what has been the

ideological commitment of the traditional theorists became a devalued hypothesis to analyse causation in the real political world" for these theorists in IR.

The second Great Debate was neither won by the behaviouralists nor by the traditionalists and, gradually the controversies receded but left a long-lasting impact on the IR scholars, especially those from USA. Ultimately, this led to the reformulation of both realism and liberalism, both of which were highly influenced by the behaviouralist methodologies. The new avatars of realism and liberalism in the form of neo-realism and neo-liberalism again fermented the renewal of the first major debate in the 1970s. Side by side there sparked off another major debate between the neo-liberalism and neo-realism on one hand and neo-Marxism on the other. This 'neo-neo' debate came to constitute the third Great Debate of IR.

The neo-liberals renewed the old liberal ideas about the possibility of progress and change, but they discarded idealism. They tried to formulate theories and apply new methods that were scientific. Among several strands of neo-liberalism, the most prominent, which tried to face the realist challenge, was generally known as pluralism, and associated with it was the Interdependence Model of international relations. The chief proponents of the neo-liberal approach were E. Haas (Influential American Political Scientist), Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye.

The main line of thinking of this neo-liberal school was the plurality multiplicity of actors. The neo-liberalists rejected the singular simplicities of the realist approach which considered states to be the only significant actors in international relations. This new school of liberal thought put a much greater emphasis on the plurality of actors and their activities in international relations They acknowledged that side by side the UN and other regional organizations like the European Union (EU), Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the African Union (AU) which remained state-based, there was: an increasing importance of non-state actors such as the multinational corporations (MNCS), International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, several international non-governmental organizations such as the Red Cross, Red Crescent, Médecins sans Frontiers, Amnesty International, and a host of other non-state actors. These actors operate between the domestic and the international spheres, thereby transcending states and making the boundaries irrelevant to or some extent.

The other idea which the neo-liberals put forward is the concept of complex interdependence, which is dramatically different from that of the realists. They argue that, besides the political

relations of governments, there are other forms of connections between societies including transnational links between the business corporations. Here, military force is not given much importance. Hence, an "absence of hierarchy among issues" is found and military power is no longer useful as an instrument of foreign policy as the other actors; besides, the states do not have violent conflict on their international agenda. Therefore, it can be said that the neo-liberals put forward non-military paradigms of international relations and continuously argued for peaceful and cooperative international relations.

The pluralists' arguments soon caught the attention of the realists and it was Kenneth Waltz who renewed realism in its new form-Neo-Realism-and revived the debate between the realists and the liberals. This stream of neo-realism tried to build upon the principles of classical realism, especially those of Hans J. Morgenthau and tried to draw from classical realism those elements of a theory adequate to the world of the late twentieth century as well as link conceptually to other theoretical efforts. Waltz's pathbreaking work *Theory of International Politics* (1979) laid the essential basis of the neo-realists' debate. He focused on the 'structure' of the international system and the consequences of that structure in the international system. For the neo-realists, international politics became more than the summation of the foreign policies of the states and the external balance of other actors. Waltz, therefore, emphasized patterned relationships among actors in a system that is anarchical. For him, states we power-seeking and security-conscious, not because of human nature viewed as lain bad' by classical realists, but because the structure of the international system compels them to do so. Therefore, neo-realists did not overlook the prospects of cooperation among states. But the point of contention was that states, while cooperating with each other, tried to maximize their relative power and preserve their autonomy. Therefore, the neo-realists were successful in putting the neo-liber. on the defensive in the 1980s.

However, during this period, efforts were embarked on by scholars to bring the were noteworthy. Bary Buzan along with Charles Jones and Richard Little tried to synthesize neo-realist and neo-liberal institutionalist positions and they introduced the concept of deep structure, which meant that political structure encompasses anarchy as well as hierarchy and it includes not only power and institutions but also rules and norms. They believed that anarchic society produced states that are sovereign but that in no way meant that anarchy is incompatible with cooperation. Buzan, Jones and Little were of the opinion that units of the international system have differing structures, extending from empires to republics and including state and non-state actors, in their international action, exhibit cooperative and

competitive behaviours. This resulted in alliances, coalitions, regimes, norms and institutions for international cooperation. Change and continuity were brought about by the interaction between the international system and its units. On the whole, Buzan, Jones and Little retained the core elements of Waltz's structural realism but broadened it by looking into the international system as being based on anarchy but still including patterns of cooperation.

Another challenge, which came up during this time and straightaway confronted the neo-realists and neo-liberalists, was the Marxists viewpoint. The main contributions came from neo-Marxists such as Andre Gunder Frank (1967), Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) and others who formed the School of International Political Economy (IPE). Their fundamental contributions were in providing powerful insights into the origin and development of the international system which is roughly divided into the dominant North and the dependent South. Their effort was to locate the causes of most developing countries persistent underdevelopment in the patterns of dominance and dependence. Two strands of structural theorists need attention: the World System Theory and the Dependency Theory. A core-periphery bifurcation of the world was developed by the dependency theorists who took their cue from Lenin's work, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. In the 1970s, Immanuel Wallerstein added another category of semi-periphery to the dual structure model while developing the Modern World System Theory. The line of thinking that reflected in the works of these structural Marxists is that the striking feature of the world system is the transfer of wealth and resources from the peripheral countries to the core countries. The result is that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. The core periphery bifurcation symbolizes the "relative economic strength of rich countries (i.e. those in North America and Europe as well as Japan), which forms the core of the world economy, and the poorer ones on the periphery, with the Soviet Union occupying the semi-periphery".

The 1970s and 1980s were thoroughly preoccupied with the neo-liberalism and neo-realism debate. But after the end of the Cold War from the 1990s onwards, there was a change in the way IR was seen. The preponderance of the American scholars lessened, and this made way for assertion by IR scholars of Europe and other places of the globe. The school of thought that emerged around this time in the United Kingdom came to be referred to as "the English School", with its emphasis on society of states or international society. Though the school had come to be associated with the English, but its major figure Hedley Bull was an Australian. The other chief proponents of this school were E. H. Carr, C.A.W. Manning, F.S. Northedge, Martin Wight, Adam Watson, R.J. Vincent, James Mayall, Robert Jackson, and newer

scholars like Timothy Dunne and Nicholas Wheeler. The International Society theorists made an attempt to provide an alternative set of premises which are neither Hobbesian nor utopian. In fact, they tried to arrive at non-Hobbesian conclusions from Hobbesian premises. They did not reject the realists' emphasis on power and national interest and they did acknowledge that world politics is an "anarchical society" but, at the same time, they do contend that under conditions of anarchy, states act within a system of norms which, most of the time, is constraining. Therefore, the core element in their thought is that there is a presence of a world of sovereign states where both power and law are present. Power and national interest do matter, but norms and institutions also have great significance.

However, with the end of Cold War and the dismemberment of the Soviet Union, the dominant paradigms in IR seemed unable to explain the prevailing situations. Therefore, new reflective critical ideas started gaining ground, which were a departure from the mainstream liberal, realist and orthodox Marxist thinking in IR. New debates have, therefore, arisen in IR addressing methodological as well as substantial issues. Currently a fourth debate is on its way, which challenges the established traditions in IR by alternative approaches. The new voices in IR are identified as post-Positivist approaches and the era that it has heralded has been identified by Yosef Lapid as a post-Positivist era.

Steve Smith while considering the present theoretical perspectives of IR, puts IR theories into two broad categories:

- Explanatory theories that see the world as something external to our theories. Realists, pluralists and structural neo-Marxist theories tend to be explanatory theories, with their task being to report on a world that 1s external to theories. In this endeavour, they attempt to find regularities in human behaviour and natural scientist would do.
- Constitutive theories are those that help construct the world. Most of the recent approaches, ranging from critical theories to post-modernist theories, tend to be constitutive in the sense that these theories are not external to the things they are trying to explain and they just attempt to thereby explain the social world in the way a construct how one thinks about the world.

Smith contends that present theoretical perspectives as based on:

- Foundational theoretical position which states that all truth claims can be judged true or false. Neo-neo debate, historical sociology and critical theory seem to be foundational.
- Anti-foundational theoretical position which contends that truth claims cannot be so judged since there are never neutral grounds for doing so. Post-modernism, some feminist theories, normative theories tend to be anti-foundational.

Smith further characterizes the theories into two categories:

- Rationalist, constituting the neo-liberal and neo-realist theoretical positions.
- Reflectivist, constituting the non-positivistic theories.

Smith argues that present day IR is, therefore, characterized by three principal trends:

- Continuing dominance of the three theories-Realism, Liberalism and Modern World System theory-constituting the rationalist position and epitomized by the 'neo-neo' debate.
- Emergence of non-positivistic theories marking the reflectivist position.
- Development of an approach that seeks a rapprochement between the rationalist and reflectivist positions and is epitomized by the social constructivist position.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises

Q1. Define International Relations. Trace the evolution of International Relations.

Q2. Discuss the nature and Scope of International Relations.

Q3. Discuss the evolution of International Relations after the end of the First World War to its present form.

Q4. Discuss the different stages of evolution of International Relations as an academic discipline giving special importance to the Great Debate.

1.2 Nature and Scope of International Relations

Nature of International Relations

From the birth of IR, it has been facing uncertainty regarding its boundaries. Before its academic study as a separate discipline began in the aftermath of First World War, IR was treated as a part of history, law and political theory. Even after the intellectual development started and the discipline was successful in establishing its foothold, some still considered it as a subdivision of the greater field of Political Science and emphasized the need to study political phenomena at the global level. Still, some universities today offer separate degrees and have separate departments for IR (especially at the PG level) while others teach IR along with Political Science. Some others view that the subject matter of IR can only be studied by interdisciplinary research teams drawing on the expertise of many disciplines including Political Science, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Anthropology, Medicine, Cybernetics and Communications and other related fields of study and not separately. Zimmern (a British academician and the Wilson Professor of International Polities, the first Professor of International Polities, also known as International Relations in the World) commented that "the study of international relations extends from the natural sciences at one end to moral philosophy…... at the other". He defined the field not as a single subject or discipline but as a "bundle of subjects…. viewed from a common angle".

Political Science and International Relations

Even though IR has to be treated as a bundle of subject' yet, more often controversy unfolds between the discipline of Political Science and IR. One treats the other as an offshoot or rather part of its own discipline, while the other claims to be an autonomous discipline. It is truly very difficult to compartmentalize both Political Science and IR, as both are inextricably related to one another, and such controversies must be avoided. For a more matured and holistic study, both have to work hand-in-hand. What can be done is to look at the emphasis of both and levels of entry of one another into the discipline of each other. Political Science, if it is treated as a science of politics and working towards studying formal and informal political patterns existing in a particular state, IR is more concerned with trans-territorial affairs of the state. Political Science involves concern with politics within the territorial unit that is called the State. The legislative, executive and judicial actions of a political system affecting the political life of a state are the core areas of concern of Political Science. Very little is the emphasis on and foreign relations of the state concerned comes into discussion

when it affects the national policies mainly. IR, on other hand, the is more concerned with the external relations of the states studying and the politics of power bargaining at the foreign policies of international level. Individual states, bilateral and multilateral engagements, with trans-national non-state actórs, conflict and cooperation, questions of international peace and security become the main concern of IR. However, it is not possible to draw an iron curtain between these two disciplines. It is not possible to study domestic politics totally disregarding the international politics, as international agreements and even international organizations might affect the national economic and political policies of State. Similarly, IR is also touched by domestic politics. The ruling government or regime, the bureaucrats, the political parties and public opinion come to have an impact on the external relations of the State. For example, the IMF, World Bank and WTO known as the Triad in international political economy, with their policies of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) affect the economic and financial policies of the countries, which take loans from them. On the other hand, to analyse the foreign policy trend of any state, one has to study the internal functioning of the political system, including the study of political institutions, political parties and interest groups and public opinion. What can be said is that domestic politics and international politics cannot be studied in isolation. IR, therefore has to make an entry into the domain of Political Science for a proper understanding by developing methodologies and theories to understand international politics.

Nature and Scope of IR

Conflict as the essential element of relations: Since politics is a necessary element of relations, for an understanding of the nature and scope of international relations, a brief discussion of the term "politics" is necessary.

Everything in politics, whether domestic or international, flows from the fact that people have needs and wants. The efforts to satisfy needs and wants bring people into contact with one another. This contact leads to the formation of groups. But the needs and wants of various groups are bound to differ, though the need and wants of the members of one group are normally supposed to be common. Groups do certain actions and follow certain relations in order to satisfy the needs and wants of their members.

The actions done to achieve one's interests through persuasion or pressure at the cost of other is what means politics. Although, there is a good deal of controversy among scholars on the

question of the details of the elements of relations, all of them agree that the existence of groups is the basic element.

Politics, thus, arises from the very existence of groups and disagreement among them and from the efforts of men to create relationships under which their needs and wants can be fulfilled to the maximum possible extent. Quincy Wright would define Politics as "the art of influencing, manipulating, or controlling major groups so as to advance the purposes of some against the opposition of others."

Thus, there are three important characteristics of relations; the existence of groups, disagreement between groups and the efforts of some to influence or control the actions of others. Relations, then, is a phenomenon of groups, disagreement, and group action. Disagreement, however, should not be total so as to exclude every possibility of cooperation, Relations cannot exist in a state of complete disagreement as it cannot exist in a state of complete agreement. Relationships between groups should be somewhere between the two. The purpose of a group trying to influence or control the actions and policies of other group or groups is to alter this type of relationship in its own favour.

That is why, Sheldon Volin has described politics as the process of our continuous efforts to establish such relationships with others as could be most beneficial to us. This definition of relations as a process is of special significance. This is so for two reasons. One is that our wants and desires are unlimited and the other is that we always go on trying to achieve their maximum satisfaction, even though we realize it well that their complete satisfaction is never possible.

Thus, the relationship between all units participating in the process of politics is inherently full of conflicts.

Conflict differentiated from Disputes: We should not, however, confuse conflict with disputes. Conflict is that state of relationship among the units participating in the process of politics which arises, and continues to exist, from the fact that the wants and desires of those units are unlimited and from the further fact that they regard one another as their rivals. Disputes, on the other hand, arise from specific issues.

Thus, conflict is abstract and dispute is the concrete manifestation of conflict. Disputes can be counted but conflict cannot be. It can at best be measured in terms of degrees. Whether a

group of two or more countries have a large or small number of disputes, depends upon how acute is the state of conflict between them.

Conflict is a permanent phenomenon in relations: This state of conflict can at times be more acute and at times less acute but can never cease to exist. Thus, conflict is the permanent phenomenon in relations. Bertrand de Jouvenel has rightly pointed out that conflict can never be eliminated from relations and therefore, political disputes are always "solved" only temporarily. He explodes the "myth of solution" in relations and holds that what we often regard as "solutions" of disputes are in fact nothing else than compromises reached between the parties to a dispute only temporarily. Briefly stated, the conflict nature of relationship among the participating units means that those units should ceaselessly try to control or influence the behaviour of each other so as to alter that- relationship in their own favour.

Relation is a Struggle for Power: The ability or capacity to influence or control the behaviour of others is, generally speaking, called power. It should, however, be remembered that this definition does not exhaust either the meaning or the content of power. But an essential characteristic element of relations is an effort on the part of some to control the actions of others. And since the ability to make such efforts is power, relations also involve power. It is in this sense that all relations are considered to be a struggle for power. Power becomes a means for the fulfilment of needs and wants. Relations without power is unthinkable. Power thus becomes the means for the achievement of our wants and desires. There is, in fact, a close relationship between the end of relations and means of relations. Since we always continue to satisfy our wants and desires, the need for power which is the means to achieve our ends, also continues to exist. The continuity of this inter-relationship between end and means makes power the most important element of relations. The result is that we try to acquire power not only for our wants and desires of the present but also for those of the future. Thus, acquisition of power becomes an end in itself and the demarcating line between end and means is often not clear. Hence the phrase "power-politics" is rather an inaccurate phrase, because all politics by its very nature is power politics. In fact, relations is nothing else but a process in which power is acquired, maintained, used and expanded. The study of relations is the study of this process. We study the needs and wants of groups and their differences only because it helps us in the study of the process of the acquisition and use of power.

Relations at the International level means International Relations

Relations at the international level is termed international relations. In the case of international relations, nations work as groups, their needs and wants are called interests or national interests, and disagreement among groups or between interests is called conflict. But the element of power remains the same. International relations, then, becomes a process of adjustment of relationships among nations in favour of a nation or group of nations by means of power. Thus, three important things relevant to international relations are: national interests, conflict and power. The first is the objective, the second is the condition and the third is the means of international relations. But the second is of greater significance than the first or the third, because if conflict is not there, national interests and power will have little function to perform. In this sense, international relations can be described as a set of those aspects of relations among independent political communities in which some element of conflict of interest is always present. However, it does not mean that power struggle in a continuing state of conflict against each other. Not every -nation is hostile to every other nation. Nations whose interests are identical or harmonious, are likely to have some sort of cooperation as a basis of their relationships and use this basis in their struggle against their enemies. Thus, international relations involve conflict as well as co-operation. Joseph Frankel argues that war and peace represent the extremes of the two recurrent modes of social interaction, namely conflict and harmony, and therefore our study of international relations should include both.

Conflict occupies a prominent place in International Relations: But conflict occupies a more prominent place in international relations. This is so due to the fact that co-operation itself is the result of conflict. This is so in two ways. Firstly, nations with identical or harmonious interests co-operate with each other in order to win the conflict with other nations. Secondly, co-operation is sought to be achieved only because international relationships are basically conflict. The study of international relations is primarily a study of the process in which a nation tries to have an advantageous position in a conflict with other nations or groups of nations' by means of power. Conflict cannot be eliminated from international society and the process of adjustment by means of power always goes on.

Conflict is a continuing phenomenon: Therefore, international relations like all relations, is by nature a continuing phenomenon. This nature of continuity also imparts the central place to conflict in international relations. Even the most co-operative and friendly relationship

may at times become conflict. Sino Indian relations may be cited as an appropriate example in this connection. The relation between India and China were most cordial and friendly for more than a decade. But since 1959 and especially after October, 1962, the two countries have been involved, in a conflict of a serious nature. From the point of view of a student of international relations, the present phase of Sino Indian relations is a more important subject of study than all the earlier phases. It is because the interest of international relations is to know how conflict is or can be resolved, although the study of cordial relationships is not outside the scope of international relations. For a student, again, international relation is the study of the control of conflict and establishment of co-operation. But as co-operation is possible only through the control of conflict, he has to pay greater attention to conflict.

International Relations is an interaction of Foreign Policies: Conflict arises from incompatibility of interests of nations. And nations try to safeguard their interests by trying to influence and control the behaviour of other nations. National interest, however is, served through foreign policy. Thus, nations come into contact with each other through their foreign policies. In this sense, international relations can also be described as an interaction of foreign policies. Feliks Gross maintains that the study of international relations is identical to the study of foreign policy. Russell Field also holds more or less the same view. The argument of the supporters of this view is that it is not possible to understand international relations without understanding the foreign policies of States. This argument has some validity. But it has been challenged by writers like Fred Sondermann and others. Sondermann holds that even the understanding of foreign policies depends upon the understanding of historical experiences, governmental structures and of foreign policy factors, which in turn requires an understanding of the relevant social, political, economic and cultural factors of each society. Some scholars have even gone to the extent of holding that even the understanding of the factors of society is not possible without the knowledge of the attitudes and subconscious compulsions of those individuals who participate in the formulation of foreign policy. Thus, the understanding of foreign policy itself is a very complicated affair and so also of the relationship between international relations and foreign policy.

Foreign Policy closely linked but not identical to international relations: The study of international relations is closely linked to the study of foreign policy but is not identical to it. The study of foreign policies of States is an important aspect of the study of international relations. But the latter is a broader field of inquiry. As a matter of fact, the question of relationship between international relations and foreign policy is made difficult by the fact

that neither foreign policy nor international relations has a clearly defined starting point. However, the study of foreign policy provides the most important single helpful factor to the study of international relations. We have said earlier that international relation is a process in which nations try to safeguard their interests, which are not compatible with these of others, by means of power. Since this process apparently works through foreign policies of States, the study of foreign policies may fulfil in some measures the requirements of the study of international relations. It is only in this sense that the study of international relations centres on the process and effects of interactions between foreign policy decisions. But the study of foreign policies of States does not exhaust the scope of the study of international relations and the former remains subordinated to the latter. Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout would call foreign policy as subcategory of international relations.

The Approaches to the Study of IR: Theories and Methodologies

In reality, the complexity in IR makes it impossible to study with a limited knowledge. What is needed is a systematic analysis of the subject matter of IR. For this, as Goldstein observes that both descriptive and theoretical knowledge are required as he contends that "It would do little good only to describe events without being able to generalize or draw lessons from them. Nor would it do much good to formulate purely abstract theories without being able to apply them to the finely detailed and complex real world in which we live". Equally important is the use of methods in developing and testing various theories. Whether one builds theories from facts or predict facts from theories, one can utilize them to the learning of IR in myriad ways. But given the complexities and unpredictability of IR, it can be said that even the best theories provide only a rough guide to understand the international processes and interactions and eventually make decisions.

Nevertheless, overtime different paradigms in IR which sparked grand debates have ultimately led to the gradual evolution of the discipline as already discussed. The main debates in IR are between:

1. Utopian Liberalism/Idealism and Realism
2. Traditional Approaches and Behaviouralism
3. Neo-liberalism/neo-Realism and neo-Marxism
4. Positivism and post-Positivist Alternatives.

Most IR scholars do agree that a single set of theories or even a single set of concepts would not be in a position to explain IR. Still three paradigms are found to dominate the study of IR:

1. Realism and neo-realism
2. Liberalism, pluralism and neo-liberalism
3. International political economy-structuralism and neo-Marxism.

Scholars like Abdul A. Said observed that five categories of theories have emerged to examine the unexplored terrain of international relations:

1. Theory of theory: how 'scientific' the discipline of IR can become.
2. Systems analysis: This refers to the development of hypotheses about the international system. The two primary foci are the state as a responding unit within the international system and the configuration of the international system on the whole.
3. Action theories: the analysis of the ways states and their decision makers conduct foreign policy including decision-making capabilities, institutions and the interaction of the political system and national society.
4. Interaction theory: which attempts to general1ze about the 'patterns' of interactions and the internal behaviour of the interacting units like the theory of balance of power, world equilibrium, gaming, "challenge and response", international processes involving competition, cooperation, bargaining and conflict.
5. Newer research techniques: borrowed from other disciplines; content analysis borrowed from the study of communications, psychometrics useful in measuring such attitudes as 'friendship' or 'hostility' among states, game theory and the like.

