



## **Department of Distance Education**

### **Punjabi University, Patiala**

---

**Class : B.A. III (Political Science)**  
**International Politics**  
**Medium : English**

---

**Semester : 6**  
**Unit : I**

#### ***Lesson No.***

- 1.1 : MEANING, NATURE AND SCOPE OF  
INTERNATIONAL POLITICS
- 1.2 : REALIST AND IDEALIST THEORY TO STUDY  
INTERNATIONAL POLITICS
- 1.3 : ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL POWER
- 1.4 : BALANCE OF POWER
- 1.5 : COLLECTIVE SECURITY

---

***Department website : [www.pbidde.org](http://www.pbidde.org)***

THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: ITS NATURE,  
DEVELOPMENT AND SCOPE

**Structure of the Lesson**

- 1.1.1 Objectives
- 1.1.2 Introduction
- 1.1.3 Beginning of the Study
- 1.1.4 International Politics (what it is?)
- 1.1.5 Definitions and Nature of International Politics
- 1.1.6 International Politics or International Relations
- 1.1.7 Development of the Field of Study
- 1.1.8 Content and Scope of Study
- 1.1.9 International Politics - Autonomous Discipline
- 1.1.10 Conclusion
- 1.1.11 Self Check Exercise
- 1.1.12 Suggested Readings

**1.1.1 Objectives:**

In this lesson we will discuss the following questions:

- A. What is International Politics?
- B. How Discipline of International Politics developed through various approaches.
- C. What is the content and scope of the study of International Politics.

**1.1.2 Introduction:**

The study of International Politics is primarily nation state oriented though there have been some shifts since 1990's. Yet nation states are the major actors and their activities in the relationship of the other countries is the main focus of study although laterly the non-state actors have also acquired significance like MNC's. Being the members of so-called world community, states seek to fulfil some of their interests through this realm of inter-state relations, which are unfulfilled otherwise by the domestic sources. The pursuance of these interests, when found incompatible, create the situation of conflict and sometime it leads to the occurrence of war. Naturally, the attention of serious minded people was drawn to the question as to why states and other such organized

political entities behave in this manner that leads to conflict and war.

### 1.1.3 Beginning of the Study

By the end of nineteenth century the experiences of frequent wars, on going conflicts and the inability of states to maintain peace and order due to variety of changes-systematic and structural, it was realized that states in themselves are no longer sufficient in meetings the challenges of time. It was then realized that due attention must be given to the realm outside the jurisdiction of their sovereignty that is through the relations with other countries. Moreover, during the period of nineteenth century states had experienced that their activities are being influenced by the forces of international politics. It was also realized that failure on their part to meet these developments would be catastrophic, because war as a happening could not be acceptable to the states. In these situations study of international politics had to acquire a shape and serious minded people had to be drawn to study this area of activity. Moreover, occurrence of wars at the beginning of the present century and rising clouds of tensions and conflicts culminating in the first world war, proved beyond doubt that the conditions, which made nineteenth century order possible, had finally broken down.

Naturally, new 'order' was to be built up realistically acknowledging the dominance of the realm of international politics. It acknowledged the existence of conflict in relationship of states and its potentialities for creating situation of wars. Any effort towards the maintenance of peace, minimization of conflict and avoidance of war, therefore, had to give pre-eminence to the phenomena of international politics rather than introvertly taking refuge under the classical state system. Since the experience had raised the status of Peace as a preferred value, the systematic study of international politics, had to make beginning.

Publication of *Paul Reinsch's book 'World Politics' (1900)* followed by the establishment of '*Carnegie Endowment of Peace (1910)* with the specific purpose "to hasten abolition of war", marks the beginning of the concern with the study of international Politics. It is since then the move for distinctiveness and separate status of International Politics as a field of academic enquiry have been initiated. The goal of the study of international politics was clearly indicated in the *Report of Carnegie Endowment of Peace (1914)*. It stated that "as a pre-requisite for riding the war, solid knowledge was required of the underlying forces which move nations, and for the development of their relations."

Thus it was natural as William Olson says, "discipline beginning with such noble purpose, the preservation of peace and the avoidance of war had to grow." It picked up accelerating tempo to cope up with the development. But these early students were not pacifists or reformers of propagandist variety. Rather their concern has been to acquire systematic knowledge of the behavior

of states in international politics so that the areas of conflict could be located and ways to resolve those conflicts could be suggested for the cause of maintenance of reasonable peace. Since peace has remained an elusive goal, there has been constant thinking, re-thinking and application of new approaches, suitable techniques and methodologies to analyse the data and predict the course of international politics in future.

Thus '**peace**' as dominating value of the study of international politics on the one hand the introduction of various approaches to study on the other led to the rapid development of the field of study since early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Today there is some degree of systematisation of the field of study as it has undergone through five distinct phases of development. Yet there seen to be some disagreement with regards to general nature and scope of the subject. For instance, *Prof. Quincy Wright* admits in the preface of his book published in 1955 that "there seems to be little doubt that international relations exist, yet there is some doubt on the point or at least in the sense in which it exists" Similar was the dilemma of Alfred Zimmern in 1935 when he said, international relations is a 'point of view' or a way of looking at things. Even in the last sixties and seventies the situation remained by and large same despite the existence of the army of the experts and number of scholarly writings. To quote William C. Olson:

"From quantitative point of view, not only the field has been defined, it has been redefined, it would be difficult to agree that this necessarily represents a progressive change, because scholar interests have gone in so many different directions, seeking so many different ends. Debates, great as well as petty, which have surfaced form time to time in our brief histoy as still going on, even though the subject matter of these debates has varied."

In such a situation, therefore, for a systematic beginning on needs to examine all such questions separately which helps to define its nature and scope, viz, what is international politics in terms of its focus of analysis; which have been various phases of its development in terms of its approaches, methods and subject matters and finally, does it qualify to be an independent discipline?"

#### **1.1.4 International Politics (What it is ?)**

International Politics, as the term itself suggests, is politics among the nations and other organized political entities. Term 'international' signifies the environment created by the interaction of these nations states and other such units where in the activity of politics takes due to this mutual interaction or relationship. Thus, international politics signifies essentially a political process taking place at a particular level in which nation states and other such units participate. The activity, however, has to be political in nature

To define politics one may accept that politics is a group phenomenon in which participants must not agree with each other on everything. The disagreement however, must not be total. For politics to exist, relationship must fall somewhere between complete agreement and complete disagreement. There must be both common and contradictory desires.

Some writers have tried to deflect the attention from the conflict perspective to cooperation aspects on the ground that the politics is an attempt towards conciliation of conflicting desires. But this myth has been forcefully exploded by Bertrand De Jouvenel by asserting that “conflict may become less acute at time but never it ceases to exist.” Political disputes are temporarily solved. Thus conflict is a most salient feature for identifying any activity as political. The effort of politics is generally towards the management of conflict.

Another important element identifying politics is the element of power or the capability required for influencing or controlling the behaviour of others. Thus power as element in politics essentially is a “means”. This contention that politics is a constant struggle for power<sup>1</sup>, is although debatable, yet there is a truth in the preposition that nations try to acquire power not only for wants and desires of the present but also for those of the future.

#### **1.1.5 Definitions and Nature of International Politics:**

Keeping these elements ‘conflict, power, coercion and influence etc.’ as the identifying elements of politics, international politics may be defined as below:

“As the interaction of state politics within the changing pattern of power relationship” (**Padelford Lincoln**)

“Those aspects of interaction and relations of independent political communities in which some of opposition, resistance and conflict of purpose or interest is present.” (**Sprout and Sprout**)

“International Politics is the study of rivalry among nations and conditions and institutions which ameliorate or exacerbate these relationship” (**Kenneth Thompson**).

“International Politics is a struggle for power, whatever the ultimate aim of International Politics power is always the immediate aim.....the aspiration of power being the distinguishing element of international politics. International Politics is of necessary power politics.”(**Hans.J. Morgenthau**)

The above given definitions suggest that international politics has been viewed in perspective of conflict and co-operation . It is precisely because that in international politics no centralised authority exists as in national

politics, which could provide order and judicial legitimacy. States are free to act as they wish which would be determined by their perceived interests.