Several alternative approaches have also developed into the study of contemporary IR.

1. Post-modernist theories propounded by Richard Ashley (1988), R.B.J. Walker (1993), James Derian (1989) and others.
2. Critical theories advocated by Andrew Linklater (1990), Robert Cox (1996) and others.
3. Historical sociology propounded by Michael Mann (1986 and 1983), Charles Tilly (1990), Theda Skocpol.
4. Feminist theories advocated by J. Ann Tickner (1988), Cynthis Enloe (1988, 1990, 1993 and 1999) and Christine Sylvester (1998).

Despite such breakthroughs in theory building and paradigm development and improvisations, IR is difficult to study by utilizing such theories. At best, a mixture of combination of theories is required to obtain acceptable results. 1 aim is to provide the IR scholars and students with a choice of IR theories u will help to comprehend the multi-

layered and cultural complex world as well recognize the processes and difficulties involved in coming to understand them.

Scope and Subject Matter of IR

International Relation is a dynamic discipline. With the world fast changing in the face of globalization, along with the threats of fundamentalism, ethnicity and terrorism, ebbing state system, crisis in sovereignty of states, human rights, newer international regimes, the discipline has been forced to move beyond its traditional themes and incorporate a 'new agenda' in its study.

Initially, the discipline devoted itself to the study of diplomatic history, foreign policies of states, international law, international organizations. Since the outbreak of the Second World War and in the years following it, the world was not only engulfed in a Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union but it also witnessed the birth of many new states due to rapid decolonization, which led to an expansion of the scope of IR. As a result, new theories, and newer methodologies to study IR emerged. As in the 1960s and 1970s, when behaviouralism made a pathway into the study of IR, motives and behaviours of states as well as political leaders came to be studied. It is quite an extensive discipline embracing diplomatic history, international politics, international organization, international law, area studies, behaviour of states and their mutual relations, international trade and foreign policy. Its scope is still expanding and will expand in future too. As Frederick S. Dunn contends that the word 'scope' is ambiguous because it implies fixed boundary lines readily identifiable as a surveyor's mark. Therefore, he suggested that the "subject matter of international relations consists of whatever knowledge, from any sources, may be of assistance in meeting new international problems or understanding old ones". IR scholars have never agreed on where the boundaries of their field lie.

Goldstein projects IR as a field of study focussing on:

1. Issue areas-diplomacy, war, trade relations, alliances, cultural exchanges, participation in international organizations, etc.
2. Conflict and cooperation in relationship among states concerning issue areas.
3. International security-questions of war and peace.
4. International political economy-between 1970 and 1980-increasing concern with economic issues made international political economy (IPE) inextricably woven into IR, especially with regard to security Issues.

Palmer and Perkins include such topics within the domain of IR such as state system, national power, diplomacy, propaganda, war, imperialism, balance of power, collective security, international organizations, international law, regional conflicts, national interests, nuclear weapon and changing international system.

According to Frankel, the contents of IR must take care of the changes in the international system, i.e., the rise in the number of states, MNCs and terrorist groups; the shift of the major danger spots geographically, from Europe to Middle East and Africa, from the strategic to the economic field; the growing recognition of the need for some form of global or regional regimes, overriding Sovereign states. Therefore, the study should include the making of foreign policies, the mutual interactions among states, conflicts, competitions and cooperations among them, national power, diplomacy, propaganda, international system and international organization.

Coloumbis and Wolfe emphasize that the study of IR should involve the approaches to the study of IR, theories of IR, nation-states and nationalism, national power, national interest, foreign policies of nation-states and nationalism, national power, decision making, diplomacy, war, balance of power, international law, international economy, international organizations, functionalism and regional integration, gap between the rich and poor nation-states, new actors in international system, threats facing humankind.

Kal Holsti points out that during the heydays of the Cold War, the field was characterized by three distinct sets of normative concerns or discourses which tried to answer the question 'what to study? They are:

- Security, conflict and war
- Cooperation and the conditions for peace
- Equity, justices and the sources of international inequality

According to Jackson and Sorenson, traditional IR was concerned solely with the development and change of sovereign statehood in the context of the larger system or society of states which might help in explaining the questions of war and peace. However, they assert that contemporary IR is concerned not only with political relations between states but also with a host of other subjects such as economic interdependence, human rights, transnational corporations, international organizations, the environment, gender inequalities, development, terrorism, and so forth.

Baylis and Smith in their effort to include upcoming agenda in IR tried to incorporate several new themes. They looked not only into the historical context of international society and world history till the end of Cold War and discussed the main theories in IR, including the new approaches to IR theory in the post- Cold War era, but also focussed chiefly on international security in the War post-Cold era, international political economy in the age of globalization, international regimes, diplomacy, the UN and international organizations, transnational actors, environmental issues, nuclear proliferation, nationalism, cultural conflicts in IR, humanitarian intervention in world politics, regionalism and integration, global trade and finance, poverty, development and hunger, human rights, and gender issues.

A wider content has been using macropolitical perspective, provided by Kegley and Wittkopf. By using macropolitical perspective, they draw our attention to:

- Characteristics, capabilities and interests of the principal actors in world politics (nation-states and various non-state participants in international affairs).
- The principal welfare and global issues that populate global agenda.
- The patterns of cooperation and contention that influence the interactions between and among actors and issues.

Further, they state that the scope of contemporary IR has to expand to accommodate such questions as: Are states obsolete? Is interdependence a cure or a curse? Is technological innovation a blessing or a burden? Will ge0-economics supersede geo-politics? What constitutes human well-being in an ecologically fragile planet?

Lawson points out that, although the traditional concern for war and inter-state warfare in particular is still the focus of IR, but IR's "new agenda embraces a "vast range of policy issues". They include global environment concerns, the epidemiology of AIDS, legal and illegal migration, including refugee movements, the North-South gap, human rights, reform of the UN and its agencies, extension of international law, and the prosecution of crimes against humanity, whether involving terrorism, religious fundamentalism or international organized criminal activities that range from drug production and trafficking to money laundering, smuggling goods of all kinds including weapons, diamonds, endangered species and people and 'new wars' arising from identity politics' linked with religious, ethnic or cultural factors. Lawson highlights that the "notion of 'human security' rather than 'state security' is now very much in ascendance."

The vast topics which have now come to dominate the study of IR may again not be sufficient with the changing needs of time. Prospects of change remain as world conditions change.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises

Q1. Discuss the nature and scope of IR.

Q2. Discuss the approaches to the Study of IR.

1.3 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

International relations is a broad field that helps create bonds between nations through economic, social, and political relationships. International politics is a subset of the study of international relations, and as such, it requires critical thinking skills and proficiency in cross-cultural communication. While international relations encompasses a wide array of disciplines, professionals who specialize in international politics typically focus more narrowly on specific types of nation-to-nation affairs, such as foreign policymaking, diplomacy, and trade regulation.

What is International Relations?

- International relation is the study of foreign affairs and relations among the nations in the international system.
- International relation is related to comprehensive relations among people and different groups in the world.
- It comprises of all behaviour that originates from one country/nation and affects another country/nation.
- International relation include relation related to different dimensions like economic, legal, political or any other character.
- It is the study of all forms of interactions that exist between the nations within the international system.
- IR is a multidisciplinary field.

What is International Politics?

- International politics is the core element of international relations.
- International politics is the discipline that studies about operation of political power between the states.
- It is also known as study of politics in different countries of the world.
- It mainly focuses on the operation of political power between the states.
- 'International Politics as an inalienable part of International Relations." – Hans Morgenthau, scholar.
- International politics is related with the government, political parties, and officials.
- It primarily analyses the political relation and its operation among the state.

Common Specializations between International Politics & International Relations:

Professionals of International Relations (IR) backgrounds who have an interest in international politics may use their knowledge of the global political landscape to help government agencies, private organizations, or other legal entities implement mutually beneficial policies. Depending on the nature of their employers, professionals in this field may specialize in several different areas, including:

- **International Communications:** Although advancements in communications technology have made it possible to interact with people anywhere in the world, some nations still have limited access to information. International communications professionals facilitate communication between governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and local communities by promoting public services, sharing information about peacekeeping and political missions, coordinating strategic responses to propaganda, and providing training to public information officers around the world. Messaging to communities may relate to issues such as public health and safety, human rights, economic and social development, and environmental sustainability. Those who work in international communications must have a deep understanding of all media channels, including new digital and social media platforms. In addition, they should possess a strong working knowledge of how governments operate and engage with their citizens and an awareness of political and social conditions that can affect the public's access to information in different parts of the world.

- **International Security:** Both government institutions and private companies are constantly faced with a range of international security threats including military aggression, cyber espionage, cyber warfare, and human rights violations. To stave off these threats, these organizations recruit security experts who can interpret intelligence data and guide the implementation of safeguards against activities that could be potentially harmful. These experts may specialize in areas such as digital security, border defence, or military affairs. Those who have a dual interest in security and international politics can use their diplomatic skills and foreign policy knowledge to advise government decision-makers on how to maintain stable global relationships while responding to cyber threats.

- **International Law:** Global organizations must comply with different sets of laws and standards in every part of the world in which they operate. International law

professionals play a lead role in helping their organizations navigate this complex array of foreign legal systems. Individuals who work in international law can further specialize in areas such as humanitarian, trade, or environmental law, as well as laws involving human rights and war crimes. A knowledge of international politics can help legal professionals understand how the laws of individual nations overlap and conflict with one another.

- **International Economics:** Demand is rising for international economics specialists to sort out challenges within the global economy and create policies to achieve economic stability. International economists research global markets and advise their organizations on trade and spending decisions. They may also analyse financial data to track economic trends and detect suspicious transactions. International economists are also involved in resolving disputes over unfair trade practices, currency manipulation, and artificial inflation of commodity prices. The discipline requires a strong understanding of how different economic systems relate to one another and how they affect the development of nations.

Definitions

International relations is an academic discipline that studies the relationships (both political as well as non-political) between states as well as non-state actors in the international stage. International politics, on the other hand, is an academic discipline that studies the operation of political power in the state level as well as among other states in the international stage. Thus, this is the main difference between international relations and international politics.

Analysis

International relations provide an in-depth analysis of the outcome of politics and interactions among varied actors in the international stage (both state as well as non-state actors), and their effect on the social, economic sectors in the countries. Also, it enables to overcome the future crises in all the social aspects in global societies. On the other hand, international politics only provide an in-depth analysis of the power operation and the political endeavors of the local as well as global states in the world. Therefore, it enables to foresee the consequences of the political moves in the international stage. Hence, this is another difference between international relations and international politics.

Focus

Focus is also a difference between international relations and international politics. The focus in international relations is broader and wider in comparison to that in international politics while international politics mainly focus on studying the manner in which political power operates within and beyond the states in the international stage.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises:

Q1. What are the differences between International Relations & International Politics? Elaborate.

Q2. Write an essay on the various similarities & differences between International Relations & International Politics.

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (Edited), The Globalization of World Politics, Fourth Edition, OUP, USA 2008
2. John Baylis, J.Wirtz, C.Gray, Strategy in Contemporary World, OUP, UK, 2010
3. John W. Young and John Kent, International Relations since 1945 A Global History, OUP, USA, 2004
4. Joshua S. Goldstein, International Relations, 8/e, Pearson Education 2008 Politics among Nations authored by Hans, J. Morgenthau
5. Mahendra Kumar, Theoretical Aspects of International Politics, Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala, 1967
6. Paul R.Viotti and Mark V.Kauppi, International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity, 3/e, Pearson Education 2007
7. Peu Ghosh, International Relations, PHI Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2010

CHAPTER-2

Approaches to the Study of International Relations

LEARNING OUTCOME: After going through this lesson, students will be able to-

- **Understand the concept of Liberalism specially by I. Kant and W. Wilson**
- **Know the concept of Realism by Morgenthau and K. Waltz**
- **Grasp the Systems Theory by M. Kaplan**

International relation as a discipline is relatively new. After the end of the First World War, it was emerged seriously as a branch of study. The discipline developed during the 1930's, as a predominantly idealistic spectrum, that is, many practitioners were explicitly working along the lines which assumed the world peace would be preserved by strengthening the League of Nations and collective security. However, with the break of Second World War some of the eminent thinkers like E. H. Carr and Hans Morgenthau emerged in the scene, who were popularly known as the realists. Morgenthau's path breaking work "Politics among Nations" (1948) took the centre stage arguing that the struggle for power was the dominant feature of international politics. The substantive arguments were immensely important, relating to a world which looked as though it might well destroy itself, and it is not surprising that some of the central scholars in the discipline did not interest themselves directly in methodological questions. Around the middle of the 1950's, when cold war fully established, a group of scholars arose who, impressed by the apparent success of other disciplines such as economics, etc. began to apply the techniques of social sciences to its study.

However, writers on international relations agree that the structure of international society is becoming increasingly complex, but they disagree violently about the most helpful way of looking at it. The traditional way was to concentrate upon the states as the historically prominent units and to ignore other agents which lack the basic character of states - their sovereignty and territoriality. The influence of post-war evolution of the behavioural sciences has led to a greater or lesser acceptance of a behavioural analysis of international system as consisting of numerous, more or less, autonomous interacting actors.

It is very important why theories are required to understand international relations. Theories are interesting less for the substantive explanations they offer about political conditions in the modern world than as expressions of the limits of the contemporary political imagination when confronted with persistent claims about and evidence of fundamental historical and structural transformations. They can be read as - expressions of an historically specific understanding of the character and location of political life in general. Theories of international relations are more interesting as aspects of contemporary world politics that need to be explained than as explanations of contemporary world politics. As such they may be read as characteristic discourse of the modern state (Walker, 1993, Inside/Outside: IR as Political Theory, Cambridge: CUP). Let us now discuss the different approaches to understand international relations among the different cooperating and conflicting nation-states. They can be broadly categorized as: Classical Realism, Neo-Realism, Neo-Liberalism, and Structural Approaches.

2.1 LIBERALISM

The tradition of liberal political thought as propounded by liberal thinkers like Immanuel Kant, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Stuart Mill, John Locke, David Hume, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Adam Smith was revived, adopted and transformed to give birth to the liberal approach to IR. The chief proponents of post-World War I liberalism were Alfred Zimmern, Norman Angell, James T. Shotwell and Woodrow Wilson. They are sometimes referred to as Liberal idealists or simply idealists. E.H. Carr (1939), however, ascribed them as utopians.

At the heart of the liberal worldview lie certain basic assumptions about the human rationality and morality, belief in reforming institutions as solutions to problems and most importantly idea about human progress. In the words of David Sidorsky liberalism consists of "In simplest terms, first a conception of man as desiring freedom and capable of exercising rational free choice. Second, it is a perspective on social institutions as open to rational reconstruction in the light of individual needs. It is third, a view of history as progressively perfectible through the continuous application of human reason to social institutions".

Based on their optimism, the liberalists conceptualize the individual as the possessor of rationality and a seat of moral values and virtues and also capable of controlling their basic impulses. They try to justify the irrational and immoral behaviour of the individuals as not the manifestations of flawed human nature but the result of ignorance and misunderstanding,

which is possible to overcome through education and reforming of social and political institutions.

Alongside such positive picturization of human beings, the liberals tend to be less emphatic about social and individual conflicts as inevitable. They believe that it is possible to bring about the greatest good for the greatest number that would reap benefits for all and create an order that would maximize individual freedom and material and economic prosperity. The logical corollary of this is the concept of "harmony of interests".

Contrary to the realist position that focuses on the possibility of conflict of interests and clashes, the liberals lay emphasis on the common interests. The belief is that people and nations share common interests and the prospects of cooperative activities among them will satisfy these interests. Liberals are critical about the realist perspective of international conflict and war and consider them as a distortion of reality. On the other hand, they believe that on the whole the majority of interactions among nations are cooperative and non-conflictual. Wars do take place but they contend that the majority of nations live in peace and the fact that they are at peace is not because of any balance of power.

Most importantly, the liberal contention for human progress is worth mentioning. At the core of this thinking is also the implicit trust (or liberal faith) that human beings by nature are rational creatures. The liberals reject the realist position that the basic dynamics and fundamental realities of international relations remain unchanged. They contend that as people are rational, they would learn that certain things such as war is irrational and undesirable and, as they learn more about how the world, they live in works they will gain knowledge which ultimately will help them to solve problems. As Robert Gilpin (War and Change in World Politics, 1981) noted that, just as realism "is founded on a pessimism regarding moral progress and human possibilities", so too liberalism is founded on an optimism regarding moral progress and human possibilities.

Kegley and Wittkopf present the underlying beliefs of the liberalist worldview and uphold that the basic assumptions of liberalism are:

1. Human nature is essentially "good" or altruistic and people are, therefore, capable of mutual aid and collaboration.
2. The fundamental human concern for others' welfare makes progress possible.
3. Bad human behaviour, such as violence, is the product not of flawed people but of evil institutions which encourage people to act selfishly and to harm others.

4. War is not inevitable and its frequency can be reduced by eradicating the institutional arrangements that encourage it.

5. War is an international problem requiring collective or multilateral, rather than national, efforts to control it.

6. The international society must reorganize itself in order to eliminate the institutions that make war likely and nations must reform their political systems so that self-determination and democratic governance within states can help pacify relations among states.

However, there were several manifestations of idealisms before and after the inter-War period. It can be said that there were "contending liberalisms at work in world politics during that time and later. They can be classified as:

Liberal Internationalism: This strand of liberal thinking puts faith in human reason and believes that this reason could deliver freedom and justice in international relations. Their emphasis was on transformation of individual consciousness, abolishing war, setting up of a world government, promoting free trade and maintaining peace. Liberal internationalists talked about the harmony of interests in international relations, which was vehemently criticized by E.H. Carr in his famous work The Twenty Years' Crisis (1939). Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) were the leading exponents of liberal internationalism.

Idealism: Unlike the liberal internationalists, the idealists believed that peace and prosperity is not a natural condition but is one which must be constructed and for which the requirement is of "consciously devised machinery'". In other words, they talked about the establishment of an international institution to secure peace and, with this objective, they supported the moves for the establishment of the United Nations after the failure of the League of Nations. They were also the proponents of collective security, human rights, "New International Economic Order" peace and disarmament.

Liberal Institutionalism: David Mitrany (1966) and Ernst Haas (1968) were the earlier liberal institutionalists who believed that integration through international and regional institutions would help to solve common problems. Their work provided impetus for increased cooperation between the European states. The later liberal institutionalists such as Keohane and Nye emphasized the centrality of actors other than the states and focused on transnationalism and interdependence. The core content of these contending liberalisms was,

however, akin to the emphasis on economic freedom, support for national self-determination, international system organized and regulated on the basis of norms and rules, doctrine of non-intervention, opposition to authoritarian rule, outlawing war and disarmament.

Neo-Liberal Internationalism: This strand of neo-liberal thinking is dominated by the supporters of democratic peace thesis whose core thinking is based on the assumption that liberal states do not go to war with other liberal states. To this end Francis Fukuyama (1989) in his article entitled "The End of History'" in The National Interest, championed the victory of liberalism over all ideologies and contended that liberal states were internally more stable and more peaceful in international relations. He believes that liberal states have established pacific union within which war becomes unthinkable.

Neo-Idealism: Advocates of neo-idealism like David Held, Norberto Bobbio and Danielle Archibugi believe that global politics must be democratized. David Held even prescribes a "cosmopolitan model of democracy'" in place of Westphalian and UN models, and creation of regional parliaments, extension of the authority of regional bodies such as the European Union, as well as democratization of international organizations like the UN. He also recommends the realization of human rights through national parliaments and monitoring by a new International Court of Human Rights.

Neo-Liberal Institutionalism: Proponents of neo-liberal institutionalism Ake Axelrod, Keohane and Nye put forward their ideas in response to Kenneth Waltz's theory of neo-realism in his famous work Theory of International Politics (1979). This strand of neo-liberal institutionalism shares with the realists the assumption that states are the most significant actors and the international environment is anarchic. But the neo-liberal institutionalists try to focus on the task of initiating and maintaining cooperation among states under conditions of anarchy.

Criticisms

Most of the assumptions of the idealist have been criticized on a number of grounds. They have been considered as impracticable, utopian and most of the liberal principles are charged of being culture-specific and ethnocentric. They portray Western values and try to impose those on the non-Western values. Free trade, interdependence, democracy are concepts wedded to Western liberal tradition and looked at with much contentions by the developing world. For, it is the big and powerful states which control the functioning of international politics. The liberals attempt for peace, effective international organization and disarmament

efforts have met with little success. Further, idealism has been criticized vehemently by the realists for not taking into account the realities of human nature and, hence, politics. Pursuit of self-interest becomes the sole guiding principle in case of individual actions and state activities. Morality has least importance in the arena of politics, As Couloumbis and Wolfe, observed, The Realists argue that the adoption of legalistic, moralistic and even ideological behaviour in politics tends to run contrary to the forces of nature and it results either in pacifism and defeatism on the one hand and a fierce exclusivist, and crusading spirit on the other". Kegley and Wittkopf also pointed out that "Much of the idealist programme for reform was never tried, and even less of it was ever achieved".

This does not mean that idealism is without any value. A scholar at this point of time can ask the question whether realism and idealism can be synthesized to get a comprehensive approach in the study of international relations. Reinhold Niebuhr (The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness 1944) opines that it is possible to combine the wisdom of the Realists with the optimism of the idealists or one can discard the pessimism of the realists and the foolishness of the idealists. The essence of this line of thinking is to retain the reality of power struggle among the states as well as directing the efforts of the states towards building up of international peace and security and peaceful coexistence. Reinhold Niebuhr spoke of children of light and children of darkness. The former, children of light, regard subordination of self-interest to universal laws so that they are at harmony with universal good and the latter, children of darkness, regard self-interest as the prime guiding principle. On the basis of this criterion, Niebuhr regards the children of darkness as evil and wicked and the children of light as virtuous. But again, he realizes that the children of darkness are wise and the children of light are foolish for they fail to understand the power of self-interest and underestimate anarchy. Niebuhr, therefore, suggests that the children of darkness should learn something from the children of light and the children of light should borrow something from the children of darkness. It is the only possible way to evolve a comprehensive approach to understand international relations.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises:

Q1. Write an essay on Liberalism in international relations.

Q2. What do you mean by neo-liberalism? Elaborate with examples.