Those writers who prefer to use the term international relations than International Politics for certain reasons, they also view the reality within "Conflict" and "Power" framework. For instance, Stanley Hoffman says, "The discipline of International relations is concerned with factors and activities which affect the external Politics and power of basic units into which the world is divide." Johan Burton despite certain disagreement with regard to the treatment of reality of International Politics he conceives of International as product of phenomenon of conflict among the states.

Despite such broad agreement on conflict as elements of politics more particularly to international politics, there are some who view politics as an activity of conciliation and consensus building. To Benard Crick politics consist of conciliation of multiple actual or potentially conflicting interest within boundaries of some definable unit, the State.

Such view of politics necessitating existence of political element would accept international politics as an extension of national political activity and not something that exist in its own right. It is because there is no normative ordering in international areas as there is no centralized authority. While these assumptions, which provide for this definition are themselves faulty, the obvious lacuna is found in its denial of existence of conflict that provides impetus for consensus building and conciliation. The resolution of conflict whether through violent or non-violent means (less than war) constitute political activity. That is why even the enlargement of area of cooperation among these nations which find no incompatibility of interests in their relationship is also political activity. These efforts to attain this level of relationship may be the advanced preparation for the avoidance of conflict in their future relationship. Therefore, Joseph Frankel while arguing for war and peace as two extremes of social interactions namely conflict and harmony, international politics should include both with regard to its nature of study, he does not deny the pre-eminence of conflict in the study of international politics. For these reasons one may conclude with Reynold " that conflict might be termed as organising concept for international politics, as well as national politics."

To sum up, international politics refer to the process by which conflicts arise and are resolved at international level. In this environment nation states try to serve their other interests, which are not met by the domestic milieu. Thus, the study of international politics is the study of conflicts, how they originate, how the parties of the conflict behave in an attempt to deal with conflict and how they are resolved. Its study also involves an examination of

political system context the constitutional and normative structure norms, within which the conflict takes place.

#### 1.1.6 International Politics or International Relations

A distinction between these two terms international politics and international relations must be made particularly because they are often used interchangeably. Moreover, those students studying the behaviour of nation and of other participants in this area need a clarification of this semantic confusion in order to have correct perspective to their subject. Such understanding alone would help to point as to whether the title actually responds to those various topics included in the syllabus.

One finds international relations has been widely accepted term all over the world and included generally all those topics which are now taught in our universities under the heading of international politics with some deletions and additions. The reasons for this state of affair has been to quote **Palmer and Perkins** "International politics would deal with the politics of international community in a rather narrow sense, concerning on diplomacy and relations among states and other political units whereas international relation is a term properly embracing the totality among the groups in world society."

The assumptions behind such view have been his understanding of international politics that " It describes official political relations between government acting on behalf of their states and that international politics is not conducted between and among the nations states." It is therefore, obvious as to why he preferred the title international relations.

According to **Palmer and Perkins**, international relations is considerably broader terms and refers to much wider variety of both public and private interaction at the international level which may not involve conflict. Entire range of communication, economic transaction, movement of people along with political and military relationship – formal and non-formal; constitute the broad array of activities include in international relations. The description should therefore, be broad enough, and should not be confined within the narrow focus of international politics.

While conceding to the appeal of the broadness of title it is needed to look at this question rather realistically as to how the terms international politics is replacing "relations". To quote Harry Hansom Rowe "At the core of the study of international relations is the Laswellian question of who gets what, when and how in the international arena. So field must be concerned with the interaction among the states revolving around the concept of "power" in its broader connotations. Mere existence of nation state may not require interaction unless there are some differences or expectations. For instance, interaction



between Paraguay and Luxemburg are non-existent. Why ? Relations or interactions being when there are economical and political compulsion. Such interactions being only when there are economic or political reasons and not simply because that the states exist.