2.2 REALISM

Classical Realism: Hans Morgenthau

Realism as an approach to international relations very much contrasts to other approaches like idealism, liberalism, and Marxism. Realism simply connotes the idea that since the time of classical antiquity it has served as a tool to understand, examine and evaluate the relations among nations. A brief look at its history, realism owes its origin to Greek classical period. Thucydides is the classical exponent of realism in classical antiquity. With the progress of civilization Machiavelli toward the end of the medieval period, Hobbes and Rousseau in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries popularized the idea in their thought process. What does realism mean? It claims that 'on the apparent durability of power politics as a feature of human civilization.' 2 However, Walker doubts that does this view include the coherent intellectual traditions (Walker, 1987). The growth of the concept took place vehemently in post Second World War period.

Realism is more or less considered as an Anglo-American baggage in international relations theory. The emergence of the First World War provoked the study of realism centrally pointing toward the causes of war and the failure of collective security of the civilization. At the genesis of the idea at this phase solely concentrated on the origin of the causes of the war as well as its prevention from further recurrence. This phase of realism reached at its failure after the catastrophes of 1930 and 1940's and the failure of the collective security system prescribed by the League of Nations.

After the unsuccessful orientation of the first phase, post-war realism developed in response to the practical and intellectual failures of the inter-war period, and the experiences of cold war. It was concerned to rebalance the approaches of the inter-war idealists by giving the priority to the need to study the international system as it was, rather than as one might like it to be. The writings of the thinkers like Morgenthau, E. H. Carr and John Herz following the Second World War period suggest a new mode in realist thought primarily focusing on power politics among states as the key to understanding the operation of the world system. Morgenthau advocated for a world government as a solution to occurring wars at world levels. Realism at this phase accompanied by strategic studies concentrates on developing theories of nuclear deterrence. The strategic studies developed during this period try to analyse the rapid growth of unilateralism.

The methodological behavioralists argued that the work of the classical realists did not satisfy the principles of scientific investigation. There are two kinds of attack set forth here. One is a frontal attack coming from those concerned with interdependence, political economy and transnational relations. This included not only fundamental questioning about the centrality of state and military powering realist thinking but also an accusation that realism was unable to deal with either the issues or the character of international politics in an interdependent world and a denunciation of the logic and the morality of relativism and normative bias towards conflictual assumptions.

The second attack came from the English School, whose main writers were Martin Wright (1977) and Hedley Bull (1977). It did not question the primacy of the state or power politics, but developed the concept of international society as a way of norm-based order, into the understanding of international relations.

The classical realism's most important exponent is Hans Morgenthau and he also known as the father of post war realism and arguable the most influential theorist of international relations in his generation (Richard Ned Lebow, 2003, The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests and Orders, CUP). Morgenthau's work influenced the domain of international politics and the idea of relativism became a dominant paradigm in the field and maintained this position throughout the cold war. However, in 1980's neorealism gained currency, and Kenneth Waltz became an important thinker in this era.

The classical realists have holistic understandings of politics that stresses the similarities, not the difference between domestic and international politics, and the role of the community in promoting stability in both. They recognize that communal bonds are fragile and easily undermined by the unrestrained pursuit of unilateral advantage by individuals, factions, and states. Classical realists think of political systems in terms of the principles of order, and the ways in which they shape the identities of actors and the discourses they use to frame their interests. For classical realists the changes in identities and discourses are associated with modernization and hegemonic war and more often a consequence than a cause of such a transformation. This different understanding of cause and effect has important implications for the kinds of strategies classical realists envisage as efficacious in maintaining or restoring order. While recognizing the importance of power, they put more weight on values and ideas.

Thucydides constructed no theories in modern sense of the term, but he is widely regarded as the first theorist of international relations. Clausewitz and Morgenthau are explicitly

theoretical. All the classical realists are, however, united in their belief that theoretical knowledge is not an end in itself, but a starting point for actors to work their way through contemporary problems and, in the process, come to deeper forms of understanding. Classical realism can be thematically designed in the following ways: (a) order and stability, (b) balance of power, (c) interest and justice, (d) modernization, (e) restoring order.

Order and Stability: Most realists have a straight forward answer to the problem of order: effective central authority. Governments that defend borders, enforce laws, and protect citizens make domestic politics more peaceful and qualitatively different from international politics. The international arena remains anarchical, self-help system, a brutal arena where states look for opportunities to take advantage of each other (John Mearsheimer, 1994, '*The False Promise of International Institutions*', International Security, 19/5-49). Survival depends on a state's material capabilities and its alliance with other states (Waltz, 1979, *Theory of International Politics*, Readings, Massachusetts: Addition- Wesley, pp-103-04, Robert Gilpin, 2001, *Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order*, Princeton: PUP).

For classical realists, all politics is an expression of the same human drivers and subject to the same pathologies. They see more variations in order and stability within domestic political order and international systems than they do between them. They explain this variation with reference to the cohesiveness of society, domestic or international, and channels into which it directs human drives.

Morgenthau's understanding of the relationship between domestic and international politics mirrors that of Thucydides and Clausewitz. At the outset of 'international politics among nations', he introduces a sharp distinction between domestic and international politics, which he then systematically undermines. All politics he insists is a struggle for power into ritualized and socially acceptable channels. In international arena, the struggle cannot so readily be tamed (Morgenthau: *Politics among Nations*, p-172, and '*The Decline of Democratic Politics* (1958: 80, Chicago: Chicago University Press). The character of international relations nevertheless displays remarkable variation across historical epochs. In the eighteenth century, Europe was one great republic with common standards of politeness and cultivation, and a common system of arts, and laws and manners.

Balance of Power: Contemporary realists consider military capability and alliances as the very foundation of security. They regard the balance of power as universally applicable

mechanism, although most effective in a multipolar system. For Morgenthau, the universality of power drive meant that 'the balance of power was a general social phenomenon to be found on all levels of social interaction (*Decline of Democratic Politics*, p-49, 81).

Individuals, groups and states inevitably combined to protect themselves from predators. At the international level the balance of power had contradictory implications for peace. It might deter ear if status quo powers outgunned imperialist challengers and demonstrated their resole to go to war in defence of the status quo. Balancing could also intensify tension and make war more likely because of the impossibility of assessing with any certainty the motives, capability and the resolve of others. Leaders understandably aim to achieve a margin of safety, and when multiple state or opposing alliances act this way, they ratchet up international tensions. In this situation, rising powers may be tempted to go to war when they think they have an advantage, and status quo powers to launch preventive against rising challengers. Even when the balance of power failed to prevent war, Morgenthau reasoned, it might still limit its consequences and preserve the existence of states, small and large, that constitute the political system. Like Clausewitz, Morgenthau credited the balance with having served these ends for much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Politics among Nations, pp-155-59, 162- 66, 177, and Decline of Politics, p-80).

For Morgenthau, the success of balance of power for the better part of two centuries was less a function of the distribution of capabilities than it was of the existence and strength of international society that bound together the most important actors in the system. When that society broke down, as it did from the first partition of Poland through the Napoleonic wars, the balance of power no longer functioned to preserve the peace or the existence of the members of the system.

International society was even weaker in twentieth century and its decline was an underlaying cause of both world wars. Morgenthau worried that its continuing absence in the immediate post war period had removed all constraints on super power competition. By the 1070's he had become more optimistic about the prospects for peace. Détente, explicit recognition of territorial status quo in Europe a corresponding decline in the ideological confrontation, the emergence of Japan, China and West Germany as possible third forces and the effects of Vietnam on American power had made both superpowers more cautious and tolerant of the status quo. But perhaps most importantly, their daily contacts, negotiations, and occasional

agreements had gone some way toward normalizing their relations and creating the basis for renewed sense of international community.

For Morgenthau, as it was for Thucydides and Clausewitz, politics as a struggle for power and unilateral advantage. The differences between domestic and international politics were merely differences of degree. Military capability and alliances were necessary safeguards in the rough and tumbled worlds of international relations, but could not be counted on to preserve the peace or independence of actors. Order, domestic and international, ultimately rested on the strength of the community. When states and their rulers were bound by common culture, by convention and personal ties, competition for power was restrained in its end and its means. Under such conditions, a balance of power might prevent some wars and limit the severity of others. In the absence of a community, military capability and alliances were no guarantee of security and could provoke wars they were intended to prevent.

For classical realists order is the result of identities and international constraints they generate both directly on behaviour, and indirectly by the manners in which identities shape interests. Order is only secondary attributable to the external constraints imposed by governments alliances and superior military capabilities. International society, conceived of as community at the international level is of crucial importance to classical realists.

Interest and Justice: Morgenthau tackles the questions of justice and interest importantly. In 'Politics among Nations' the concept of interests is defined in terms of power, sets politics apart as an autonomous sphere of action; and in turn makes a theory of politics possible. Morgenthau goes on to subvert this formulation to develop a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between interest and power. These contradictions can be reconciled if we recognize that Morgenthau, Like Clausewitz, distinguished between the realm of theory and practice. The former aspires to create an abstract ration ideal based on the underlying dynamics of international politics. Such a theory represented the crudest of templates. Policy and its analysis were concrete, not always rational, and had to take into account many considerations outside the spheres of politics.

The contrast between theory and practice is equally apparent in Morgenthau's conceptualization of power. He thought of power, as an intelligible quality with many diverse components, which he catalogs to some length. But in the real world, the strategies and tactics leaders use to transform the raw attributes of power into political influence were just as important as the attributes themselves. Because influence as psychological relationship

leaders need to know not only what buttons are at the disposal but which ones to push in any circumstance. There were no absolute measures of state power, because it was always relative and situation specific. The successful exercise of power required a sophisticated understanding of goods, strengths and weaknesses of allies, adversaries and third parties. But above all it demanded psychological sensitivity to others needs for self-esteem.

People seek domination but most often end up subordination to others (Morgenthau, Scientific Man Vs Power Politics, p-145). They try to repress this unpleasant truth, and those who exercise power effectively employ justifications and ideologies that facilitate this process. Whenever possible, they attempt to conceive those who must submit to their will that they are acting in their interests or those if the wider community (Morgenthau, "the Decline of Politics", p-59). What is required of mastery of international politics, Morgenthau insisted, 'is not the rationality of the engineer but the wisdom and moral strength of the statesman (Morgenthau, 'Politics among Nations', p-172).

For Morgenthau, adherence to ethical norms was just as much in the interests of those who wielded power as it was for those over whom it was exercised. He made this point in his critique of American intervention in Indochina, where he argued that intervention would fail and erode America's influence in the world because the ends and means of the American Policy violated the morality of the age. There was a certain irony to Morgenthau's opposition. In his 'Politics among Nations', Morgenthau marked to disabuse an influential segment of the American elite if its naïve belief that ethics was an appropriate guide for foreign policy and that international conflicts could be resolved through the application of law. Morgenthau was adamant that morality defined in terms of the conventions of the epoch, implies limits on the ends that power seeks and the means employed to achieve them (Morgenthau, Scientific Man Vs Power Politics, p-151-68).

Modernization: Modern realists differentiate systems on the basis of their polarity: unipolar and multipolar (Morgenthau, Scientific Man Vs Power Politics, p-145 polar (Randal L. Schweller, 1998, Deadly Imbalances: Hitler's Tri polarity and strategy of World Conquest, New York: Columbia University Pres). System change occurs when the number of poles changes. This is often the result of hegemonic wars, brought on in turn by shifts in the balance of material capabilities.

For classical realists, transformation is a much broader concept, and they associate with processes that we have come to describe as modernization. Modernization brings about shifts

in identities and discourses and, with them, changing conceptions of security. Morgenthau's understanding of modernization recapitulates another aspect of Thucydides. Modernization led to misplaced faith in reason, undermined the values and norms that had restrained individual and state behaviour. Morgenthau drew more directly on Hegel and Freud. Hegel warned of the dangers of the homogenization of society arising equality and universal participation in society. It would under traditional communities and individual ties to them without providing alternative source of identity. Hegel wrote on the eve of the industrial revolution and did not envisage the modern industrial state with its large bureaucracies and modern means of communication. These developments Morgenthau argued, allowed the power of the state to feed on itself through a process of psychological transference that made it the most exalted object of loyalty.

Neo-Realism: Kenneth Waltz

The realist thinking was revived by Kenneth Waltz in the 1970's. Those who believed in Waltz's vision are guided by the term structural realism combined with the work of liberal tradition that focuses on economic relations, regimes and international society (Buzan, Jones and Little, 1993), though the identity was not settled in the times of writing.

Neo-realism was the counter attack in this intellectual joust. It abandoned the conservative assumptions about human nature that underpinned classical realism and reasserted the logic of power politics in the firmer foundation of anarchic structure. It defended the centrality of the state, and especially of great powers, exposing the partiality of some interdependence views of international relations, and reaffirming the primacy of American power in the international system.

Neorealist Parsimony: Waltz and the Passive - adaptive state under socializing anarchy: We have common sense thought that describes that neorealism has a paradox: it insists on the absolute centrality of the autonomous state on international politics, and yet denies the possibility of a theory of state John M. Hobson, 2000, The State and International Relations, CUP, P-19). For Waltz, the state in international politics is exclusively derived from the systemic reproduction requirements of the anarchical state system. At the international structure, the state is derived international agential power either to shape the international political structure or to back its constraining logic.

Waltz in his 'Theory of international politics' (1979) starts with the continuity assumption. This remains a problem for Waltz. It was the high degree of continuity of outcomes that

allegedly marked international politics through the millennia. He says 'the texture of international politics remains highly constant; patterns recur and events repeat themselves endlessly. The relations that prevail inferentially seldom shift rapidly in type or in quality. They are marked by a dismaying persistence (Waltz, 1979, pp-66). Waltz believes strongly that international politics is, and always has been empires, city-states or nation-states. This is explained by Waltz to construct a theory on which there are a minimum of explanatory variables, which themselves are subject to little change or transformation.

This is why parsimony or elegance is fundamental to Waltzian neo-realism (Waltz, 1979, Chapter- I). To have a parsimonious (narrow) theory, Waltz insists that empirical complexity or reality) must be simplified and reduced down to one key factor. He singles out the international political structure as the sole determining variable of international politics, in turn producing a positivistic theory which seeks to uncover the essential laws of motion of international politics. Waltz views that the problem with previous international political theory was dealt with its reductionist methodology. He defines reductionism unintentionally as a theory in which the whole (international theory) is understood or explained by its parts, i. e, the units (Waltz, 1979: 18-19). Reductionism (associated with a second image approach which focuses on the national level variable, as well as first image theory which focuses on the individual) is avoided through a third image approach, which relies on the international political structure as the independent variable (Waltz, 1959). The vital move is to define the international political structure in highly parsimonious terms which requires that unit-force (domestic force) variables be omitted (Waltz, 1979, Chapter-5).

Because at the domestic level there are an indefinite number of variables –economic, political, sociological, technological, etc. which are constantly changing and yet, for Waltz, international relations have not changed but has always remained the same. If changes in international outcomes are linked directly to changes in actors, how can one account for similarities of (international) outcomes that persist or recur even as actors vary? (Waltz, 1979: 65). So, to avoid reductionism and preserve parsimony, in order to explain continuity, it is crucial to ensure that the international political structure is defined only in systemic ways, with a rigid exclusion of non-systemic, unit-force/ national variables.

Waltz's definition of International Political System- There are three basic features or tiers of domestic political structures, though only two for international political system: (1) the ordering principle, or the deep structure – a phrase coined by Ruggi (1986:135), (2) the

character or the differentiation of the units, (3) the distribution of capabilities, or the surface structure. However, the deep structure provides the key.

The Ordering Principle (Deep Structure)- There are two types of ordering principle: anarchy and hierarchy. Hierarchy characterizes domestic political structures, while anarchy characterizes international systems. Under (domestic) hierarchy, the units, (individuals) specialize in producing cars, others house, others vegetables, etc. Because they specialize, they come to rely on others for goods that they need but do not themselves produce – hence, entailing cooperation and interdependence. Such harmony and interdependence are possible only because the problem of security has already been solved by the state. By contrast, in anarchical international systems, the units (i.e., the states) must adaptive self-help because there is no higher authority (world state) which can solve the security problem. They cannot specialize vulnerability. Why does the absence of a world government lead to self-help and competition?

Waltz draws on the domestic analogy, which is based on the argument made by Thomas Hobbes in his Leviathan (1651). Hobbes argued that before the advent of the modern state – in what is known as the state of nature – there was a war of all against all. Thus, men were free but highly insecure, since there was no higher authority which could have prevented from prying on each other. Hobbes solution was the construction of a state or higher coercive authority, known as 'Leviathan' through the social contract, whereby all individuals agreed to surrender their freedom to the state in order to gain security.

Applying this framework to international relations (the domestic analogy), Waltz assumes that state in the inter-state system is like Hobbes individuals within the state of nature, even though ironically. Hobbes denied, or at least heavily qualified, such an assumption by arguing that the international state of nature was in fact less intolerable to men than was the pure (domestic) state of nature (Walker, 1987: 73). Just as individuals compete with each other in pursuit of their own interests in Hobbes domestic state of nature so, for Waltz, individual states compete with each other in the anarchic realm if international politics: among states, the state of nature is the state of war; among men in the state of nature as among states, anarchy, or the absence of government, as associated with the occurrence of violence (Waltz, 1979:102). And precisely because there is no world Leviathan or world state there is nothing to prevent inter-state conflict from recurring. In short, order is possible only if there exists a higher coercive authority. States are free to pursue their own national interest but are forever,

insecure, because war can break out at any time. Accordingly, if states are to survive, they must cooperation in favour of self-help. Cooperation is ultimately dangerous because, in lowering their guard states become vulnerable to predators.

Because the ordering of principle is so important but is invisible or as Waltz put it the problem: How to conceive of an order without … (a visible) (Waltz, 1979:89? Waltz draws on macro-economic theory by of analogy in order to understand the nature or power of anarchy. Drawing on Adam Smith's discussion of the market, Waltz claims that just as the market emerges as a result of the spontaneous actions of the individuals and firms and so the international political structures emerge out of the spontaneous actions self-interested states pursuing their own selfish national interests. But once formed the international system constrains the actors (i.e., the states). For Smith, It was the structure of the market system the determined the self-help and adaptive behaviour of individuals (and firms) just as for Waltz the anarchic system determines the adaptive behaviour of states. Smith's famous claim was that through the competition of selfish individuals, an invisible hand of market competition ensued the reproduction of society overall (Smith, 1776:423). Similarly for Waltz, the competition of selfish states, the invisible hand of anarchy ensures the reproduction of anarchic state. And just as for Smith the market selects appropriate behaviour for survival by rewarding those who confirm to the logic of the market with high profits and those who do not with bankruptcy, so for Waltz, the international political structure selects out states according to whether their behaviour conforms to anarchy rewarding those who confirm with survival or even great power, and those who do not with decline, defeat or extinction (Waltz, 1979: 89-93).

Character of the Units- In a hierarchy (i.e. in domestic structure) the units are differentiated according to functions: all units are unlike and specialize in different functions, and accordingly enter into an interdependent system of mutual cooperation. But under international anarchy, states are like units and are minimally differentiated in terms of functions. Thus, while they differ greatly in terms of capability, functionally they are all alike – that is they are all sovereign, having a centralized political system with a legitimate monopoly of violence and rulemaking, and are not subject to higher political authority either domestically or internationally (Waltz 1979: 95). The reason why they are all the same derives from the socializing logic of anarchy. Failure to emulate the successful practices of the leading states (i.e. to conform the logic of anarchic competition) leads to the opening up of a relative power gap and therefore, heightened vulnerability or even extinction. Survival

dictates convergence or functional homogeneity. Waltz's fundamental argument is that the second (tier) is not needed on defining international political structure, because so long as anarchy endures, states remain like units (Waltz, 1979: 93, 103).

Waltz effectively 'black-boxes' the state – that is, unit forces are held constant. It is the manoeuvre that informs the billiard-ball metaphor. States are like billiard-balls, not simply because they constantly clash, but billiard-balls are solid such that their internal properties do not vary and above all, do not affect their external behaviour. Here in lies the crux of Waltz's understanding of the state: that because states are like units (due to the socializing effects of anarchy), their partial attributes cannot enter into the definition of international political structure as an independent (i.e. determining) variable, precisely because their internal attributes do not vary. Of course, they differ greatly in terms of regime form, ideology, etc. but, as we have seen these have purposefully been ignored. The fact that states (e.g. liberal/authoritarian, capitalist/socialist) have fought wars irrespective of their type or form suggests that unit forces are not relevant (Waltz, 1979: 66). In short Waltz accords the state no determining agential power or influence in international politics. Accordingly, the state must be dropped as an independent causal variable in international politics. It is for this reason that Waltz argues that we do not need a theory of the state.

Distribution of Capabilities: While states are all functionally alike, nevertheless they are differentiated in terms of power capability (i.e. power differentiation). Here Waltz refers to strong and weak states. Strong states as great powers are in effect power-makers; they can change the behaviour of other states, where as weak state in effect power-takers, having no choice but to follow the great powers. Under anarchy, power differentiation ensures that all states must follow self-help or decline or perish. But does not the inclusion of capability allow forces back into the definition, as is sometimes charged by his critics (e.g. Gabriel, 1994: 85). No, Waltz answers, because having abstracted every aspect of the state except power, what emerges is a positional picture, in which states are understood by their placement in the system as opposed to their individual attributes (Waltz, 1979: 99).

Waltz's minimalist or functionalist definition of the state: the passive military-adaptive state: We now reached at this point that Waltz followed systemic approach to international politics. It is because the state resides within an independent and self-determining anarchical international system. It can be granted no serious ontological status or international agential power. Although the states are very much the key units of the system, they have no

determining influence. Thus, no formal theory of the state is required. Nevertheless, Waltz has a minimalist definition of the state: what we term the theory of the passive military adaptive state (Hobson, p.24). The core aspects of this state have an institutional foundation.

The institutional means of adoption: high/ absolute agential state power- The most fundamental institutional means that underpins adaptive behaviour of the sovereignty of the state, in which, that state has high or absolute domestic agential power. This does not imply that the state can do simply as it pleases, but morally that the state is free of external or internal interference (by non-state actors) to decide for itself how it will cope with external challenges. States develop their own (adoptive) strategies … It is no more contradictory to say that sovereign states are always constrained (by the system) and often tightly so than it to say that free individuals often make decisions under the heavy pressure of events (Waltz, 1979; 96). In short, the state is granted high (absolute) domestic agential power and can operate wholly independently of domestic (and international) social forces.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises:

Q1. Write an essay on Realism in international relations.

Q2. What do you mean by neo-realism? Elaborate with examples of offensive & defensive realism.

2.3 SYSTEMS THEORY

Morton Kaplan

The systems theory originated primarily due to the behavioural revolution in social science. The desire of the new genre of social scientists, to evolve a general body of knowledge by integrating the various disciplines of social sciences, finally led to the emergence of a host of theoretical approaches inspired by natural science methods. The chief among them was the systems analysis, and prominent contributions in the field of international politics were made by Easton (1965), Kaplan (1957), McClelland (1966), Rosenau (1961), and Boulding (1956), among others.

Morton Kaplan has been the chief _exponent of systems theory in international relations. He conceives international system as an analytical entity for explaining the behaviour of international actors and the regulative, integrative and disintegrative consequences of their policies. The positive element in Kaplan's thinking is the consideration of the possibility of 'change". Thus, he studied the behaviour of a system under changing conditions. He stated that there is some coherence, regularity and order in international relations and it is constituted of two things: "international system" and "nation-state system". The international system is composed of subsystems and a set of actors, both international and supranational, and is characterized by interactions among them. Nation-states are the primary actors and their role changes with the change in the international system. Kaplan describes six models of international system. They are:

The Balance of Power System: According to Kaplan, the period between 1815 and 1914 experienced a golden age of Balance of Power (BOP). Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the system started faltering as rules started to be flouted by major international actors. Finally, the whole BOP system collapsed with the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. Kaplan also suggested certain basic rules for the functioning of the balance of power system. These rules meant that one takes the following steps:

- Act to increase capabilities but negotiate rather than fight.
- Fight rather than pass up an opportunity to increase capabilities.
- Stop fighting rather than eliminate an essential national actor.
- Act to oppose any coalition or single actor which tends to assume a position to predominance with respect to the rest of the system.

- Act to constrain actors who subscribe to supranational organizing principles.
- Permit defeated or constrained essential national actors to re-enter the system as acceptable role partners or act to bring some previously inessential actor within the essential actor classification.
- Treat all essential actors as acceptable role partners.

In Kaplan's view, these features would help keep intact the balance in relations. Failure would mean an end to balance and, ultimately, the system.

1. **The Loose Bipolar System**: The loose bipolar system, often recognized as the 'Cold War' model, envisages an international system that comes into operation when there is only two superpowers leading their respective competitive blocs and there is also a simultaneous presence of non-member bloc-actors and universal actors. Thus, this system would comprise two major bloc actors: the non-aligned states and international organizations like the United Nations. Both blocs try to increase their capabilities and are willing to run at least some risks to eliminate rival bloc. Both blocs also attempt to subordinate the objectives of the universal actors to their own objectives. Non-aligned states, on the other hand, try to support the universal actor to check the power of the two blocs and reduce the danger of war between them. Both blocs strive to increase their membership but at the same time tolerate the status of the non-aligned states.

2. **The Tight Bipolar System**: The loose bipolar system may get transformed into a tight bipolar system where two major powers lead their respective blocs and it virtually becomes different forms of interactions between the two blocs. In this system, therefore, the role of non-aligned states or non-member states either disappears or become less significant. Even universal actors such as international organizations become too weak to mediate.

3. **The Universal System**: This system emerges when the world gets transformed into a federal world state based on the principle of mutual tolerance and universal rule of law. The system almost resembles a world federation. It, therefore, works through a universal actor such as an international organization like the United Nations or such other agencies, which would have the necessary capacity to maintain peace and security and prevent war, once the bipolar system ceases. It would be performing judicial, economic, political and administrative work although the states would enjoy sufficient autonomy

4. **The Hierarchical System**: Such system will come into existence when a single universal actor absorbs all the other states either through conquest or treaty. The system will be directive if found on the basis of world conquest. It would be non-directive when power would be distributed among units according to hierarchy under the domination of a single national actor. The states as territorial units are, thus, transformed into functional units. The non-directive system is based on will, and the directive system on force.

5. **The Unit Veto System**: This is a kind of system when all the states would possess equal potentialities to destroy each other. The mere possession of deadly weapons and nukes would deter the attacks on a particular state. Therefore, this system reaches stability when a state can resist and retaliate threats from every other state.

Criticisms:

Major criticisms have been launched against the systems approach. The general criticisms against the system analysts are that they have not evolved any theories but only frameworks, which cannot make significant contributions to international relations. The theory is also difficult to operationalize as empirical testing is difficult. There is a gap between theory and research. It is, therefore, limited in scope.

Kaplan's models of international system have been subjected to rigorous criticisms. It is argued that the system not only offers limited possibilities but its merit is also limited. The first two models roughly correspond to real situations in the backdrop of particular historical trajectories. The other four models are totally hypothetical, impracticable and arbitrary. It was almost like an intellectual exercise on Kaplan's part without any reference to reality. Kaplan's model also neglected the role of geo-strategic factors as well as national and sub-national factors. However, the criticisms do not mean that the systems approach is absolutely without merit. It has made significant contribution in the scientific study of behaviour in international relations. It can be used along with other approaches to the study of international relations.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises:

Q1. Write an essay on Systems Theory in international relations with examples.

SUGGESTED READINGS:

1. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (Edited), The Globalization of World Politics, Fourth Edition, OUP, USA 2008

2. John Baylis, J.Wirtz, C.Gray, Strategy in Contemporary World, OUP, UK, 2010

3. John W. Young and John Kent, International Relations since 1945 A Global History, OUP, USA, 2004

4. Joshua S. Goldstein, International Relations, 8/e, Pearson Education 2008 Politics among Nations authored by Hans, J. Morgenthau

5. Mahendra Kumar, Theoretical Aspects of International Politics, Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala, 1967

6. Paul R.Viotti and Mark V.Kauppi, International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity, 3/e, Pearson Education 2007

7. Peu Ghosh, International Relations, PHI Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2010

CHAPTER-3

BASIC CONCEPTS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

LEARNING OUTCOME: After going through this lesson, students will be able to-

- **Know the concept of Balance of Power**
- **Understand the concept of Collective Security and Disarmament**
- **Recognize the importance of National Interest and Ideology**

3.1 BALANCE OF POWER

Balance of Power is the core theory of international politics within the realist perspective. A 'balance of power' system is one in which the power held and exercised by states within the system is checked and balanced by the power of others.

Balance of power, in international relations, the posture and policy of a nation or group of nations protecting itself against another nation or group of nations by matching its power against the power of the other side. States can pursue a policy of balance of power in two ways: by increasing their own power, as when engaging in an armaments race or in the competitive acquisition of territory; or by adding to their own power that of other states, as when embarking upon a policy of alliances.

The term *balance of power* came into use to denote the power relationships in the European state system from the end of the Napoleonic Wars to World War I. Within the European balance of power, Great Britain played the role of the "balancer," or "holder of the balance." It was not permanently identified with the policies of any European nation, and it would throw its weight at one time on one side, at another time on another side, guided largely by one consideration—the maintenance of the balance itself. Naval supremacy and its virtual immunity from foreign invasion enabled Great Britain to perform this function, which made the European balance of power both flexible and stable.

The balance of power from the early 20th century onward underwent drastic changes that for all practical purposes destroyed the European power structure as it had existed since the end of the Middle Ages. Prior to the 20th century, the political world was composed of a number of separate and independent balance-of-power systems, such as the European, the American,

the Chinese, and the Indian. But World War I and its attendant political alignments triggered a process that eventually culminated in the integration of most of the world's nations into a single balance-of-power system. This integration began with the World War I alliance of Britain, France, Russia, and the United States against Germany and Austria-Hungary. The integration continued in World War II, during which the fascist nations of Germany, Japan, and Italy were opposed by a global alliance of the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, and China. World War II ended with the major weights in the balance of power having shifted from the traditional players in western and central Europe to just two non-European ones: the United States and the Soviet Union. The result was a bipolar balance of power across the northern half of the globe that pitted the free-market democracies of the West against the communist one-party states of eastern Europe. More specifically, the nations of western Europe sided with the United States in the NATO military alliance, while the Soviet Union's satellite-allies in central and eastern Europe became unified under Soviet leadership in the Warsaw Pact.

Because the balance of power was now bipolar and because of the great disparity of power between the two superpowers and all other nations, the European countries lost that freedom of movement that previously had made for a flexible system. Instead of a series of shifting and basically unpredictable alliances with and against each other, the nations of Europe now clustered around the two superpowers and tended to transform themselves into two stable blocs.

There were other decisive differences between the postwar balance of power and its predecessor. The fear of mutual destruction in a global nuclear holocaust injected into the foreign policies of the United States and the Soviet Union a marked element of restraint. A direct military confrontation between the two superpowers and their allies on European soil was an almost-certain gateway to nuclear war and was therefore to be avoided at almost any cost. So instead, direct confrontation was largely replaced by (1) a massive arms race whose lethal products were never used and (2) political meddling or limited military interventions by the superpowers in various Third World nations.

In the late 20th century, some Third World nations resisted the advances of the superpowers and maintained a nonaligned stance in international politics. The breakaway of China from Soviet influence and its cultivation of a nonaligned but covertly anti-Soviet stance lent a further complexity to the bipolar balance of power. The most important shift in the balance of

power began in 1989–90, however, when the Soviet Union lost control over its eastern European satellites and allowed non-communist governments to come to power in those countries. The breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991 made the concept of a European balance of power temporarily irrelevant, since the government of newly sovereign Russia initially embraced the political and economic forms favoured by the United States and western Europe. Both Russia and the United States retained their nuclear arsenals, however, so the balance of nuclear threat between them remained potentially in force.

Nature of Balance of Power

Palmer and Perkins describe several major features of Balance of Power:

1. **Some sort of Equilibrium in Power Relations**: The term Balance of Power suggests 'equilibrium which is subject to constant, ceaseless change. In short, though it stands for equilibrium, it also involves some disequilibrium. That is why scholars define it as a just equilibriums or some sort of equilibrium in power relations.

2. **Temporary and Unstable**: In practice a balance of power always proves to be temporary and unstable. A particular balance of power survives only for a short time.

3. **To be Actively Achieved**: The balance of power has to be achieved by the active intervention of men. It is not a gift of God. States cannot afford to wait until it "happens". They have to secure it through their efforts.

4. **Favours Status Quo**: Balance of power favours status quo in power positions of major powers. It seeks to maintain a balance in their power relations. However, in order to be effective, a foreign policy of balance of power must be changing and dynamic.

5. **The Test of Balance of Power is War**: A real balance of power seldom exists. The only test of a balance is war and when war breaks out the balance comes to an end. War is a situation which balance of power seeks to prevent and when it breaks out, balance power comes to an end.

6. **Not a Device of Peace**: Balance of Power is not a primary device of peace because it admits war as a means for maintaining balance.

7. **Big Powers as Actors of Balance of Power**: In a balance of power system, the big states or powerful states are the players. The small states or less powerful states are either spectators or the victims of the game.

8. **Multiplicity of States as an Essential Condition**: Balance of Power system operates when there are present a number of major powers, each of which is determined to maintain a particular balance or equilibrium in their power relations.

9. **National Interest is its Basis**: Balance of Power is a policy that can be adopted by any state. The real basis that leads to this policy is national interest in a given environment.

Methods of Balance of Power:

Alliance and Counter Alliances: Alliance-making are regarded as a principal method of balance of power. Alliance is a devise by which a combination of nations creates a favourable balance of power by entering into military or security pacts aimed at augmenting their own strength vis-à-vis the power of their opponents. Alliances are a necessary function of the balance of power operating with a multistage system. Alliances generally lead to counter alliances. When an alliance is specifically or indirectly directed against some states, it is quite natural that they will not remain as silent spectators. For example, the Triple alliance of 1882 between Germany, Austro Hungary and Italy led to a rival alliance, Triple Entente 1907 between Britain, France and Russia. Alliances may be both offensive and defensive. While an offensive alliance seeks to upset the balance in favour or its members a defensive alliance aims at restoring peace.

Armament and Disarmament: All nations, particularly very powerful nations, place great emphasis on armaments as the means for maintaining or securing a favourable position in power relations in the world. It is also used as a means to keep away a possible aggressor or enemy. However, armament race between two competitors or opponents can lead to a highly dangerous situation which can accidentally cause a war. In this way armament race can act as a danger to world peace and security. Consequently, disarmaments and Arms Control are regarded as better devices for maintaining and strengthening world peace and security. Like armament, disarmament can resolve a balance of power one can succeed in keeping its rival disarmed one preserves the balance in one's favour. But in practice, disarmament as such has rarely been resorted to except in case of defeated powers on the conclusion of general war. For example, the effort on the part of the allied powers after the First World War was to keep Germany permanently weak.

Buffer States or Zones: Another method of balance of power is to set up a buffer state between two rivals or opponents. Buffers, observes, V. V. Dyke, "are areas which are weak, which possess considerable strategic importance to two or more strong powers. Buffer is a small state created or maintained as a separating state for keeping two competing states physically separate each stronger power then tries to bring the buffer within its sphere of influence but regards it as important, if not, vital, that no other strong power be permitted to

do so. The major function of a buffer is to keep the two powerful nations apart and thus minimize the chances of clash and hence to help the maintenance of balance".

Divide and Rule: The policy of divide and rule has also been a method of balance of power. It has been a time-honoured policy of weakening the opponents. It is resorted to be all such nations who try to make or keep their competitors weak by keeping them divided or by dividing them. This method means the division the enemy in such a way that they are not able to become powerful. The French Policy towards Germany and the British policy towards the European continent can be cited as the outstanding examples. The rich and powerful states now do not refrain from using divide and rule for controlling the policies of the new states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Compensation: It is also known as territorial compensation. It usually entails the annexation or division of the territory of the state whose power is considered dangerous for the balance. In the 17th and 18th Centuries this device was regularly used for maintaining a balance of power which used to get disturbed by the territorial acquisitions of any nation. For example, the three partitions of Poland in 1772, 1793 and 1795 were based upon the principle of compensation. Austria, Prussia and Russia agreed to divide Polish territory in such a way that the distribution of power among them would be approximately the same.

Intervention: Intervention is a dictatorial interference in the internal affairs of another state with a view to change or maintain a particular desired situation which is considered to be harmful or useful to the competing opponents. Some times during a war between two states no attempt is made by other states to intervene. This is done for making the two warring states weaker. As such intervention and non-intervention are used as devices of balance of power.

Merits of Balance of Power

- It is a source of stability in international relations.
- It helps continuous adjustments and readjustments in relations without any grave risk of war among nations.
- It ensures multiplicity of states.
- It guarantees the freedom of small states.
- It discourages war.
- It checks imperialism.
- It is a source of peace in international relations

Demerits of Balance of Power

- Balance of Power cannot ensure peace. In fact, several wars were fought in the name of preservation of Balance of Power.

- Preponderance of one power can also secure peace.

- It has a narrow basis. It fails to give proper weight age to other socioeconomic, cultural and moral factors.

- Equality of number of states is a myth

- Nations are not free to break alliances at their will.

- It is uncertain.

Relevance of Balance of Power

In contemporary times, Balance of Power has lost much of its utility due to several changes in the international relations. The following changes in the international relations as well as in the traditional balance of power system have adversely affected the role and relevance of Balance of Power as a device of power management in international politics.

1. **End of the era of European Domination and the dawn of era of Global Politics**: The structure of international politics has undergone a radical change from the classical period. From a narrow European dominated international system, it has come to be a truly global system in which Asian, African and Latin American states enjoy a new and added importance. Today Europe is no longer the centre of world politics. European politics constitutes only one small segment of international politics. This change has considerably reduced the operation ability of balance of power.

2. **Emergence of Ideology as a Factor of International Relations**: The new importance of ideology and other less tangible but, nevertheless, important elements of national power have further created unfavourable conditions for the operation of balance of power.

3. **The Bipolarity of Cold War period and the new era of Unipolarity**: The bipolarity (presence of two super powers and their blocs) that emerged in the cold war period reduced the flexibility of the international system. It reduced the chances of balance of power whose working requires the existence of flexibility in power relations, alliances and treaties. Presently unipolarity characterizes the international system.

4. **The End of the Era of Colonialism and Imperialism**: Another big change in the structure of balance of power has been the disappearance of imperialism and colonialism: It has limited the scope for the exercise of power by the European

powers, who in the past always worked as the key players of the principle of Balance of Power.

5. **Disappearance of the "Balancer":** The rise of two super powers the disappearance of the "holder of balance" or the "balancer" considerably reduced the chances of balance of power politics during 1945-91. Traditionally, Britain used to play such a role in Europe. The sharp and big decline in the power of Britain in the post-war period compelled it to abandon its role of balancer between the two super powers. No other nation or even a group of nations was successful in acting as a balancer between the USA and the (erstwhile) USSR. The absence of a balancer further reduced the role of balance of power in post-war international relations.

6. **The Emergence of Global Actors**: The rise of the United Nations and several other international and regional actors in international relations has given a new looked to the international relations of our times. The presence of the UN has made a big change in the structure and functioning of the international system. With a provision for collective security of international peace and security, the United Nations constitutes a better source of peace. Due to all these changes in international relations, Balance of Power has come to suffer a big decline. It has definitely lost much of its relevance.

In contemporary times, Balance of Power has ceased to be a fully relevant and credible principle of international relations. However, it still retains a presence in international relations, more particularly, in the sphere of regional relations among states.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises:

Q1. Discuss the nature and different methods of Balance of Power.

Q2. Critically highlight the merits and demerits of Balance of Power.

Q3. Examine the relevance of Balance of Power in contemporary context.

3.2 COLLECTIVE SECURITY & DISARMAMENT

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Collective security can be understood as a security arrangement, political, regional, or global, in which each state in the system accepts that the security of one is the concern of all, and therefore commits to a collective response to threats to, and breaches of peace. Collective security is more ambitious than systems of alliance security or collective defence in that it seeks to encompass the totality of states within a region or indeed globally, and to address a wide range of possible threats. While collective security is an idea with a long history, its implementation in practice has proved problematic. Several prerequisites have to be met for it to have a chance of working. It is the theory or practice of states pledging to defend one another in order to deter aggression or to target a transgressor if international order has been breached.

Collective security is also referred to by the phrase *"an attack on one is an attack on all"*. However, usage of this phrase also frequently refers to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the collective security provision in NATO's charter.

Collective security is one of the most promising approaches for peace and a valuable device for power management on an international scale. Cardinal Richelieu proposed a scheme for collective security in 1629, which was partially reflected in the 1648 Peace of Westphalia. In the eighteenth century many proposals were made for collective security arrangements, especially in Europe.

The concept of a peaceful community of nations was outlined in 1795 in Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*. Kant outlined the idea of a league of nations that would control conflict and promote peace between states. However, he argues for the establishment of a peaceful world community not in a sense that there be a global government but in the hope that each state would declare itself as a free state that respects its citizens and welcomes foreign visitors as fellow rational beings. His key argument is that a union of free states would promote peaceful society worldwide: therefore, in his view, there can be a perpetual peace shaped by the international community rather than by a world government.

International cooperation to promote collective security originated in the Concert of Europe that developed after the Napoleonic Wars in the nineteenth century in an attempt to

maintain the *status quo* between European states and so avoid war. This period also saw the development of international law with the first Geneva Conventions establishing laws about humanitarian relief during war and the international Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 governing rules of war and the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The forerunner of the League of Nations, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), was formed by peace activists William Randal Cremer and Frederic Passy in 1889. The organization was international in scope with a third of the members of parliament, in the 24 countries with parliaments, serving as members of the IPU by 1914. Its aims were to encourage governments to solve international disputes by peaceful means and arbitration and annual conferences were held to help governments refine the process of international arbitration. The IPU's structure consisted of a Council headed by a President which would later be reflected in the structure of the League. At the start of the twentieth century two power blocs emerged through alliances between the European Great Powers. It was these alliances that came into effect at the start of the First World War in 1914, drawing all the major European powers into the war. This was the first major war in Europe between industrialized countries and the first time in Western Europe the results of industrialization (for example mass production) had been dedicated to war. The result of this industrial warfare was an unprecedented casualty level with eight and a half million members of armed services dead, an estimated 21 million wounded, and approximately 10 million civilian deaths.

By the time the fighting ended in November 1918, the war had had a profound impact, affecting the social, political and economic systems of Europe and inflicting psychological and physical damage on the continent. Anti-war sentiment rose across the world; the First World War was described as "the war to end all wars" and its possible causes were vigorously investigated. The causes identified included arms races, alliances, secret diplomacy, and the freedom of sovereign states to enter into war for their own benefit. The perceived remedies to these were seen as the creation of an international organization whose aim was to prevent future war through disarmament, open diplomacy, international co-operation, restrictions on the right to wage wars, and penalties that made war unattractive to nations.

In a 1945 *American Political Science Review* article, Frederick L. Schuman criticized notions that a new collective security organization could contribute to world peace. Schuman pointed to examples from history of collective security organizations that failed to facilitate world

peace. He argued that the organization that would become the United Nations could only facilitate world peace if the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom worked in unison, but that the organization would fail if there were divisions between the three powers.

Basic assumptions:

Kenneth Organski (1960) lists five basic assumptions underlying the theory of collective security:

- In an armed conflict, member nation-states can agree on which nation the aggressor is.
- All member nation-states are equally committed to contain and constrain the aggression, irrespective of its source or origin.
- All member nation-states have an identical freedom of action and ability to join in proceedings against the aggressor.
- The cumulative power of the cooperating members of the alliance for collective security is adequate and sufficient to overpower the might of the aggressor.
- In the light of the threat posed by the collective might of the nations of a collective security coalition, the aggressor nation will either modify its policies or be defeated.

Prerequisites:

Hans Morgenthau (1948) states that three prerequisites must be met for collective security to successfully prevent war:

- The collective security system must be able to assemble military force in strength greatly in excess to that assembled by the aggressor(s), thereby deterring the aggressor(s) from attempting to change the world order that is defended by the collective security system.
- Those nations, whose combined strength would be used for deterrence as mentioned in the first prerequisite, should have identical beliefs about the security of the world order that collective security is defending.
- Nations must be willing to subordinate their conflicting interests to the common good defined in terms of the common defence of all member-states.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS:

After World War I, the first large-scale attempt to provide collective security in modern times was the establishment of the League of Nations in 1919 and 1920. The provisions of the League of Nations Covenant represented a weak system for decision making and collective action. According to Palmer and Perking, they pointed failure of the United States to join the League of Nations and the rise of the Soviet Union outside the League as one of major reasons for its failure to enforce collective security. Moreover, an example of the failure of the League of Nations' collective security was the Manchurian Crisis, when Japan occupied part of China, both of which were League members. After the invasion, members of the League passed a resolution that called for Japan to withdraw or face severe penalties. Since every nation had a veto power, Japan promptly vetoed the resolution, severely limiting the League's ability to respond. After one year of deliberation, the League passed a resolution condemning the invasion without committing its members to any action against it. The Japanese replied by quitting the League.