Secondly, it is important to notice that all kinds of international relationship does not involve politics or conflict impinging on political relationship. Politics is involved only when there is some kind of conflict of interest between the participants. Politics involves the origin of conflict and attempt to resolve it. Decisions leading to conflict, open conflict in form of violence, as well as attempts to find substitute for violence, are all important elements which constitute international politics. International relations as an activity does not focus on this, rather it includes so many other things i.e. inter-state cultural relations, inter-state economic, technological cooperation of flow of mail and cargo etc., which could be peripheral importance although at time some of these issues may become important to International politics as the questions of nuclear technology between India and United States. In order to have a proper understanding of the forces and factors that shape the relationship of state and govern their behaviour vis-à-vis each other, the focus should be placed on political factor and not simply on relationship aspect. Thus, international politics is more relevant term than international relations, and in the context data of various kinds of relationship may prove to be relevant.

Relation aspect cannot overshadow the significance of international politics which has come to acquire its near autonomous existence today. It draws its sustenance primarily from the global forces operating in the environment of world politics i.e. cold war in fifties and early sixties, detente and North-South dialogue in sixties and seventies, question of the new international economic order and equal share in technology etc. International politics today seems to be more concerned with trends of neo-colonialism and hegemony etc. which are shaping the world than mere bilateral relations, or international relations. One can, therefore, conclude that international politics is more suitable title than international relations for it does not allow itself to be overshadowed by the peripheral details included in international relations and keeps its focus primarily on core issues of Politics operating among the nations or political issues which determine the shape of international system as for instance, the demise of erstwhile Soviet Union.

#### **1.1.7 Development of the field of study:**

The study of international politics, according to a survey conducted by Kenneth Thompson in late fifties, has undergone the four stages of development since the World War I. Although each of these stages have a definite thrust which determines as to what is relevant data for the study of this phenomenon



even through there has been a great deal of overlapping of these approaches which are essentially “classical in character provided a fertile ground for the experiment and testing of theoretical models, tools and techniques of other discipline so that the study of international politics could be made scientific in its description and prediction could be made possible.” Although the realisation of this objective is not possible in near future yet such concerns are found in the writings of sixties and seventies which is termed as the fifth phase of the development of study. It is also identified as scientific school in international politics. Apart from these, there is post-scientific phase of study which takes note of substance and method both.

The contemporary phase of study of international politics could be termed as the sixth phase of its development. It presents the effort towards the moderation of these two major streams classical and scientific school. It emphasizes the urgency for the study of substantive issue of world politics.

#### **1.1.7.1 Diplomatic Historical Approach**

The first phase of the development of study of international politics has been totally historical in character. With the help of usual tools and methodology of history a distinct shape to this subject was provided. Students engaged in study of the activity endeavoured to account and explain the present with the help of what had gone on before. It gave due recognition to international law and for relationship among the states.

The First book on this subject published in year 1900, Paul Reinch’s **“World Politics”** contains three major themes : Diplomatic History, International law and International economics. Its treatment of the subject is exclusively historical. It was generally assumed as admitted by James Bryce in the preface of his book “International Politics” (1922) that “History is the best indeed the only guide, to the comprehension of facts as they stand.” From historical viewpoint, this was glorious period of history of international politics. It was characterised by a high degree of accuracy and strict adherence to the principle of historical research and documentation.

It is true as emphasised by Headly Bull, that in order to know how international system undergoes transformation, the knowledge of history is necessary. International political events are located in time and to understand that “ We must know its place in temporal sequence of events what the antecedent situations were, out of which it grew. What the elements of continuity are that link it with what has gone on before and what the elements of charges are that mark it out as different.”

However, historical approach suffered from many defects such as partial application. Diplomatic history alone is not enough to provide perspective of international politics nor does it help to analyse the contemporary issues.

Secondly, it discarded recent events from its analysis as their factual accuracy was deemed doubtful. They refrained from formulating any generalisation on the basis of their study nor they upheld any universal principles. They simply acted as exhibitor of the process of history, it helped in collection of data from past records of history and made a modest beginning of the study of international politics.