The Abyssinia Crisis occurred in 1935, when Fascist Italy invaded the Abyssinian Empire, now Ethiopia. In a similar process, sanctions were passed, but Italy would have vetoed any stronger resolution. Additionally, Britain and France sought to court Italy's government as a potential deterrent to Hitler since Mussolini had not yet joined the Axis powers of World War II. Thus, neither Britain nor France put any serious sanctions against the Italian government.

In both cases, the absence of the United States deprived it of another major power that could have used economic leverage against either of the aggressor states. Inaction by the League subjected it to criticisms that it was weak and concerned more with European issues since most leading of its members were European, and it did not deter Hitler from his plans to dominate Europe. Abyssinian Emperor Haile Selassie continued to support collective security, as he assessed that impotence lay not in the principle but its covenanter's commitment to honor its tenets.

One active and articulate exponent of collective security during the immediate pre-war years was Soviet Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov.

After the Munich Agreement in September 1938 and the passivity of outside powers in the face of German occupation of the remainder of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, Western

powers were shown not to be prepared to engage in collective security with the Soviet Union against aggression by Germany.

Soviet foreign policy was revised, and Litvinov was replaced as foreign minister in early May 1939 to facilitate the negotiations that led to the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact with Germany, which was signed by Litvinov's successor, Vyacheslav Molotov, on August 23. The war in Europe broke out a week later with the invasion of Poland, which started on September 1. Thus, collective security may not always work because of the lack of commitment and the unwillingness of states or the international community to act in concert

UNITED NATIONS:

The 1945 United Nations Charter contains stronger provisions for decision-making and collective military action than those of the League of Nations Covenant, but it represents not a complete system of collective security but a balance between collective action and the continued operation of the states system, including the continued special roles of great powers. States in the UN collective security system are selective to support or oppose UN action in certain conflicts, based on their self-interests. The UN can be somehow seen as the platform for self-interest purposes for members in Security Council because of the permanent members' veto power and the excessive assistance or aid, which have made those states to act unilaterally and to ignore the approval of or to violate resolutions of the Security Council. The Iraq crisis is a clearer example: "Rather than seek the global interest of peace and security through stability in Iraq and the Middle East region, the domination oriented members amassed their vast economic, diplomatic and military resources, captured and brazenly subjugated Iraq to an unprecedented regime serving their economic interest under Iraq Reconstruction Programme". In addition, the lack of geographical spread of members in the Security Council causes an imbalance in the role of maintenance global peace and security. The voices of small countries can be heard, but policies are not adopted in response to them unless they serve the great powers' interests.

However, collective security in the UN has not completely failed. The role of the UN and collective security in general is evolving with the rise of civil wars. Since the end of World War II, there have been 111 military conflicts worldwide, but only 9 of them have involved two or more states going to war with one another. The others have been civil wars in which other states have intervened in some manner. That means that collective security may have to

evolve towards providing a means to ensure stability and a fair international resolution to those internal conflicts. Whether that involves more powerful peacekeeping forces or a larger role for the UN diplomatically is likely to be judged on a case-by-case basis.

DISARMAMENT

Disarmament is the act of reducing, limiting, or abolishing weapons. Disarmament generally refers to a country's military or specific type of weaponry. Disarmament is often taken to mean total elimination of weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear arms. General and Complete Disarmament was defined by the United Nations General Assembly as the elimination of all WMD, coupled with the "balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, based on the principle of undiminished security of the parties with a view to promoting or enhancing stability at a lower military level, taking into account the need of all States to protect their security."

At The Hague Peace Conferences in 1899 and 1907 government delegations debated about disarmament and the creation of an international court with binding powers. The court was considered necessary because it was understood that nation-states could not disarm into a vacuum. After World War I revulsion at the futility and tremendous cost of the war was widespread. A commonly held belief was that the cause of the war had been the escalating build-up of armaments in the previous half century among the great powers (see Anglo-German naval arms race). Although the Treaty of Versailles effectively disarmed Germany, a clause was inserted that called on all the great powers to likewise progressively disarm over a period of time. The newly formed League of Nations made this an explicit goal in the covenant of the league, which committed its signatories to reduce armaments 'to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations'.

One of the earliest successful achievements in disarmament was obtained with the Washington Naval Treaty. Signed by the governments of Great Britain, the United States, Japan, France, and Italy, it prevented the continued construction of capital ships and limited ships of other classification to under 10,000 tons displacement. The size of the three country's navies (the Royal Navy, United States Navy and Imperial Japanese Navy) was set at the ratio 5-5-3.

In 1921 the Temporary Mixed Commission on Armaments was set up by the League of Nations to explore possibilities for disarmament. It was made up not of government representatives but of famous individuals who rarely agreed. Proposals ranged from abolishing chemical warfare and strategic bombing to the limitation of more conventional weapons, such as tanks. A draft treaty was assembled in 1923 that made aggressive war illegal and bound the member states to defend victims of aggression by force. Since the onus of responsibility would, in practice, be on the great powers of the League, it was vetoed by Great Britain, who feared that this pledge would strain its own commitment to police its British Empire.

Another commission in 1926, set up to explore the possibilities for the reduction of army size, met similar difficulties. However acting outside the League. French Foreign Minister Aristide Briand and US Secretary of State Frank Kellogg drafted a treaty known as the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which denounced war of aggression. There were 65 signatories to the pact, but it set out no guidelines for action in the event of a war. It was in 1946 used to convict and execute Nazi leaders of war crimes.

A final attempt was made at the Geneva Disarmament Conference from 1932 to 1937, chaired by former British Foreign Secretary Arthur Henderson. Germany demanded the revision of the Versailles Treaty and the granting of military parity with the other powers, while France was determined to keep Germany demilitarised for its own security. Meanwhile, the British and Americans were not willing to offer France security commitments in exchange for conciliation with Germany. The talks broke down in 1933, when Adolf Hitler withdrew Germany from the conference.

Methods of disarmament:

Disarmament and arms control measures can be imposed on states, be taken unilaterally by a state or be agreed between two states or multiple states.

Right up to the recent past, the most widely occurring form of disarmament was imposed disarmament on those who had been vanquished in war. In Antiquity, for example, a victorious Rome demanded, in the aftermath of the second Punic War (218–201 BC) that Carthage give up all its war elephants and its entire battle fleet bar ten ships. To demonstrate their power, the Romans set hundreds of Carthaginian ships on fire before the gates of the city state.

In the modern era, the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 laid down far-reaching disarmament measures to be taken by Germany and its allies, in the wake of Germany's defeat in World War I.

Then there are unilateral measures in the form of a country independently deciding to reduce its military capabilities and assets. For instance, Costa Rica decided in 1948 to completely disband its armed forces, becoming the only country in the world to have done so. In the United States, President George H.W. Bush, responding to the new post-Cold War environment in 1991, announced a unilateral initiative to scrap thousands of American tactical nuclear warheads. A little time later the then Soviet leader, President Mikhail Gorbachev, followed suit with a parallel move.

Motives of disarmament and arms control:

Disarmament and arms control clearly depend on the ideas and objectives that shape foreign and security policy as well as on military strategy. But the internal power of each country's "military–industrial complex" (in the words of US President Dwight D. Eisenhower) also has an impact on the formulation of foreign, military and disarmament objectives. Most countries have always regarded the military instruments of power as the key to national security, to achieving and expanding influence in the world and ensuring access to natural resources or territories. So it is hardly surprising that history records only modest success in relation to disarmament and arms control efforts. Nevertheless, there are also forces that drive these efforts, which have, under certain historical conditions, repeatedly led to arms agreements. These drivers include:

- concerns about the stability of international relations and one's own position within a power nexus;
- real or supposed military advantages that result from agreements on disarmament and arms control;
- opportunities for making savings in the arms sector by renouncing weapons that now have hardly any military value;
- the aim of agreeing on codes of behaviour in a war (e.g. treatment of prisoners of war, distinguishing between soldiers and civilians) that are in line with one's own interests;
- sections of the public and peace movements that raise their voices against the destructive potential of wars, demand action to alleviate human suffering in war, and

present an ethical, moral, political or social critique of the perils of military build-up, thus exerting pressure on policymakers, both nationally and internationally.

Nuclear Disarmament

Nuclear disarmament is the act of reducing or eliminating nuclear weapons. Its end state can also be a nuclear-weapons-free world, in which nuclear weapons are completely eliminated. The term denuclearization is also used to describe the process leading to complete nuclear disarmament.

Disarmament and non-proliferation treaties have been agreed upon because of the extreme danger intrinsic to nuclear war and the possession of nuclear weapons.

Proponents of nuclear disarmament say that it would lessen the probability of nuclear war occurring, especially accidentally. Critics of nuclear disarmament say that it would undermine deterrence and make conventional wars more common.

Why is Nuclear Disarmament important?

Nuclear Disarmament is the beginning of a nuclear-weapons-free world. Considering its impact on human lives, the use of nuclear weapons is highly criticized. Also, nuclear disarmament is an important initiative for international security and peace among nations.

Is Nuclear Disarmament possible?

Nuclear Disarmament is a highly debated and advocated issue of the current era. There are several initiatives globally that advocate the elimination of nuclear weapons. Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is one of the finest attempt to achieve nuclear disarmament.

Major treaties:

- *Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT) 1963:* Prohibited all testing of nuclear weapons except underground.
- *Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)—signed 1968*, came into force 1970: An international treaty (currently with 189 member states) to limit the spread of nuclear weapons. The treaty has three main pillars: non-proliferation, disarmament, and the right to peacefully use nuclear technology.

- *Interim Agreement on Offensive Arms (SALT I) 1972*: The Soviet Union and the United States agreed to a freeze in the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) that they would deploy.

- *Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) 1972*: The United States and Soviet Union could deploy ABM interceptors at two sites, each with up to 100 ground-based launchers for ABM interceptor missiles. In a 1974 Protocol, the US and Soviet Union agreed to only deploy an ABM system to one site.

- *Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) 1979*: Replacing SALT I, SALT II limited both the Soviet Union and the United States to an equal number of ICBM launchers, SLBM launchers, and heavy bombers. Also placed limits on Multiple Independent Reentry Vehicles (MIRVS).

- *Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) 1987*: Banned US and Soviet Union land-based ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and missile launchers with ranges of 500–1,000 kilometres (310–620 mi) (short medium-range) and 1,000–5,500 km (620–3,420 mi) (intermediate-range).

- *Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I)*—signed 1991, ratified 1994: Limited long-range nuclear forces in the United States and the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union to 6,000 attributed warheads on 1,600 ballistic missiles and bombers.

- *Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty II (START II)*—signed 1993, never put into force: START II was a bilateral agreement between the US and Russia which attempted to commit each side to deploy no more than 3,000 to 3,500 warheads by December 2007 and also included a prohibition against deploying multiple independent reentry vehicles (MIRVs) on intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs)

- *Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT or Moscow Treaty)*—signed 2002, into force 2003: A very loose treaty that is often criticized by arms control advocates for its ambiguity and lack of depth, Russia and the United States agreed to reduce their "strategic nuclear warheads" (a term that remained undefined in the treaty) to between 1,700 and 2,200 by 2012. Was superseded by New Start Treaty in 2010.

- *Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)*—signed 1996, not yet in force: The CTBT is an international treaty (currently with 181 state signatures and 148 state ratifications) that bans all nuclear explosions in all environments. While the treaty is not in force, Russia has not tested a nuclear weapon since 1990 and the United States has not since 1992.[61]

- *New START Treaty*—signed 2010, into force in 2011: replaces SORT treaty, reduces deployed nuclear warheads by about half, will remain into force until 2026.
- *Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons*—signed 2017, entered into force on January 22, 2021: prohibits possession, manufacture, development, and testing of nuclear weapons, or assistance in such activities, by its parties.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises:

Q1. What do you mean by Collective Security? Explain in detail.

Q2. Write an essay on the role of League of Nations and United Nations to promote Collective Security.

Q3. What do you mean by Disarmament? Why Nuclear Disarmament is important?

3.3 NATIONAL INTEREST AND IDEOLOGY

National interest is not only the key concept in foreign policy but also is a guide to the foreign policy formulation. The history of the concept of national interest dates back to the time when the evolution of the modem state system took place. It was and remains an important element to describe the underlying rationale for the behaviour of states and statesmen in a threatening international environment. But the idea of separateness, of differentness from others, and the consequent idea of preserving and protecting one's values against others, goes back to antiquity. The word "interest" derives from the Latin, meaning "it concerns, it makes a difference to, it is important with reference to some person or thing." One common-sense definition describes it as the general and continuing ends for which the nation acts. National interest shows the aspirations of the state, it can be used also operationally, in application to the actual policies and programmes pursued; it can be used polemically in political argument, to explain, rationalise or criticise. Above all, all statesmen are governed by their respective national interest. Whenever a treaty or summit takes place, the statesmen keep their national interest hung round the neg. If a statesmen agrees to concessions or preferential treatment, he does so only when he is convinced that this brings some advantage to his state directly or indirectly. For instance, America's approval of China as a Most Favoured Nation signifies America's interest to catch the potential market. So this favourable treatment of China, secured not only trade openings but also friendship. When China was admitted in the United Nations through United States endeavour, it showed a greater political cum economical interest. Co-operation, conflict, war, competition, rapprochement and all take place keeping in mind the interest of the nation at a given situation.

The crux of the concept as advanced in the post-war years was that in a world in which states are "the major units of political life, which command the supreme loyalty and affection of great mass of individuals." Statesmen who are responsible for and to their separate publics, and who operate in an uncertain and threatening milieu, have little choice but to put the interests of their own entity above those of others or those of the international system. National interest, thus became a synonym for national egoism. One could not rely on others, nor could one rely on international institutions and processes to protect one's key values. See what happened in the inter-war period, despite international institutions, such as- international law, international organisation and international trade, had been set up to reduce the harshness of "realpolitik", but had culminated in a disastrous World War II. International

institutions are invariably controlled by powerful countries. Even these international institutions are acted upon to meet the national interest of those powerful and influential countries. The values and interests of a country is national in scope and the protection is necessary which can be done only by that country.

Components of National Interest:

In describing the national interests that nations seek to secure a two-fold classification is generally made:

(A) Necessary or Vital Components:

According to Morgenthau, the vital components of the national interests that a foreign policy seeks to secure are survival or identity. He sub-divides identity into three parts: Physical identity. Political identity and Cultural identity.

Physical identity includes territorial identity. Political identity means politico- economic system and Cultural identity stands for historical values that are upheld by a nation as part of its cultural heritage. These are called vital components because these are essential for the survival of the nation and can be easily identified and examined. A nation even decides to go to war for securing or protecting her vital interests.

A nation always formulates its foreign policy decisions with a view to secure and strengthens its security. The attempts to secure international peace and security, that nations are currently making, are being made because today the security of each state stands inseparably linked up with international peace and security. Security is, thus, a vital component of national interest. Each nation always tries to secure its vital interests even by means of war.

(B) Non-vital or Variable Components of National Interest:

The non-vital components are those parts of national interest which are determined either by circumstances or by the necessity of securing the vital components. These are determined by a host of factors—the decision-makers, public opinion, party politics, sectional or group interests and political and moral folkways.

These objectives have been listed by V.V. Dyke and his list includes: Prosperity, Peace, Ideology, Justice, Prestige, Aggrandisement and Power. Though each state defines these objectives in a manner which suits its interests in changing circumstances, yet these

objectives can be described as common to almost all states. Thus, national interest which a nation seeks to secure can be generally categorized into these two parts.

Classification of National Interests:

In order to be more precise in examining the interest which a nation seeks to secure, Thomas W. Robinson presents a six fold classification of interests which nations try to secure.

1. The Primary Interests:

These are those interests in respect of which no nation can compromise. It includes the preservation of physical, political and cultural identity against possible encroachments by other states. A state has to defend these at all costs.

2. Secondary Interests:

These are less important than the primary interests. Secondary Interests are quite vital for the existence of the state. This includes the protection of the citizens abroad and ensuring of diplomatic immunities for the diplomatic staff.

3. Permanent Interests:

These refer to the relatively constant long-term interests of the state. These are subject to very slow changes. The US interest to preserve its spheres of influence and to maintain freedom of navigation in all the oceans is the examples of such interests.

4. Variable Interests:

Such interests are those interests of a nation which are considered vital for national good in a given set of circumstances. In this sense these can diverge from both primary and permanent interests. The variable interests are largely determined by "the cross currents of personalities, public opinion, sectional interests, partisan politics and political and moral folkways."

5. The General Interests:

General interests of a nation refer to those positive conditions which apply to a large number of nations or in several specified fields such as economic, trade, diplomatic relations etc. To maintain international peace is a general interest of all the nations. Similar is the case of disarmament and arms control.

6. Specific Interests:

These are the logical outgrowths of the general interests and these are defined in terms of time and space. To secure the economic rights of the Third World countries through the securing of a New International Economic Order is a specific interest of India and other developing countries.

Methods for the Securing of National Interest:

To secure the goals and objectives of her national interest is the paramount right and duty of every nation. Nations are always at work to secure their national interests and in doing so they adopt a number of methods.

The following are the five popular methods or instruments which are usually employed by a nation for securing her national interests in international relations:

1. Diplomacy as a Means of National Interests:

Diplomacy is a universally accepted means for securing national interests. It is through diplomacy that the foreign policy of a nation travels to other nations. It seeks to secure the goals of national interests. Diplomats establish contacts with the decision-makers and diplomats of other nations and conduct negotiations for achieving the desired goals and objectives of national interests of their nation.

The art of diplomacy involves the presentation of the goals and objectives of national interest in such a way as can persuade others to accept these as just and rightful demands of the nation. Diplomats use persuasion and threats, rewards and threats of denial of rewards as the means for exercising power and securing goals of national interest as defined by foreign policy of their nation.

Diplomatic negotiations constitute the most effective means of conflict-resolution and for reconciling the divergent interests of the state. Through mutual give and take, accommodation and reconciliation, diplomacy tries to secure the desired goals and objectives of national interest.

As an instrument of securing national interest, diplomacy is a universally recognized and most frequently used means. Morgenthau regards diplomacy as the most primary means. However, all the objectives and goals of national interest cannot be secured through diplomacy.

2. Propaganda:

The second important method for securing national interest is propaganda. Propaganda is the art of salesmanship. It is the art of convincing others about the justness of the goals and objectives or ends which are desired to be secured. It consists of the attempt to impress upon nations the necessity of securing the goals which a nation wishes to achieve.

"Propaganda is a systematic attempt to affect the minds, emotions and actions of a given group for a specific public purpose." —Frankel

It is directly addressed to the people of other states and its aim is always to secure the self-interests—interests which are governed exclusively by the national interests of the propagandist.

The revolutionary development of the means of communications (Internet) in the recent times has increased the scope of propaganda as a means for securing support for goals of national interest.

3. Economic Means:

The rich and developed nations use economic aid and loans as the means for securing their interests in international relations. The existence of a very wide gap between the rich and poor countries provides a big opportunity to the rich nations for promoting their interests vis-a-vis the poor nations.

The dependence of the poor and lowly- developed nations upon the rich and developed nations for the import of industrial goods, technological know-how, foreign aid, armaments and for selling raw materials, has been responsible for strengthening the role of economic instruments of foreign policy. In this era of Globalisation conduct of international economic relation has emerged as a key means of national interests.

4. Alliances and Treaties:

Alliances and Treaties are concluded by two or more states for securing their common interests. This device is mostly used for securing identical and complementary interests. However, even conflictual interests may lead to alliances and treaties with like-minded states against the common rivals or opponents.

Alliances and treaties make it a legal obligation for the members of the alliances or signatories of the treaties to work for the promotion of agreed common interests. The alliances may be concluded for serving a particular specific interest or for securing a number of common interests. The nature of an alliance depends upon the nature of interest which is sought to be secured.

Accordingly, the alliances are either military or economic in nature. The need for securing the security of capitalist democratic states against the expanding 'communist menace' led to the creation of military alliances like NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS etc. Likewise, the need to meet the threat to socialism led to the conclusion of Warsaw Pact among the communist countries.

The need for the economic reconstruction of Europe after the Second World War led to the establishment of European Common Market (Now European Union) and several other economic agencies. The needs of Indian national interests in 1971 led to the conclusion of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation with the (erstwhile) Soviet Union. Alliances and Treaties are thus popular means for securing national interests.

5. Coercive Means:

The role of power in international relations is a recognized fact. It is an unwritten law of international intercourse that nations can use force for securing their national interests. International Law also recognizes coercive means short of war as the methods that can be used by states for fulfilling their desired goals and objectives. Intervention, Non-intercourse, embargoes, boycotts, reprisals, restoration, retaliation, severance of relations and pacific biocides are the popular coercive means which can be used by a nation to force others to accept a particular course of behaviour or to refrain from a course which is considered harmful by the nation using coercive means.

War and Aggression have been declared illegal means, yet these continue to be used by the states in actual course of international relations. Today, nations fully realize the importance of peaceful means of conflict-resolution like negotiations, and diplomacy as the ideal methods for promoting their national interests. Yet at the same time these continue to use coercive means, whenever they find it expedient and necessary. Military power is still regarded as a major part of national power and is often used by a nation for securing its desired goals and objectives.

The use of military power against international terrorism now stands universally accepted as a natural and just means for fighting the menace. Today world public opinion accepts the use of war and other forcible means for the elimination of international terrorism.

All these means are used by all the nations for securing their national interests. Nations have the right and duty to secure their national interests and they have the freedom to choose the requisite means for this purpose. They can use peaceful or coercive means as and when they may desire or deem essential.

However, in the interest of international peace, security and prosperity, nations are expected to refrain from using coercive means particular war and aggression. These are expected to depend upon peaceful means for the settlement of disputes and for securing their interests.

While formulating the goals and objectives of national interest, all the nations must make honest attempts to make these compatible with the international interests of Peace, Security environmental protection, protection of human rights and Sustainable Development.

Peaceful coexistence, peaceful conflict-resolution and purposeful mutual cooperation for development are the common and shared interests of all the nations. As such, along with the promotion of their national interests, the nations must try to protect and promote common interests in the larger interest of the whole international community.

All this makes it essential for every nation to formulate its foreign policy and to conduct its relations with other nations on the basis of its national interests, as interpreted and defined in harmony with the common interests of the humankind. The aim of foreign policy is to secure the defined goals of national interest by the use of the national power.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercise:

Q1. How do you think National Interest influences Foreign Policy? Elaborate.
Q2. Write an essay on collective security.
Q3. Write a detailed note on nuclear disarmament.