#### **1.1.7.2 Current Events Approach**

Failure of diplomatic historians to provide answer to the problem of international society and the experience of first world war brought two new distinct approaches during the inter-war period (1919-1939). One of these approaches was the current event approach. These new students were primarily concerned, like others, to develop the understanding of the behaviour of states and thus to explain the problem of war and peace, conflict and cooperation. They assume that the study of current events would provide necessary understanding to assess the cause of conflict among the states. They emphasised upon the study of immediate present which was overlooked by the historical school. Moreover, these students could not wait for fifty years for the release of archival material for making analysis and evaluation of the events. There was a fervent desire to control the world politics in order to prevent future wars. Events prior to and after first world war as such had strengthened this approach.

The approach, however, suffered from various weakness similar to those of its predecessors. These writers pursued the study of the present without much, if any references to the past. No attempt was made to relate the present with to comparable problems that might have existed at particular time in the past. The result was the absence of any carefully conceived approach to analyse most relevant problem upon which war and peace might hinge. Thus to large extent, it was also partial approach to study international politics which bore no fruit whatever expect the compilation and exposition of recent events.

#### **1.1.7.3 Institutional and Normative approach (Idealist School)**

Another approach which became predominant during the war period was institutional approach. It is also known as organisational approach which helped the development of study of international politics. The failure of earlier approach brought forth a new set of scholars who devoted themselves to the study of this phenomenon with certain aspirations which could form the basis of the world. The vision of a better world or one better organised than the one floundered in 1914-1918, was the major aspiration of these scholars.

The dominance of this school has been so much that its critics gave the title "Idealist" to them, due to their concern to reform the world. The prominent

persons belonging to this stream of thought are Alfred Zimmermann, S.H. Bailey, Philip Noel Baker, David Mitrany of the United Kingdom and John Smuts, James Shotwell, Pitman Potter and Parker T. Moon of the United States. Drawing the sustenance from rationalist school of thought, they directed their efforts towards institutionalisation of international relations on the basis of law and organisation. They believed that if efforts are made and successful then perhaps peace as an ideal can be translated into reality.

Establishment of the "League of Nations" founded in 1919 provided the basis for this approach that the states by means of their politics and actions may resolve conflicts in their action. They ceaselessly downgraded the balance of power system. The distinctive character of these writers was their belief in progress. They believed that system of international relations which had given rise to the First World War was capable of being transformed into fundamentally more peaceful and just world order.

These writers inherited belief in the progress from the on going philosophical trends of nineteenth century. They believed that inter-state relations aspiring to achieve the order of durable peace can be sustained only by radical changes in the system of relationship itself.

For instance, Alfred Zimmermann's work, "**The League of Nations and the Rule of Law**" which is perhaps the representative work of this approach divided into three parts. Part first discusses "The Pre-War system" and suggest that "It can be a source of guidance for the maintenance of orders." The other parts dealing with future, stress that "possibilities of future are not limited by the test of previous experience but are deducible from the needs of the progress". Philip Noel Baker's treatment of the question of disarmament, Shotwell's analysis of war and David Davis contention for International Police Force follow similar approach.

Such concern of their's obviously places the idealist writers into the category of theorists. This sought as Headly Bull says "not only to present the history and recent development of international relations, but also to arise general question as to what they were, how they operated and how they might be influenced so as to better achieve the objective of peace and order.

Despite some of these points in their favour, the writers of this school suffered with certain fundamental weaknesses. Firstly, they became preoccupied with the efforts of discover the goals and the objective toward which international community should strive, and the forms and institutions which should evolve to realise these ends. Naturally it resulted in gradual disappearance of objectivity and rationality of the scholar and turned him into "An emotional and visionary reformer," "a special pleader for the certain of ideal world society." The result was obviously the total shift of focus from the realities

of international politics.

To quote **Hans Morgenthau** “The main theoretical concern during this period was not with understanding of international politics. Rather the student during this period were animated by the spirit of unbounded optimism and idealism. Academic interest was in the realm of international law and organization and there was tendency to draw a moral judgement in favour of international ventures at the expense of national experience.