SUGGESTED READINGS:

1. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (Edited), The Globalization of World Politics, Fourth Edition, OUP, USA 2008

2. John Baylis, J.Wirtz, C.Gray, Strategy in Contemporary World, OUP, UK, 2010

3. John W. Young and John Kent, International Relations since 1945 A Global History, OUP, USA, 2004

4. Joshua S. Goldstein, International Relations, 8/e, Pearson Education 2008 Politics among Nations authored by Hans, J. Morgenthau

5. Mahendra Kumar, Theoretical Aspects of International Politics, Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala, 1967

6. Paul R.Viotti and Mark V.Kauppi, International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity, 3/e, Pearson Education 2007

7. Peu Ghosh, International Relations, PHI Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2010

CHAPTER-4

WORLD IN 20th CENTURY

LEARNING OUTCOME: After going through this lesson, students will be able to-

- **Learn the Causes and consequences of First World War**

- **Know about the Causes and consequences Second World War**

- **Understand the Phases and Impact of Cold War and the Post-Cold War Era**

4.1 FIRST WORLD WAR: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

The first world war, was the outcome of a chain of events taking place in Europe, as well as in other parts of the world during the last two or three decades of the nineteenth century. You will find out in these pages that it was not merely a war but an event which made a tremendous impact on the world scene. It dismantled quite a number of the existing socio-economic and political structures.

Causes of the First World War

The causes of the First World War are so complex that any attempt to describe them adequately would involve nothing less than the writing of the diplomatic history of Europe since 1870. In fact, we may have to go back to 1789 or even to the age of Louis XIV. The causes of this war are to be sought in the conjunction of various forces and tendencies which had been operating for a long time among the nations of Europe. However, let us look into some of the important factors which led to the first world war.

The System of Secret Alliances: The most significant cause of the war was the system of secret alliances. This was, as a matter of fact, the handiwork of Bismarck, who tried to build a network of such alliances against Germany's enemies after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. This moves slowly divided Europe into rival armed camps which confronted each other. The system of alliances, as you can guess, helped on some occasions in preserving peace, in as much as the members within one group often held their friends or allies in restraint from provoking war. But it also made it inevitable that if a war did come, it would involve all the great powers of Europe.

From 187 1 to 1890 Bismarck was the arbiter of European politics. As the Chancellor of the new German Empire, he wanted peace and declared that Germany was a "satiated" country. He knew that war, which had brought to Germany power and international prominence, would, if risked again, bring her only destruction. Bismarck thus stood for the maintenance of status quo and the preservation of the new Balance of Power which he had created by his system of alliances. He knew that France was Germany's irreconcilable enemy, particularly after the ignominy of 1870. So, Bismarck's diplomatic skill and political insight were employed in building up alliances for the protection of Germany. The enemy of Germany was France, and Bismarck's achievement was the diplomatic isolation of the country. In pursuit of this policy, Germany entered into an alliance with Aushia in 1879 with a commitment of reciprocal protection in case Russia should attack either Power. Three years later in 1882, Bismarck fomented the Franco-Italian rivalry over Tunis and persuaded Italy to forget her hereditary enmity towards Austria. A secret Triple Alliance was forged in 1882 between Germany, Italy and Austria, explicitly defensive, in part against France, in part against Russia.

France, rendered powerless since the Franco-Prussian War, looked upon this formidable alliance with grave concern. So long as Bismarck was at the helm, he maintained the system of Balance of Power which he had completed by his Re-Insurance Treaty with Russia in 1887. The nightmare of isolation haunted France. But after Bismarck ceased to be German Chancellor in 1890, his successors abandoned his skilful diplomacy. Some bitterness arose between Russia and Germany at the Berlin Congress over the settlement of the Eastern Question. France took advantage of this situation and proceeding cautiously, was successful in forming an alliance with Russia in 1891. Thus, was formed the Dual Alliance which ended the period of isolation of France and served as a counterweight to the Triple Alliance. The abandonment of Bismarckian diplomacy by Germany led to some rethinking in the British diplomatic circles. The German Emperor did not believe that Germany was a "satiated Power" and called for an ambitious policy of a World Empire. He also declared that the future of Germany lay upon the sea. This change in German policy was alarming enough for England and forced her to come out of the state of "splendid Isolation". It drew Britain closer to the Dual Alliance. In 1904, she made an agreement of Entente Cordiale with France resolving all mutual differences. This was followed by a similar agreement with Russia in 1907. Thus France, Russia and England formed a separate political group called Triple Entente. As the Triple Alliance confronted the Triple Entente, the condition of Europe became

one of "armed peace". The continental powers of Europe, though at peace with the another, kept a jealous watch upon their neighbours and so atmosphere of fear and suspicion prevailed in Europe.

There being apprehensions about the coming catastrophe, all the Powers busied themselves with making feverish military preparations. This was the result of the split of Europe into two rival camps.

This division of Europe into two rival armed camp has to be seen in the context of growth and expansion of Imperialism when European countries, seized with lust for trade and territories, were acquiring new colonies and contending against each other. Naturally to make a mark in international politics by their material strength, it was necessary to build up militarily and politically.

Militarism: Militarism was actually closely connected with the system of secret alliances and was the second important cause of the war. This system of maintaining large armies actually began with the French during the Revolution and was later continued under Nepoleon. It was extended and efficiently developed by Bismarck during the unification of Germany. After the Franco-Prussian war in 1870 the military and naval armaments of all the Great powers tended to grow larger and larger. This armed race was quickened generally in the name of self-defence. It created fear and suspicion among the nations. If one of the countries raised the strength of its army, built strategic railways, its fearful neighbours were immediately frightened into doing likewise. So, the mad race in armaments went on in a vicious circle, particularly after the Balkan wars of 1912-13. Anglo-German Naval rivalry was one of the contributory causes of the war.

Militarism meant also the existence of a large body of military and naval personnel, who were psychologically tuned to the "inevitability" of an early war. To these professionals' war held out the prospect of quick promotion and great distinction. It should not imply that they urged war for selfish motives and personal advancement. Nevertheless, the opportunity to put into practice the results of their preparation for war could not possibly have failed to produce its psychological effect.

Nationalism: Another very important cause of the war was the wave of nationalism which swept all over Europe. It was actually one of the heritages of the French revolution. The resounding triumph of nationalism in Italy and Germany invested it with new vigour and made it a potent force in politics. The unifications of Italy and Germany were possible mainly

because Cavour and Bismarck were successful in arousing the spirit of nationalism. In the process it inflamed the racial pride of the people, stimulated them to exalt their country above all others, and made them arrogant in their attitude towards their neighbours. It was the excessive fervour of nationalism that intensified the rivalries of states like Germany and Great Britain and shifted them to engage on a spirited naval and military competition. It was aggressive nationalism that led the European powers to squabble over their interests in Asia, Africa and the Balkans. It was the outraged nationalism of the French people that kept alive their spirit of revenge for the loss of Alsace and Lorraine and made France the bitterest enemy of Germany. From 1866 onwards relations between France and Germany remained tense. Napoleon III, had behind him an aggrieved national opinion which nursed bitter jealousies against Prussia's strength. The delirium of nationalistic upsurge, manifested in the outbreak of Franco-Prussian war in 1870, opened a new era of popular excitement in international relations. There was also a cry of *Itali alrredenta* (unredeemed Italy) which was- the expression of the national ambition of Italy to wrest from Austria the Italian- speaking districts and the Trentino which made Italy look to Germany for support.

There were issues of nationalities along the western fringes of the tsarist Empire. Poles and Ukrainians, Lithuanians and Finns continued to exert a strong centrifugal pull on the Empire after 1870. The Russian policy towards these nationalities was of intense Russification' especially under Alexander III between 1881 and 1894. It had the effect of turning the most extreme patriots of these national groups towards the Russian Social Revolutionaries, who soon established links all over the region. These local movements represented the spirit of radical nationalism which was in ascendancy during this period.

Lastly, the unassuaged national aspirations of the Balkan peoples made the Balkan Peninsula a veritable tinder box which before long set all Europe ablaze. As a matter of fact, the' exuberant spirit of nationalism was at the back of most of the occurrences that gravitated towards the war.

Urge to Imperialism: Imperialism for our purpose refers to the purpose of Capitalistic Accumulation on a world scale in the ear of Monopoly Capitalism. It led to the increase in the production goods which forced the countries to look for new markets and new sources of raw material. It resulted in an increase in population, part of which was interested in emigrating to the still unoccupied regions of the world.

The industrial revolution also resulted in the increase in surplus capital which sought investment abroad, thus leading to economic exploitation and political competition. Due to these developments, the Great Powers began to partition Africa among themselves, to secure territory of exclusive spheres of influence in China, and to build railroads in Turkey and elsewhere. This struggle for markets, raw materials and colonies became a great passion during the 19th and early 20th centuries because Germany and Italy also entered the race during the last two or three decades of the 19th century. By 1914, all the Great European Powers had secured something or the other in Africa. In the matter of railway construction, which was one of the most important forms of economic imperialism because it involved political as well as economic interests, one finds the English building railways from the Cape to Cairo, the Russians the Trans-Siberian railway, and the Germans the Baghdad railway. The first one came into conflict with the German, French and Belgian interests, the second was partly responsible for Russo-Japanese war and the third caused endless friction between Germany and Triple Entente.

It was normally the economic interests compelled with political aims which made a country imperialistic. There was no compulsion to acquire colonies unless some active and influential group of political leaders wanted to push this policy. Britain did not embark upon the acquisition of colonies during the 1860s or even during the 1870s and after, though the economic urges of surplus population, exports and capital had been there for a long time. Neither Italy nor Russia had a surplus of manufactures of capital to export, yet both joined in the scramble. Germany, which was industrially much ahead of France, was slower in embarking on colonialism largely because of Bismarck's anti-colonial policy-he wanted Germany to be supreme in Europe only. It was actually a group of men, particularly intellectuals, economists and patriotic publicists and politicians who largely encouraged the, growth of imperialistic tendencies by their propaganda and policies.

Besides the direct political motives of imperialism, there was a medley of other considerations, which, in varying proportions, acted as an incitement to the desire for colonies. One was the activities of explorers and adventurers who were prompted by a genuine interest in scientific discoveries or a flair for adventure or love for money, and power. Christian missionaries played their part too in the spread of colonialism. The most famous was David Livingstone who was sent to Africa by the London Missionary Society. Almost all the European powers joined in this missionary activity all over Africa and Asia.

Other premier Christian Missionaries who opened up in large measure Africa were Charles Gordon, Sir John Kirk and Lord Lugard.

Newspapers, Press and the Public Opinion: Another underlying cause of the Great War was the poisoning of public opinion by the ' newspapers in almost all the European countries. The newspapers were often inclined to inflame nationalistic feelings by distorting and misrepresenting the situation in foreign countries. On several occasions when peaceful solution of the complex international problems could be possible the jingoistic tone of the newspapers in the countries involved in the conflict spoiled matters. The popular press went very far sometimes to produce results in national and international politics. As early as 1870 the publishing of the Ems telegram by Bismarck immediately inflamed and embittered the extreme nationalist opinion in Paris and precipitated the Franco-Prussian War. This shows the incalculable harm the press could do in creating tension in European politics.

The Immediate Cause: The Austrian Habsburg Empire had to reckon with the challenge of surging nationalism since 1900. It was difficult to keep in check the multi-national Empire, especially when political and military leadership in Vienna lay in the hands of people like Count Berchtold and Conrad. They saw in Serbia another Piedmont or another Prussia and were reminded of the ignominious defeats their country had suffered in 1859 & 1866 at the hands of Cavour and Bismarck in the process of Italian and German unifications. By 1914, there had emerged a comparable movement for national unification of all Slav people under the leadership of Serbia. It was a small country of just five million people but had the energy and drive to make itself the nucleus of a future Yugoslavia.

Serbia was not only the sorest thorn in Habsburg flesh, and an impediment to Pan-German designs, she was also the spearhead of Entente influence in the Balkans. In fact, she could serve as a useful wedge in the German-Austrian-Turkish combination. The crisis caused by Sarajevo therefore, did not remain a quarrel between Austria and Serbia but took the form of a trial of strength between the two grand alliances.

The incident which led to war was the murder of the heir to the Habsburg throne by a fanatic whose connection with the Serbian government could not be established. The Arch duke Franz Ferdinand and his wife, visited Bosnian, capital of Sarajevo on 28th June 1914 and was murdered by the Austrian Sero, Gavrilo Princip. Vienna regarded the murder by Serbia as a provocation for war. Austria made demands which were bound to be rejected by Serbia. So, Vienna declared war on 28th July. The bonds of the alliance held firm, and the two-armed

camps clashed at last. Sir Edward Grey, the British foreign secretary commented, "the lamps are going out all over Europe, we shall not see them lit again in our lifetime."

Consequences of the First World War

There had been wars in Europe before, involving many states. This one, however, was a general conflict between highly organised states that had at their command all the resources of modem technology and were well-equipped to find new methods of destruction and defence. It was the first war to dislocate the entire international economy which had taken the whole of the 19th century to grow and take that shape. It was fought with determination and desperation by the belligerents because they believed that it was a war for survival and for high ideals; it was fought on land, and above land, on sea and under the sea. New resources of economic and even psychological warfare were tapped because it was a war of the masses. It was a war between the peoples and not merely by armies and navies. It soon reached a point where military or civilian leaders found it most difficult to keep under check its future course of development. Obviously, any such conflict was bound to have far-reaching consequences. We shall look at some of them here.

Loss of Human Lives: During the war considerable destruction was done in terms of men and material. Millions of lives were lost. Russia was the heaviest loser with a toll of 2 million, Germany of nearly 2 million, France along with her colonies lost over one and a quarter million, Austria nearly one and a quarter million and the British Empire nearly 1 million. The U.S.A. lost around 1 lakh men. Some ten million men lost their lives and most of these were under forty years. More than twice that number were injured and almost maimed forever. The French calculations brought out that between 1914 and 1917 one Frenchman was killed every minute. This was certainly an unprecedented rate of casualties in any European warfare. This massive loss of human life definitely affected the structure of population both in sex and in age groups. The loss of life among women was much lower. Thus, in Great Britain in 1911 there were 1067 females to every 1000 males, 1921 the ratio changed to 1093 to every 1000 males. This disequilibrium led to many social complexities and other related problems in the society.

Social and Economic Changes: The war, in all the countries, had the effect of accelerating the emancipation of women wherever the movement had started before 1914. Women over 30 were granted parliamentary vote in Britain in 1918. It happened because the war required a national effort and in modem warfare civilian morale and industrial production had become

as important as fighting by the armed forces themselves. Women participated in all activities and worked on factories, shops, offices and voluntary services, hospitals and schools. They worked hand in hand with men and so won their claim of equality with them. It became easier now for them to find work in industry and business, as traditional impediments were removed. Even the barriers of class and wealth were weakened to quite a great extent by the "fellowship of the trenches". Social ethics changed quite significantly and the 'war profiteers' became a special subject of scorn and hatred.

As compared to the previous European wars, the cost of war was certainly astronomical. During the 20 years' war with Napoleon, Great Britain's debt had increased eightfold, while during four years between 1914 and 1918, it went up twelvefold. It was estimated that the total loss inflicted on warring nations was about 186 billion dollars. When this huge money was siphoned off into destructive channels, human welfare, whether in education, health or other facilities, inevitably suffered. The whole fabric of prewar civilization flow of world trade, was violently disrupted. This economic dislocation actually proved to be the most intractable result of the war. The war had undermined the foundations of Europe's industrial supremacy and after a gap of four years, when Europe began to lick its wounds and resumed its trade, it found that it was lagging far behind other counties. The U.S.A. made considerable progress in its exports, and in South America and India, new home industries cave up and developed. Japan entered the textile trade and flooded the Chinese, Indian and South American markets with its goods. The pattern of international trade was completely changed. When the European leaders gave a call for restoration of normalcy which meant going back to the world of 1913, they failed to realize that a modem war is also a revolution and the world of 1913 was as much as part of history now as the Habsburg and Romanoff Empires. It has been pointed out, that all the economic slogans of the post-war years, strangely enough, began with the prefix *Re*: reconstruction, recovery, reparations, retrenchment, repayment of war debts, restoration of the gold standard etc.

In the post war period, the triumphant nationalism in the Balkans proved violently intolerant of any settlement falling short of a balanced national economy. Nations with infant industries wanted to protect them and old industrial powers like Britain and others felt that it was necessary to safeguard their shattered economies against the competition of new rivals.

France was helped to recover economically by the restoration of Alsace and Lorraine and by the cession of Sear Coal mines for 15 years. But there were certain other economic problems

which could not be solved through mere reparations from Germany. Belgium, for example had her vital railway system disjointed by the demolition of its 2400 miles of track, and only 80 locomotives remained in the country at the end of the war. Of her 51 steel mills, more than half were destroyed and others seriously damaged. This was actually true of all other countries. The initial stages of recovery were really a sad story because $ involved finding work for the demobilized soldiers, homes for the people, and reconverting of industry to peacetime productions.

Democratic Ideals: Despite all its devastating consequences the war brought democratic ideals and institutions to peoples who had not been acquainted with them before. The war had been declared 'to make the world safe for democracy'. So obviously, the newly independent states were keen to set up democratic institutions. In one country after another, new democratic constitutions were adopted. Germany herself gave a lead by setting up a Weimar Republic, one of the most completely democratic paper constitutions ever written. It was modelled on the American, French, British and Swiss democracies. But the bane of the new democracy was that it was superimposed upon a social order that had changed surprisingly little. The only common sentiment which bound the people was the universal national resentment against their defeat and the terms of peace imposed on them by the Allies. The new regime could not last long because it had no constructive ability to run its administration on democratic lines.

Similarly in other European states the democratic institutions where ever set up, remained fragile because pf their patch-work structure. For a short while after the end of the war democracy came into vogue throughout Europe. The war provided impetus to democratic forces all over the world. It was soon discovered that western political institutions of parliamentary government were implanted in counties that had little or no experience in any sort of self-government. Nationalistic passions that had been aroused to a fever pitch by the war were responsible for the experiments but the social and economic life was still much less advanced than in the West and this proved to be the proverbial stumbling block. Even in the colonial empires of European powers the urge for self-government and freedom got a stimulus.

The Conference of Paris, 1919: The Conference of 1919 was a more representative body than the Congress of Vienna in 1815 had been. There were no crowned heads now and most of the countries were represented by their Premiers and foreign ministers. The only

exceptions were President Woodrow Wilson and King Albert. In all, thirty-two states were represented. The time, place, composition, organization and procedure of the conference all had some impact upon what it was able to achieve.

As far as time is concerned, it was held nine weeks after the signing of the armistice with Germany and was mainly timed according to the internal political consideration in the U.S.A. and Great Britain. President Wilson decided to attend in person and so the conference was delayed till he delivered his 'State of the Union' message to the Congress in December. In Britain also Lloyd George wanted the elections before the conference, which were held in mid-December. At the height of victory slogans like 'Hang the Kaiser,' 'Make Germany Pay' and 'Home fit for Heroes' were raised. The election results drastically changed the composition of the House of commons because 'hard-faced men who looked as if they had done well out of the war' entered the Parliament. The timing of the elections, being what it was, this should have hardly been surprising.

The venue of the conference was also a well-planned decision. Initially Geneva was suggested but President Wilson preferred Paris where American forces were stationed in large numbers. It could also have been symbolic because the first German Empire had been declared in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles in 187 1. Besides, Premier George Clemenceau, who was the senior most leader in the conference and was thus to preside over the deliberations of the Conference remembered Sedan well when France had been defeated after the Franco-Prussian war and the choice of Paris was to be an answer to that defeat.

The composition of the conference was even more important. It was represented not only by 'the Allies' but also by the 'Associated Powers'. Toward the end of the war many countries entered war mainly to be a party to the final settlement. The three major omissions were: the neutral powers; the Russians, who were still engaged in civil war and the war of intervention; and the former enemies, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey. The absence of these powers was significant in view of the developments in future. The absence of Germany in particular gave peace in Europe in the form of Diktat, an imposed arrangement for which the Germans felt no responsibility or respect. This was to prove as one of the basic weaknesses in the settlement.

The conference of Paris was certainly the biggest peace conference ever held anywhere in the world, despite its limitations. There were 32 official delegations which covered 314 of the world's population. But, as the war itself was a war of great powers, here too, over-all control

was exercised by a council of ten. This body comprised 2 members each of the 'Big Five' including U.S.A., Britain, France, Italy and Japan. Japan soon lost interest and stayed away and by the close of April 1919, Italy also left. Ultimately the famous 'Big Three' ran the entire show. These 'Big Three' as you must be aware, were represented by President Wilson of USA, Premier Clemenceau of France and Prime Minister Lloyd George of Britain. As pointed out earlier, the conference was finally a compromise between the two conflicting personalities of Wilson and Clemenceau. Wilson was an idealist, committed to the principles of democracy and the covenant of the League of Nations. Clemenceau, on the other hand, was an old-fashioned realist obsessed with hatred for Germany for whom French security was a matter of prime concern.

The conference, therefore, turned out to be a conflict between the impulses of idealism and of realism. Besides this, we cannot ignore the conflicts of impulses which raged within the hearts of all nations and of most statesmen. The conference was, like the minds of men in 1919, haunted by a tension between hopes and ideals on the one hand and vindictiveness and vengeance on the other which were natural reactions of people who had undergone oppression and whose latest experiences reflected hatred and fear. You can yourself imagine, why a conference with this background could not achieve any tangible results. It was harsh where it could well be lenient and weak when it was better to be strong. In the words of historian David Thomson "the Paris Conference must stand in history as a conspicuous failure; but it was an over-all failure of human intelligence and wisdom, and in part of a failure of organisation and method. This was not due to either an excess of realism or a lack of idealism, but rather to a misapplication of both."

The New Balance of Power: The Great War was not merely a war but a revolution in all walks of life. Lie socio-economic and political dislocation of tremendous magnitude, there was also a problem of temporary redistribution of the balance of power in the world. As a consequence of this war, there was a military and political collapse of the old Russian, Austro-Hungarian; German and Turkish empires. The pre-war German and Austrian dominance, for a time, came to an end. The supreme task before the peacemakers was to see that Germany is kept in check and also, weakened militarily.

Another problem was to redraw the map of eastern and central Europe in the light of newly emerging realities of national grouping, economic viability and military security.

To weaken Germany several measures were taken. German forces were asked to evacuate all the occupied territories. Alsace and Lorraine were restored to France. Germany was not to fortify the left bank of the Rhine. Her army was reduced to 100,000 men. She was prevented from arms production. Similar stringent measures were taken on naval and colonial matters. German navy was not to exceed six battleships of 10,000 tons, twelve destroyers and twelve torpedo boats. No submarines were allowed. Germany had to give up all her rights over colonies. German empire was distributed under the mandate to the allied powers on the basis of the existing pattern of occupation. Later, the League of Nations was assigned the task of monitoring the administration of these mandated territories.

The second important problem, as you were told earlier, was the reshaping of Eastern Europe. The 'Eastern Question' had been an intractable issue before the Western European powers for a long time and the Great war further aggravated it. The old Austrian empire was forced to cede most of its territories to Italy and other newly emerging nations in Eastern Europe. Hungary, the other half of the Habsburg Empire, received even harsher treatment. Serbia was the chief beneficiary which was transformed into the new southern Slav kingdom of Yugoslavia.

Turkey itself went through an internal political upheaval as a consequence of defeats in the war. Mustapha Kemal led a nationalist upsurge against the treaty of Serves, which was held between Turkey and the allied powers. Due to this pressure, a new treaty of Lausanne was signed in 1923. Kemal gave up all claims over the Arab majority areas and renounced the Islamic basis of the Turkish State. A new Turkish Republic was established under Mustapha Kemal's presidentship.

This resettlement of Eastern Europe, you can imagine, created nearly as many problems as it solved. It created a number of middle-sized powers such as Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia. It led to the growth of Arab nationalism and Zionist hopes of a Jewish national home in Palestine, which created complications which still creates international tension. The settlement also introduced a new problem of minority rights and its preservation.

The whole settlement of Eastern Europe was actually made in the light of fear of the spread of Bolshevism into Europe. In the words of Historian David Thomson: "There was a strong inclination to make the eastern states, from Finland down to Poland and Rumania, as large and strong as possible in order to serve as a cordon sanitaire, a quarantine zone to keep back the tide of communism".

The New International machinery: The League of Nations was a world organisation contrived to replace the old system of 'power politics.' It was a machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes and arbitration which replaced the old methods of secret diplomacy and separate alliances and quest for a balance of power. You are aware of the peculiarities of the international situation in Europe in 1914. It has been described as 'international anarchy' but it was actually semi-anarchy where the colonial and dynastic and national disputes threw the whole of Europe into terrifying ordeal of war.

The scheme of the League of Nations was sponsored with great fervour by President Wilson. This was eventually modified to conform with British and French proposals. The league, in one way, was an elaborate revival of the idea of a Concert of Europe into an international concert. In another light it was something new and different as here each participant swore to settle any mutual dispute through peaceful means and to share the responsibility in the event of aggression.

The league was not at all a government but was a sort of facility to be used by all governments to maintain peace. We find that it was a very well-meaning and sensible body but could be successful only its certain assumptions about the post war world proved correct. The major assumption was that all governments would want peace, a reasonable one due to the revulsion against slaughter and destruction. This assumption sounded more reasonable because there was growth of democratic states which were supposed to be more peace loving than the earlier autocracies and dynastic empires. However, as pointed out earlier these democratic constitutions proved fragile and interest in pursuing democrative ideals was short-lived. The hope that contented nationalism would move towards pacification also soon dispelled. So, in view of these believed assumptions, the League of Nations could not acquire the vitality and vigour of action which it required.

The failure of USA to become a member of the League and exclusion of Germany and Russia made it a mere buttress of the settlement. Japan was also lukewarm in its response. Only the British Commonwealth, France and Italy were its members. Italy soon defied it through its aggressive policy under the Fascist leader Mussolini.

The League failed in its supreme task of preserving peace. However, it did succeed in solving some minor disputes. Wherever the states sincerely submitted disputes to the procedure of conciliation, it worked well. It successfully settled the dispute between Sweden and Finland over the Aaland Islands. On three occasions the league successfully intervened in the

disturbed Balkan area. The league also settled the Iraq and Turkey border issue. As pointed out earlier, the League did not have an effective machinery to enforce its decisions and so failed to maintain peace where the Big Powers were involved. Two important subordinate bodies of the league were the International Court of Justice and the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The former was supposed to deal with disputes between the states and the latter with labour problems. Both these bodies form an important part of the structure of the United Nations today.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises:

Q1. What are the causes of First World War? Explain in detail.

Q2. Discuss the consequences of First World War in detail.

4.2 SECOND WORLD WAR: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

World War II began in 1939 with German aggression on Poland on 1st September. Earlier, two erstwhile enemies namely Germany and the Soviet Union had signed a non-aggression pact making way for Polish partition between two of them. All efforts to reach an understanding between the Soviet Union on the one hand and Britain and France on the other hand proved fruitless. International Relations were still characterized by the same evil practices that had led to the outbreak of the First World War – aggression for territorial expansion and secret pacts among European great powers. In fact, secret negotiations were being simultaneously carried on between the Soviet Union and Germany and between Britain and Germany. Britain and France took the Soviet Union for granted and did not bother to conclude a military alliance with the latter. This paved the way for Soviet German non-aggression pact and the German attack on Poland.

A few months before the outbreak of World War II, both Britain and France had given guarantees to Poland assuring that in case of aggression on it, they would provide her with all possible assistance. When all attempts to avoid war and protecting Poland had failed, Britain and France declared war on Germany on September 3, 1939. Italy remained neutral in the war for some time but finally joined the war on the side of Germany in June 1940. After Germany had won decisive victories against several countries in Europe, it waged a war against the Soviet Union also on June 22, 1941. This brought USSR into the Allied Camp. With the Japanese bombardment of Pearl Harbour on December 7, 1941, the United States finally entered the war. The war was fought between the Allies (Britain, France, Soviet Union, USA and their friends) on the one side and the Axis Powers (Germany, Italy and Japan) on the other. The War ended in the unconditional surrender of Italy, Germany and Japan in that order.

Causes and Outbreak of Second World War

We have read about World War II that broke out in September 1939 after the German attack on Poland, and consequent declaration of war by Britain and France against Germany. This gives the impression that the war was caused by the Polish dispute. This is partly true. Polish problem was indeed the immediate cause of the war, but many other reasons created the situation in which war became unavoidable. Let us briefly discuss all the distant as well as immediate causes of the War.

Treaty of Versailles: An attempt was made in Paris Peace Conference, held after the First World War, in 1919 to establish an ideal world order based on justice, peace and disarmament. But what finally emerged in the shape of Treaty of Versailles was a dictated treaty of peace imposed upon Germany. The victorious participants lacked sincerity of purpose.

The Paris Peace Conference lasted five months and was dominated by the 'four big' victorious powers (Britain, France, Italy and the US). None of the defeated powers were part of the peace process. Even smaller countries who had fought on the side of Allies were left out. Normal courtesies expected by the representatives of a sovereign country were not extended to Germany. The Treaty of Peace was drafted by Allies without any negotiations with defeated Germany. On May 7, 1919, Germany was given the draft treaty for its suggestion to be given in writing within three weeks. The announcement of terms of the treaty resulted in a fierce outburst of resentment in Germany. Germany denied that it alone was responsible for the war. Germany raised many objections and suggested modifications but, except for one modification, all the objections were brushed aside. Finally, Germany was made to sign the Treaty of Versailles on June 28, 1919. Germans called it a "diktat", and could not bear this insult and humiliation. The Allies also signed separate treaties with Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary and Turkey. The formal peacemaking process wasn't concluded until the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne in July 1923.

Treaty of Versailles was a punishing treaty imposed on Germany (i) Article 231 held Germany guilty of war crimes. (ii) It was forced to give up territory to Belgium, Czechoslovakia and Poland, return Alsace and Lorraine to France and cede all of its overseas colonies in China, Pacific and Africa to the Allied nations. (iii) Germany was asked to drastically reduce its armed forces, and not to have its air force. It was made to accept the demilitarization and Allied occupation of the region around the Rhine River. (iv) The Versailles Treaty redrew the borders of Europe. It created an increasingly unstable collection of smaller nations by carving up the former Austro-Hungarian Empire into states like Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Of the Ottoman Empire, only the Turkish heartland was left intact; its remaining European peripheries were undone and Middle Eastern provinces were carved as European 'Mandate' under the League of Nations. European powers still practiced balance of powers; now keeping a balance of power became more unstable with so many small states. (v) Germany was asked to pay several billion in

reparations for causing "civilian damages". The total reparations: "About 269 bn gold marks, to be exact – the equivalent of around 100,000 tons of gold".

France and Britain were largely responsible for the punitive treaty and the unstable peace that ensued in Europe. France had wanted to disarm Germany, clip its military capability, humiliate it, and take revenge for all its past defeats at the hands of Germany. War had given Britain an opportunity to dominate Europe and remake it. It did not want to lose its domination over Europe; and looked at the US and President Wilson's 14-Point programme with suspicion.

British economist John Maynard Keynes had found that Germany could not possibly pay so much in reparations without severe risks to the entire European economy. US President Herbert Hoover blamed reparations for causing the Great Depression of 1929. Many realized that Germany could not pay all the reparations. The 1924 Dawes Plan and the 1929 Young Plan reduced the debt to 112 billion gold marks; Germany was granted loans to meet its payment schedule. The 1929 world depression sent all European economies into a long tailspin. The US then proposed a one-year moratorium on German payments. Germany had paid only about one-eighth of what it owed when Hitler came to power and refused to pay any more of the reparations. The act of defiance greatly appealed to the nationalist pride of Germans. The European Allied powers, however, won't give up. After the Second World War, Germany was divided into states – the capitalist Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the socialist German Democratic Republic (GDR). Who was the successor state that would now pay the reparations? The 1953 London Treaty agreed to suspend the payment of reparations till the two Germanys united. The question of debt recovery arose in 1990 with German reunification. It was then agreed that in the altered international circumstances, payment of reparations should be written off once and for all. However, it was only in 2010 that Germany made the final payment of 70 million Euros to pay the interest on loans it had taken to pay the reparations.

The Treaty of Versailles mutilated and humiliated Germany. Twenty years later, it was the turn of Germany to take revenge. Hitler had come on the Centre stage, led his proud people to avenge their humiliation and thus paved the way for the Second World War.

Failure of Collective Security System: Collective security system was a noteworthy ideal the world leaders had pledged at the end of the First World War. Providing security collectively to the victim of international aggression was its aim. The Covenant of the

League of Nations provided that in case of aggression, members of the League, by their collective action, would compel the aggressor to withdraw. This collective action could either be in the form of economic sanctions against the aggressor, or military support to the victim of aggression or both.

During the inter-war years, it was, however, proved that the League was an ineffective organization in respect of a big power if the latter decided to wage a war against, or annexe, a small country. In 1931, Japan committed aggression against China and by early 1932, managed to conquer Manchuria – a province of China. Japan very cleverly kept on telling the League that her action in Manchuria was in self-defense i.e. (protecting life and property of Japanese in Manchuria, and only a police action not aggression). Japan, a permanent member of the League, forged ahead to establish a puppet Manchukuo regime in Manchuria. When the League asked member-nations not to recognize Manchukuo, Japan left the League but retained control on the conquered territory.

Later, in 1935 Italy waged a war against Abyssinia and in May 1936 formally annexed that country into Italian Empire. The League tried to enforce collective security system, declared Italy an aggressor and clamped economic sanctions. All this was of no avail as no military action was taken against Italy who was also a big power and permanent member of the League Council. Similarly, no action was taken by a weak League of Nations against Germany. When she repudiated the military clauses of the Versailles Treaty (1935) and the freely negotiated Locarno pact, remilitarized Rhineland (1936), annexed Austria (1938) and dismembered Czechoslovakia (1938-39). Thus, failure of the collective security system turned out to be a major cause of World War II.

Failure of Disarmament: It was agreed at the Paris Peace Conference that world peace could be ensured only if nations reduced their armaments to a point consistent with their domestic safety or defense. That means all the weapons of offensive nature were to be destroyed. The task of preparing a plan for the reduction of armaments was entrusted to the League of Nations. The League appointed temporary Mixed Commission in 1920 which however could not do any substantial work because France insisted on security before this disarmament. In 1925 Preparatory Commission was instituted. Due to divergent views of nations that mattered, it could not identify offensive weapons. Finally, without much preparatory work, a Disarmament Conference met at Geneva in February 1932. Once against mutual distrust and suspicion led to the failure of the Conference, after protracted negotiations.

Germany had been disarmed by the Treaty of Versailles. Victor nations were to disarm later. They, however, never really wanted to disarm. Therefore, in October 1933 Germany declared that she was leaving both the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations. Later in 1935 Germany formally declared that she was no more bound by the military or disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. Other countries were already in possession of large quantities of armaments and big armed forces. German decision heralded a massive armament race which led to an armed conflict. The failure of disarmament became yet another major cause of Second World War.

World Economic Crisis: World economic crisis began in 1929 with sudden stoppage of loans by the American financial houses to the European countries. Many of them, particularly Germany, were making rapid industrial progress mostly with the borrowed American money. The economic crisis had its severe impact during 1930-32. It adversely affected the economics of most countries either directly or indirectly. Germany proved to be the worst affected country where nearly 700,000 people were rendered jobless. It was forced to declare that it would not make any more payment of reparations. Out of the economic crisis of Germany emerged Nazi dictatorship of Adolf Hitler. He became Chancellor of Germany in 1933, but soon destroyed democracy and established his dictatorship. Meanwhile, even England had to take some harsh measures like abandoning the gold standard. Germany, Japan and Italy took advantage of this economic crisis and separately embarked upon aggressive designs. They set up their Fascist Bloc which became largely responsible for the Second World War.

Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis: On the eve of the First World War, Europe was divided into two hostile camps. The same process was once again repeated with the formation of an alliance of Germany, Japan and Italy. It was concluded through the Anti-Comintern pact during 1936-37. This combination of Fascist powers generally called the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis was aimed at imperialist expansion. They glorified war, and openly denounced peaceful settlement of disputes. They bullied Western countries and victimized weaker nations like China, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Albania and Poland. Their war-like acts and aggression though noticed, yet went unpunished. Alarmed at the conduct of Axis powers, England and France came closer to each other and an unsuccessful attempt was made at the formation and of an Anglo-French-Soviet Front. Although France and the Soviet Union had an alliance, yet in their desire to appease Hitler, France and England ignored the Soviet Union and when Stalin wanted a military pact between three non-Fascist powers, they took it easy. The Soviet Union became

suspicious and surprised the world by signing the non-aggression pact with Germany. This directly cleared the way for the German attack on Poland which led to the outbreak of the Second World War. While the Soviet Union also invaded Poland, England and France declared war on Germany.

The Problem of National Minorities: Peace settlement after the First World War had resulted in the formation of new nation-states in Europe, with large national minorities left behind uncared for. President Woodrow Wilson of the United States had advocated the principle of self-determination. But on account of various strategic considerations, this principle was never properly implemented. Thus, for example, large German minorities found themselves in the company of non-Germans in Poland and Czechoslovakia. There were Russian minorities in Poland and Rumania; and even after the Minority Treaties were concluded after the Paris conference, about 750,000 Germans were under foreign rule. Hitler exploited the situation and in the name of denial of rights to German minorities in Czechoslovakia and Poland prepared to attack these countries. He annexed Austria, destroyed and dismembered Czechoslovakia and finally invaded Poland. Thus, the problem of minorities became an important issue and major excuse for the war.

Appeasement by Britain and France: Foreign policy based on appeasement of Nazi-Fascist dictators turned out to be a major cause of the Second World War. After the First World War, there appeared a rift in the policies of Britain and France. Balance of power had always been the cornerstone of the British foreign policy. Britain feared that a very powerful France would disturb the balance of power in Europe. Hence, it helped Germany against France in the inter-war years. Once Hitler came to power in Germany and Italy became an ally of the Nazi dictator, Britain quickly moved closer to France who badly needed British assistance against a very hostile Germany. After 1933, France's foreign policy virtually became an extension of British foreign policy. Britain was worried about the growing influence of Communism. Not only the Soviet Union had to be effectively challenged, but the so-called popular fronts in France and Spain had also to be destroyed. With this objective in view, Britain adopted the policy of appeasement towards Hitler and Mussolini. France soon followed suit. Appeasement was started by Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin but vigorously pursued by Neville Chamberlain in 1938. Anglo-French desire to help Mussolini during the Abyssinian War, while maintaining support for League efforts, their virtual surrender to Hitler at the Munich Conference, and their inability to protect weaker nations like Austria and Albania were clear evidence of Anglo-French weakness and this prepared the ground for the War.

German Attack on Poland: The apparent and immediate cause of the war was the German attack on Poland on September 1, 1939. Earlier, when all attempts at an Anglo-French alliance with the Soviet Union had failed, Hitler entered a non-aggression pact with Stalin. This was most unexpected, as, for several years, only hatred had existed between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Now, keen to partition off Poland between themselves, Germany and the Soviet Union signed the pact not to wage war against each other. Yet, as events turned out, the pact was called by its critics as "simple aggression pact against Poland". In a secret pact, which emerged only in 1945, the two countries had resolved to divide Eastern Europe into their spheres on September 1, 1939, England and France had already assured Poland of their help in case of an invasion. They kept their word and declared war on Germany. While Germany invaded Poland in the west, Soviet troops moved into Poland from the east on September 17-18, 1939. Poland was divided between Germany and the Soviet Union by the Soviet-German Frontier and Friendship Treaty of 28 September 1939. Meanwhile, many other countries have also declared war on Germany, though these were symbolic declarations as even France and Britain were still busy preparing for war, while Poland was being destroyed.

Beginning of the War: Poland, as we have seen above, became the immediate cause of the War. On March 23, 1939 German troops had quietly occupied Memel (a German city under Lithuanian sovereignty) after Hitler had asked Lithuania to surrender it. On the same day, German Foreign Minister Ribbentrop called Polish Ambassador and dictated to him terms that Germany would like to impose upon Poland. He demanded that Danzig (which had already been Nazified) should be returned to Germany, and an east-west highway and rail-link across the Polish Corridor may be allowed so that East Prussia could be directly linked with Germany. This virtually meant a corridor across a corridor. Hitler, however, was calculating repeat of another Munich mistake by Britain which did not take place. Prime Minister Chamberlain announced unequivocally British guarantees to Poland. Later, when Italy invaded and annexed Albania (7th April), Britain gave similar guarantees to Greece and Rumania. France followed Britain in announcing conscription. Hitler retaliated on the next day and repudiated the Polish-German non-aggression pact of 1934 and Anglo-German Naval Treaty of 1935.

The Anti-Comintern Pact was signed by Germany and Japan in November 1936 and, a year later, Italy too joined. Thus, the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis represented three countries determination to liquidate world communism was formed. It was, in fact, an alliance against

the Soviet Union. By August 1939 Hitler was prepared to settle the Polish issue on his terms; however, he was on the lookout for a plausible pretext. He got the arms of (an otherwise determined) Britain diplomatically twisted when Hitler agreed to have direct negotiations with Poland on Danzig issue. Hitler asked Britain, through its Ambassador in Berlin on August 29, 1939, to arrange a Polish delegation, to reach Berlin the next day, fully empowered to negotiate and conclude an agreement with the Germans. This was the most unusual demand. Normally, international negotiations take a lot of time to begin. In any case, formal proposals are first sent through diplomatic means before inviting foreign delegation, who could not arrive on August 30. Germany closed all doors for negotiation. This gave Hitler the much-awaited pretext for the planned invasion of Poland. The war broke out early in the morning of September 1, 1939, when German troops invaded Poland. England and France declared war on Germany on September 3, 1939. On 18 September the Soviet Union also invaded Poland, but neither Italy nor the United States entered the war for some time. Meanwhile, England and other allies were already in a war, yet attempts were still on for some solution. But Germany was determined for a full-fledged war.

USA and USSR become Allies: When the war began, Germany and Italy were political allies, but Soviet-German non-aggression pact disappointed Mussolini. Italy did not enter the war till June 1940. Then, as France was on the verge of defeat and surrender, Italy joined the war on the side of Germany against France and the Allies. The Soviet Union did not join the war but was helping Germany by invading Poland. She later attacked Finland and was expelled from the membership of League of Nations. Stalin continued to trust Hitler until the Nazi dictator had defeated most European neighbours and attacked the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941. Meanwhile, Stalin had coerced three Baltic nations - Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia - to join the Soviet Union as its Union Republics. They lost their independence as Stalin told their leaders that if they refused to join USSR, they would be ruined by Germany.

The Soviet Union had also dictated terms to Rumania and recovered Bessarabia and Bukovina from it. Thus, by mid-1941 Soviet Union was busy collecting war gains without being in the war. Hitler had secured French surrender in June 1940. But Hitler was not so lucky where Spain was concerned. General Franco kept his country out of the war. Since it was being fought by Hitler in association with Stalin, Spain remained neutral throughout the war.

Public opinion in the United States was overwhelmingly opposed to being drawn into the war. In 1937, the US Congress had passed the Neutrality Act which also prohibited the sale of armaments in a future war. When the war broke out and Germany started bombing and destroying western democracies, Americans began weakening their neutrality stance. Cash and Carry Act was passed in November 1939, permitting countries at war to buy American weapons provided they paid cash and carried them in their ships. When the war reached a crucial stage, the Lend-Lease Act was passed in March 1941. It allowed the President to sell, exchange, end the lease or otherwise dispose off any defense article. Thus, the US began supplying armaments to friendly countries such as Britain and China. Three months later when Soviet Union was attacked by Germany, she was also covered by the Lend-Lease Act.

The Soviet-German non-aggression pact signed in 1939 had been designed by Hitler to keep the Soviet Union in the dark about his actual intentions. As soon as Germany had defeated her enemies on the European continent, it began preparing for the invasion of the Soviet Union itself. But Stalin remained convinced that Hitler would not attack the Soviet Union. Everyone had warned Stalin of Nazi attack—Churchill, American Embassy and Stalin's men in Tokyo. But Stalin refused to listen till 22 June 1941 when Germany launched the attack on the Soviet Union. Stalin was stunned at this and the Soviet Union sought Allied assistance. Britain accepted the Soviet Union into the Allied camp. In July, London and Moscow signed a military pact.

When the Soviet Union was facing a devastating war, the United States was forced to enter the war in December 1941, when Japan attacked its naval base in Pearl Harbour. American relations with Japan were never cordial. Japanese assets in America were already frozen. In August 1941 the United States had announced that any Japanese action against Thailand would cause her grave concern. Unsuccessful attempts were made for a meeting between US President Roosevelt and Japanese Prime Minister Kono in September. In October, Kono resigned and General Tojo became the Prime Minister of Japan. He openly encouraged conflict. In November, Britain had promised to declare war on Japan if the United States became involved in a war with that country. Tension was building up rapidly and war appeared imminent. On 6 December 1941 President Roosevelt made a personal request to the Japanese Emperor for help in maintaining peace. Instead, on December 7, 1941, Japan bombarded American Naval fleet based at Pearl Harbour (Hawaii Islands). A few hours later, Japan declared war "on the United States of America and the British Empire". On December 11, both Germany and Italy declared war on the United States. The war thus became global.