#### **1.1.7.4 The Realist Approach**

Realist approach viewing international politics as conflict of national interest defined in terms of power, came as a reaction to utopianism. Publication of *E.H. Carr's book "Twenty Years Crisis - 1919-1939"* evaluated the trends of international relations and established the case for realistic analysis based on the concept of power. Publication of *George Schwargenberger's "Power Politics" (1941)*, *Martin Wright's "Power Politics" (1945)* *Hubert Butterfield "Christianity Diplomacy and War" (1953)*, in the United Kingdom and *Nicholas Spykman's "America's Strategy in World Politics" (1942)*, *Reinhold Niebhur's "The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness". Morgenthau's "Politics among the Nations" (1948)* and *George Kennan's "American Diplomacy"* in the United States, are some of the leading publications which established the realist tradition in international politics borrowing philosophical substance from Hobbes and Machiavelli.

The realist approach devoted itself to investigate, which are the elemental facts of activity of nations ? Which are the driving forces that lie at the back of foreign policy of all the states ? It reached to an agreement that powers as a concept is more satisfactory tool of analysis of all international politics. To quote Hans Morgenthau “the struggle for power is basic phenomenon of all societies and its social relations and international politics, which is one of the area of human activity is no exception to the rule. Various assumption propagated by the idealist i.e. the harmony of interest among the States, urge for cooperation, role of public opinion, role of morality etc. were demolished by the realist school. They stressed mutual rivalry and conflict of national interest, explained in terms of power as guiding factor of the behaviour of States in international politics. For instance, under realist influence the world organisation like United Nations were seen as “political organisation designed not as substitute of power politics but as appropriate mechanism within which the direct national rivalries are compromised through normal political process.

Naturally for a long period of time it remained the dominant theme of analysis and helped in systematisation of the field of study around the basic concepts of Nation state, National power, National interest and balance of power. No doubt post-realist school development indicated concern for greater

sophistication in their analysis but realist school represents an important point of theoretical understanding of international relations.

#### **1.1.7.5 Scientific Approach**

The fifth phase of the development, which coincides with behavioural revolution in political science, has been concerned with building up theories and models. This move towards theories building coincides with and also preceded the development of new concept and theories in other social sciences, including political science with under the impact of behaviour approach had come to accept the needs of such theories which can explain with a considerable degree of accuracy the pattern of behaviour of the political units and systems.

In political science, it changed the traditional or classical concern of political science and at the same time its methods of study. So international politics treated as a sub-field of political science; could not remain uninfluenced by these developments. Moreover, earlier approach i.e. power approach also started demonstrating its own inadequacies. The emergent nature of world politics of the post second world war era, the cold war, entry of new nations after decolonisation, new role of technology etc. also confirmed the inadequacy of traditional approaches and of the concept of power as the reliable tool of analysis, therefore, the writers started drawing from the tools and techniques of other disciplines. Prominent among these, that have contributed in shaping of the subject prominently are: Systems theory of *Mortan Kaplan*, Equilibrium theory of *George Liska*, Decisions Making theory of *Synder and Joseph Frankel*, theory of Games of *Osker Morgenstem*, Bargining theory of *Thoms C. Schelling* and theory of Social Communication of *Karl Deutch*.

Above mentioned scientific approaches are only a few which have received greater acceptability. Or else as Abdul Said says "Today prominent students of international relations theorist (and) there are as many theories as is the number of theorists". These so-called theories redefined the field of study and broadened and scope of the subject. These theories can be put into two broad categories on the ground of their general applicability (a) theories that cover the wide range of international politics i.e. system theory or general equilibrium theory (b) theories that attempt at using one particular concept supposedly strategic enough to allow the organisation of whole field around it, like decision making and communication theory etc. The second type of theories are known as partial and preferential theories due to the preference to analysis for a particular concept providing for the explanation of reality like study of decision by Synder and communication by Karl Deutsch.

The salient characteristics of these writers, have been in reality the urge for sophistication in analysis. As a result, methodologies and models were

borrowed from other disciplines and it made the study of international politics highly inter-disciplinary. Secondly the new set of writers did not belong necessarily to the field of History, International Law, Political Science. Philosophy as has been the case in the past. Rather they came forward from other disciplines including natural and biological sciences. For instance, Thomas Schelling and Kenneth Boulding came from Economics, Herman Kahn from Physics and Antol Rappoport from Biology, Albert Wholstetter from Mathematics.