Consequences of the Second World War

New Superpowers: World War II brought about changes in the status of countries and continents. Britain and France lost their positions of pre-eminence as superpowers and yielded place to the USA and the USSR.

Start of Decolonisation: After the War, Britain and France were confronted with various domestic and external problems. Both of them could no longer hold onto their respective colonies. Thus, the post-war world witnessed the end of colonialism in Africa and Asia.

Birth of UN: One of the momentous results of the War was the birth of the United Nations. Although the League of Nations failed to deliver, mankind did not altogether lose its hope of making the world a safer and happier place to live in. The UN Charter enshrines the hopes and ideals of mankind on the basis of which countries can work together to maintain lasting peace. However, the establishment of the UN was agreed much before the end of the Second World War under the Atlantic Charter.

Start of Cold War: After the end of the war, a conference was held in Potsdam, Germany, to set up peace treaties. The countries that fought with Hitler lost territory and had to pay reparations to the Allies. Germany and its capital Berlin were divided into four parts. The zones were to be controlled by Great Britain, the United States, France and the Soviet Union. The three western Allies and the Soviet Union disagreed on many things and as time went on Germany was divided into two separate countries: East Germany, which had a Communist government and West Germany, which was a democratic state. This laid the foundation of the Cold War.

New Economic Order: Bretton Woods Conference, formally United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, meeting at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire (July 1–22, 1944), during World War II to make financial arrangements for the postwar world after the expected defeat of Germany and Japan. It drew up a project for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD-now known as World Bank) to make long-term capital available to states urgently needing such foreign aid, and a project for the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to finance short-term imbalances in international payments in order to stabilize exchange rates. Also, the US dollar was established as a reserve currency for the world trade.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises:

Q1. Discuss the causes of outbreak of Second World War in detail.

Q2. What are the major consequences of Second World War? Explain in detail.

4.3 COLD WAR: ORIGIN, CAUSES AND IMPACT

The Cold War was more than a rivalry between two superpowers. The period of this war, that is the years between 1945 and 1990, also contained a history of international politics of a different kind. The Cold War period saw the evolution of a world order where diplomacy and negotiation in their various forms were established. It added a very different dimension to military build-up – arms race, military blocs, proxy wars etc. The simultaneity of the existence of the United Nations is perhaps a very important dimension to the evolution of the Cold War as the world did not witness another world war. It is said that today's contemporary world is poles apart and very dynamic from what it was before 1945. How this dynamism did come to our world? To appreciate that dynamism, this Unit brings to you a brief summary of the significant events that unfolded in different phases between 1945 and 1990.

Meaning of Cold War

Isn't it perplexing to say that a certain war was described as 'Cold'? War is always 'hot' fought with weapons by armies to gain some designated strategic goals. But it being 'Cold' is something that calls for some thinking and explanation. What we know is that the Cold War continued for more than four decades between 1945 and 1990. The War touched the entire world, actually divided several countries and also prompted them to join hands with others to form political and military blocs. A feature of Cold War was thus bloc politics two blocs, led by the two super powers viz. United States of America and the erstwhile Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR, or Soviet Union).

In the process, tens of millions of people suffered in very different ways, including violent death, persecution and disappearance. Economic development was disrupted and in cases denied resulting in the misery and hunger for millions of poor people in different parts of the world. Millions suffered and hundreds of thousands were killed in 'communist' and 'anti-communist' rebellions, uprisings, repression, civil wars and interventions throughout Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean besides East Europe, Balkans and other parts of the world. Despite having these sufferings on record, interestingly, we continue to call this 45-year war as the Cold War! And interestingly, not once American and Soviet armies fought face to face in a battlefield. All this definitely calls for little thinking on the dimensions of its meaning. When one refers to this war as the Cold War, the aim is to convey that it was fought under an ideological cover. The war saw intense competition between two mutually hostile political ideologies and worldviews. These were 'capitalism' and 'socialism'. Both these

terms have wide ranging expressions of two different variants of socio-economic, political and cultural organizations. In plain terms, therefore, capitalism stood up for liberal democracy and free market economy whereas socialism sought to champion state ownership, workers' rights and egalitarian system. The United States provided leadership to the capitalist world and the Soviet Union.

This intense ideological competitiveness gave rise to bloc rivalry. Bloc rivalry was a signpost of the 45-year Cold War. When the Soviets, for example, initiated the Molotov Plan in 1947 for its Eastern European allies to aid them and rebuild their ailing economies, the Americans responded with the multi-billion-dollar Marshall Plan (or, the European Recovery Programme) in 1948 for the post World War II sick economies of the Western Europe. The Marshall Plan was in force only for four years, the Molotov Plan remained till the last breath of the USSR with a new name since 1949 known as the Council for Mutual Economic Assistant (COMECON). Similarly, when the American side of the war founded an intergovernmental military alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949, the Soviet side had rivaled them with signing the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (the Warsaw Pact) in 1955. These ideological underpinnings and bloc rivalry impressed the observers of the war to qualify it as 'Cold' as it did not involve direct military confrontations between the warring camps. This has led many to characterize the Cold War as 'nonmilitary' conflict. More nuanced meanings, however, of the Cold War sits between its ideological cover and the so-called non-military conflict. Some described Cold War a collection of 'low-intensity' conflicts. Of course, the two sides fought several 'proxy' wars in Africa, Asia and Latin America – which was yet another feature of the Cold War.

Origin of the Cold War

There are two main explanations for the origin of the Cold War. These two can simply be termed as (i) geopolitical and (ii) ideological.

Geopolitical: Some historians trace the origins of the Cold War to the Soviet socialist revolution of 1917 and the European military intervention in Russia in 1918 to scuttle the first socialist state in the world. Other scholars see the origins of the Cold War to the military pacts and their violations between the European great powers immediately prior to and in the course of the Second World War. But the Cold War is widely believed to have begun in 1945; this was the time when the Soviets and the Americans had started seeing themselves as two most powerful nations in the West. This perception was at the core that also nurtured the

expansionist aspirations that were believed as incompatible among the Soviets and the Americans in terms of their own power and capability. The view that understands the Cold War from the angle of power, capability, expansionist aspirations etc is called the 'geopolitical explanation' to the origin of the Cold War. This is also a post-World War II view to the origin of the Cold War. It assumes that at the end of the war in 1945, the United States and the Soviet Union were the only two superpowers along with important powers like the United Kingdom and France – which had militarily weakened. It is said that though the Americans and the Soviets had allied in the World War II to defeat the Axis Powers, there was lack of trust between the two. Moreover, both were aspiring to achieve dominance in Europe and their aspirations were matched by their power and capability.

Ideological: The 'geopolitical explanation', however, does not tell the reasons for the lack of trust between the United States and the Soviet Union. This gap is filled by the 'ideological explanation' that goes back to the Russian Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. The Bolshevik Revolution was inspired by communism – the ideology espoused by the 19th century philosopher, Karl Marx. Success of a workers' revolution in Russia under the leadership of the Vladimir Lenin was looked at with suspicion and hostility by the capitalist classes in Europe and the US. Foremost, the success of the socialist revolution sent a powerful and historically important message to the workers, peasantry and all other exploited classes and subjugated and colonized people. The message was: it is possible to overthrow capitalism and its attendant colonialism and imperialism and liberate the exploited and oppressed classes and people. Soviet revolution greatly inspired people in the colonies including in India; many began talking of liberating their nations from the colonial rule and establish an egalitarian socialist order. Likewise, Soviet revolution galvanized the workers in Europe especially in Germany, Britain, France and Italy where the communist and socialist parties became politically active and radical in anticipation of a worker's revolution. Communist and socialist parties were formed in the 1920s in several Latin America countries, and in the European colonies in Asia and Africa; for instance, Communist Party of India was formed in 1925 to organize the peasantry and the working class. The imperial powers of Europe and the US looked at this with great hostility. Secondly, the Soviet Revolution offered a different paradigm of looking at international system and building a new international system that would be based on the solidarity and cooperation among liberated peoples of the world. Russia was part of the Allied forces during the First World War but withdrew from the War after the Revolution and abandoned all secret military pacts and understandings for territorial

expansion which it had signed with Britain and other European powers. Promoting new norms of IR was not acceptable to great powers which were used to war, military alliances, spheres of influence and overseas colonies. As Soviet Union withdrew from the First World War, European imperial powers requested the US to military intervene in Russia. Russian revolution had aroused great enthusiasm and hope among colonial people. This was dangerous and unacceptable for colonial masters. American expeditionary forces and those of other Allied countries thus intervened in Soviet Union in 1918; the intervention lasted several years. An ideological justification was given for this Allied military intervention. It was said that the Bolshevik Revolution was antagonistic to the "values of freedom" that the Americans claimed their own and that the Russian Revolution was a danger to freedom and democracy everywhere. Socialism was dubbed as totalitarianism which negated democracy and human rights.

The ideological antagonism and political hostility remained with the post1945 superpowers and contributed to widen the lack of trust between the two. The 1946 'iron curtain' speech of former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and the Americans dropping the atom bomb on Japan increased the ideological rivalry between the two superpowers. The origin of the Cold War was pre-1945 in the ideological sense and thus its vestiges are thought to remain in the post-1990 world. Speaking in the US, and joined in by the American President Harry Truman, Churchill declared: "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent." Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech is considered one of the opening shots in the Cold War. Churchill also spoke of "communist fifth columns" that, he said, were operating throughout western and southern Europe. He talked of the threat of communism to the European colonies in Asia and Africa which were fighting for their freedom and emancipation. Finally, Churchill asked the US to lead the free world against the threat posed by communism to the world. The die was cast. US, led the West, determined for half a century to 'contain' and 'roll-back' communism from the entire world; and this determination became the essence of Cold War-related interventions and wars.

Causes of the Cold War

Various causes are responsible for the outbreak of the Cold War.

- At first, the difference between Soviet Russia and USA led to the Cold War. The United States of America could not tolerate the Communist ideology of Soviet Russia.

On the other hand, Russia could not accept the dominance of United States of America upon the other European Countries.

- Secondly, the Race of Armament between the two super powers served another cause for the Cold War. After the Second World War, Soviet Russia had increased its military strength which was a threat to the Western Countries. So, America started to manufacture the Atom bomb, Hydrogen bomb and other deadly weapons. The other European Countries also participated in this race. So, the whole world was divided into two power blocs and paved the way for the Cold War.

- Thirdly, the Ideological Difference was another cause for the Cold War. When Soviet Russia spread Communism, at that time America propagated Capitalism. This propaganda ultimately accelerated the Cold War.

- Fourthly, Russian Declaration made another cause for the Cold War. Soviet Russia highlighted Communism in mass-media and encouraged the labour revolution. On the other hand, America helped the Capitalists against the Communism. So, it helped to the growth of Cold War.

- Fifthly, the Nuclear Programme of America was responsible for another cause for the Cold War. After the bombardment of America on Hiroshima and Nagasaki Soviet Russia got afraid for her existence. So, it also followed the same path to combat America. This led to the growth of Cold War.

- Lastly, the Enforcement of Veto by Soviet Russia against the western countries made them to hate Russia. When the western countries put forth any view in the Security Council of the UNO, Soviet Russia immediately opposed it through veto. So western countries became annoyed in Soviet Russia which gave birth to the Cold War.

Phases of Cold War

The Cold War did not occur in a day. It passed through several phases. After the Second World War, from 1945 to 1991, the indirect rivalry between the US and Soviet Union like the military coalitions, espionage, arms buildups, economic aid and proxy wars, to dominate the world, can be divided into 7 phases for the broader understanding of how these countries carried out different propagandas by time to destroy each other. Thus, the Cold War is divided into the following 7 phases to make it easier for readers to understand it in the easiest possible way.

1st Phase (1946-1949): At the conclusion of the Second World War, the Soviet Union formed Eastern bloc by occupying the Eastern European countries like Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Eastern Germany and so on and afterwards, converted these countries into its satellite states by establishing communism and destroying democracy from 1946 to 1949.

On the contrary, in March 1947, President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, unveiled the policy of containment also called "Truman Doctrine" to provide political, military and economic assistance to all democratic nations under the threat of communism or to fight communism. As per this policy, the US allocated $400 million to Greece and Turkey to stop the infiltration of communism. Besides, the US declared "Marshall Plan" on 5th June 1947. It was an American initiative to reconstruct Europe, after the end of World War II. The United States provided around $12 billion in economic support to help rebuild European Countries to prevent the spread of communism.

Pakistan and India, the two important countries for the US and Soviet Union got independence in August 1947. Pakistan was not reluctant to support democracy against communism while India followed the policy of neutrality towards the two conflicting super powers.

Soviet's leaders looked upon the United States with Suspicion after these developments. The US also had a nuclear bomb and could easily defeat the USSR, but it was not in mood to start the third World War. The Cold war turned furious during this phase.

2nd Phase (1949-1953): The US established a military alliance with the European countries and Canada by signing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on 4th April 1949 to check the influence of communism. The treaty provided collective defence to its members in response to an attack from external party. The sole aim of the alliance was to prevent the further infiltration of the USSR in Europe.

In August 1949, the USSR tested its first nuclear bomb at Semipalatinsk and successfully balanced its power with the US and made the Cold War more complicated. In the same year, a new communist country, China, appeared on the map of the world, creating further

problems for the US. Washington did not recognize People's Republic of China. As a result, Beijing was drifted towards the Soviet's bloc as evident in its support for North Korea.

In the Korean War, which lasted from 1950 to 1953, the US jumped to support the democratic government of South Korea against the communist North Korea with the help of the United Nations. The war started when North Korea invaded South Korea with the help of China and the Soviet Union. After the participation of, particularly, the US, the communist regimes found it hard to occupy the entire Korea. As a result, the war ended in 1953 and resulted in the division of Korea into two states: North and South Korea.

3rd Phase (1953-1957): Two new US-sponsored treaties emerged in this phase namely South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), signed in September 1954 and Middle East Defence Organization (MEDO) in 1955 to prevent communism from gaining ground in these regions. Within a short span of time, America gave military assistance to 43 countries and formed 3300 military bases around the USSR.

Moscow, in the response to NATO and SEATO, concluded "Warsaw Pact" with the Eastern European countries on 14th May 1955. It was a collective defence treaty like NATO.

4th Phase (1957-1962): In 1960, the U-2 plane incident escalated the tensions between Washington and Moscow. The US flew U-2 spy planes from Peshawar airbase to collect intelligence information. In May 1, 1960, the Soviet Air Defence Forces shot down the plane and captured its pilot.

The Soviet Union constructed Berlin wall in 1961 to divide Eastern Germany from the Western Germany and effectively control the movement of immigrants. It was called the "Symbol of Cold War."

The Cuban Missile Crisis was witnessed in this phase. In response to the deployment of the missile in Turkey and Italy by the US in the proximity to the USSR, the Soviets, with the support of the Cuban premier, Fidel Castro, started to construct the missile launch facilities in Cuba, 140km away from Florida. The activities of missiles deployment were confirmed by the US when U-2 spy plane produced clear photos of the facilities.

President John F. Kennedy ordered naval blockade to prevent missiles from reaching Cuba. Afterwards, an agreement was signed, under which, the US agreed to not invade Cuba and to dismantle its missiles present in Turkey. The USSR, on the other hand, discontinued its missile program in Cuba. The Cuban missile crisis lasted 13 days from October 16-28, 1962.

5th Phase (1962-1969): In the wake up of "Cuban Missile Crisis", there was an urgent need to take measures to prevent the nuclear war between the two conflicting super powers. As a result, a "Hot Line" was established in 1963 between the US and USSR to facilitate the communication in emergency and prevent the nuclear war owing to miscalculation. The Hot Line was a direct communication facility to be used in emergency only.

To reduce nuclear weapons, the partial test ban treaty (PTBT) also called Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) was concluded in 1963. It is officially known as a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water except underground. The governments of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and the United States signed it in Moscow on August 5, 1963.

Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was also concluded in 1968 to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and its technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and to achieve the goal of nuclear disarmament. This phase is a period of nuclear cooperation.

6th Phase (1969-1978): This phase is marked as Détente meaning the easing of hostility between the United States and the Soviet Union. Richard Nixon became the president of the US in 1969 and he followed the friendly policy towards the USSR to put an end to the cold war. He was the first president to visit China after World War II. He also visited Soviet Union in 1972. His visit to the Soviet Union was a historical achievement because he signed Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty or SALT I with his Russian counterpart Brezhnev to limit the number of ballistic missiles each country could hold.

In 1970, the USSR signed treaty with West Germany and agreed to not use force against her. This greatly contributed in reduction of tensions in Europe. After Nixon's tenure ended, Jimmy Carter assumed the duties of presidency in the United States and continued the policy of Détente. His attempts were directed to negotiate further reduction in nuclear

missiles. Although Carter's efforts were honest, his attempts to put further limits on nuclear ammunition by signing SALT II in 1979 were hampered because the Congress refused to pass the SALT-II treaty. The basic reason cited for the rejection of SALT II by the Congress was the invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet Union in 1979.

7th Phase (1979-1991): This phase proved disastrous for the USSR and resulted in its dis-integration. The Détente ended in 1979 when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. President Zia of Pakistan offered to act as a conduit to support Afghan Mujahedeen by providing them weapons and training to fight the Soviets. The US, finally, agreed to the President Zia and sent containers full of weapons and bags full of dollars to defeat the Soviets with the help of the Afghan Mujahedeen and Pakistan.

Initially, the policy makers back in Washington did not believe that these rebels would defeat the Soviets. However, the result of war turned out to be surprising for them. According to CIA estimation, by 1983, the total war expenditure of the Soviets was 8 to 10 times higher than the total money US congress spent on Mujahidin. According to CIA director William Casey, who briefed president Reagan in 1984, Mujahedin had killed or wounded 17,000 Soviet soldiers and control 60 percent of the countryside. The war had cost the Soviet's government about $12 billion. This damage had been purchased by US taxpayers for $200 million plus another $200 million contributed by Saudi Arabia.

As a result, the Soviet Union decided to withdraw from Afghanistan in 1987. In 1991, it was dis-integrated owing to its economic bankruptcy caused by the Afghan's war. It lost all its satellite states and new Central Asian countries also got independence from the USSR. The cold war finally ended and the US became the unchallenged super-power of the world.

Thus, the phases of cold war started from 1949 and lasted till 1991 when the USSR was finally dis-integrated and gave up its rivalry with the US owing to its economic crisis caused by the Afghan's war. Some believe that the cold war ended in 1987 when the Soviet Union withdrew from Afghanistan, but it kept its support continue to Najibullah communist's governments of Kabul. It was in 1991 that Moscow gave up all its activities against Washington and hence, marks the proper termination of the Cold War.

Result of Cold War

The Cold War had far-reaching implications in the international affairs.

- At first, it gave rise to a fear psychosis which resulted in a mad race for the manufacture of more sophisticated armaments. Various alliances like NATO, SEATO, WARSAW PACT, CENTO, ANZUS etc. were formed only to increase world tension.

- Secondly, Cold War rendered the UNO ineffective because both super powers tried to oppose the actions proposed by the opponent. The Korean Crisis, Cuban Missile Crisis, Vietnam War etc. were the bright examples in this direction.

- Thirdly, due to the Cold War, a Third World was created. A large number of nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America decided to keep away from the military alliances of the two super powers. They liked to remain neutral. So, Non-Alignments Movement became the direct, outcome of the Cold War.

- Fourthly, Cold War was designed against mankind. The unnecessary expenditure in the armament production created a barrier against the progress of the world and adversely affected a country and prevented improvement in the living standards of the people.

- Fifthly, the principle 'Whole World as a Family', was shattered on the rock of frustration due to the Cold War. It divided the world into two groups which was not a healthy sign for mankind.

- Sixthly, The Cold War created an atmosphere of disbelief among the countries. They questioned among themselves how unsafe were they under Russia or America.

- Finally, The Cold War disturbed the World Peace. The alliances and counter-alliances created a disturbing atmosphere. It was a curse for the world. Though Russia and America, being super powers, came forward to solve the international crisis, yet they could not be able to establish a perpetual peace in the world.

War is a violent incident. Yet the Cold War, fought between the blocs led by the United States and the Soviet Union between 1945 and 1990 was called the Cold War because of its dimensions that included ideological cover, bloc rivalry, nonmilitary confrontation, arms

race, space race etc. The two sides fought many 'proxy' wars in different parts of the world through their allied regimes and political groups. Calling the Cold War, a collection of "low-intensity" conflicts seems to come closer to its real nature. Prevalence of those conflicts and their origin over a period of time are best explained from geopolitical and ideological viewpoints. There are three main identifiable phases of the Cold War. The period from 1945 to 1962 saw its beginning and then increasing hostilities. Thereafter, the Cuban Missile Crisis brought relaxation in the bipolar tensions. This relaxation was called détente and lasted from 1962 to mid-1970s. Defying the belief that the Cold War had ended; it was reawakened in late 1970s when the Soviet troops entered Afghanistan in support of a communist regime and the Americans had responded to it in a manner proverbial to the pre-détente rivalry. Reagan revived arms race as he sought to spend on Strategic Defence Initiative – the so-called 'star war' programme. The Cold War, however, ended in 1989 when the Soviets had pulled out their troops from Afghanistan and positive news started coming also from other parts of the world. The Soviet Union's policies of perestroika and glasnost were believed to be in the centre of changes in late 1980s. In no time the Soviet Union had disintegrated and the Cold War was declared dead.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Self Assessment Exercises:

Q1. What do you mean by Cold War in International Relations? Discuss the major factors of its origin.

Q2. Discuss the different phases of Cold War in detail.

Q3. Write an essay on the impacts of Cold War.

SUGGESTED READINGS:

1. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (Edited), The Globalization of World Politics, Fourth Edition, OUP, USA 2008

2. John Baylis, J.Wirtz, C.Gray, Strategy in Contemporary World, OUP, UK, 2010

3. John W. Young and John Kent, International Relations since 1945 A Global History, OUP, USA, 2004

4. Joshua S. Goldstein, International Relations, 8/e, Pearson Education 2008 Politics among Nations authored by Hans, J. Morgenthau

5. Mahendra Kumar, Theoretical Aspects of International Politics, Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala, 1967

6. Paul R.Viotti and Mark V.Kauppi, International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity, 3/e, Pearson Education 2007

7. Peu Ghosh, International Relations, PHI Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2010

Techno City, Khanapara, Kling Road, Baridua, 9th Mile,
Ri-Bhoi, Meghalaya-793101
Phone: 9508 444 000, Web : www.ustm.ac.in