Such development invited a serious rethinking of the study of international politics particularly by the traditionalists, who felt that the substance of politics is being totally ignored in favour of methodological concerns that thus study of losing the sight of its singular purpose that is to strengthen the foundations of peace by indicating the areas of conflict and disagreement. Thus ensuring debate known as scientific traditionalist debate helped to bring back to focus of study the relevant issue of politics pertaining to nations, yet it must be admitted that later set of writers even belonging to traditionalist stream of thought like Raymond Aron, Stanley Hoffman, Robert Tucker, Rosen and Reynold etc. are quite sensitive to the demands of methodological clarity in analysing international politics.

#### **1.1.7.6        Positivist Theory of International Politics**

With the introduction of scientific theories to the international politics, there was change too in the conventional theories. Realism was evolved in the form of neorealism in the late 1970s. Kenneth Waltz in his book 'Theory of International Politics-1979, revived realism with great strength. He maintained that national security, national sovereignty and national interest are still prominent subjects to study in international politics. There is conflict and anarchy in international relations and bi-polar balance of power (during cold war) could maintain international stability and security. Although economic interdependence is relevant today, yet the national state playing the dominant role in international politics. Waltz denied the role of human nature (Morgenthau's theory) in international relations. Instead, international political system affects the foreign policy of national states and other international relations.

Second, positivist theory was propounded by **neo-liberalism**. According to neo-liberalism interdependence among the nations is essential for international peace and stability. Neo-liberalism agreed with neo-realism's point of anarchy in international relations. However, stability can be established through international interdependence. No state would take the risk in conflict of their economy if it is in doldrums by waging the war. European Union (EU) is largely the result of theory of functionalism and neo-functionalism which is based on neo-liberalism. According to Neo-liberalism, besides the nation state, international organisations, regional organisations, international NGOs (Green Peace, Amnesty International etc.) play important role in international relations. Therefore, interdependent economic system is important instrument to establish peace and security in the world.



Third theory of positivism is **neo-Marxism** A.G. Frank, John Galtung and Wallestrain etc. rejected neo-realism and neo-liberalism on the ground that both of these theories more or less propagate states as pre-dominant actors in international politics. These theories also implemented European or Western model for developing countries, whereas the developing countries are dependent on the western world in case of capital, technology and industrial manufactures. Then how there can be interdependence. There is only dependence of periphery (less important area) on core (developed countries). According to neo-Marxism world economic system is the system of exploitation of periphery by the developed world.

#### **1.1.7.7 Post-Positivism**

Positivism received set back after the dismantling of bi-polar international system or disintegration of Communist block. Specifically neo-realism lost its dominant relevance which was based on the argument that bi-polar nuclear balance of power will remain constant and will maintain stability and security in the world. Neo-realism was also failed to predict the disintegration of USSR. According to post-positivism that metanarratives (great theories of social relations.): Neo-Realism, Neo-liberalism, Neo-marxism have stressed upon 'Existentialism'. It means every social issue, problem can be objectively examined or studies. The theorists own opinion should not be part of theory and studies are those which are objective. These 'metanarratives' tried to prove that whatever they have constructed to study international politics, is constant, permanent and forever.

Means positivism advocates that there are 'objective truths' of international relations/social relation. They have also given their same theories/model for developed/developing or communities belonging to different cultures.

Post-positivism and post-modernism argued against the 'existentialism' and 'objective truths' statements of positivism. According to post-positivism there are no objective truths to study international politics or social relations. The study of human behaviour is always subjective because human behaviour is neither constant nor can be predicted. For example positivist theories failed to predict the dismantling of Soviet Union and end of bi-polar power politics.

Post-positivist theories are, e.g., post-modernism, critical theory, constructivism, feminism, environmentalism etc. Post-modernism pleaded that there are 'unsayables' people or communities belonging to different cultures who are 'exclusions' in set prevailed developmental model of 'metanarratives'. Positivism's universalism is against the valuable diversity of people and, therefore, multiculturalism.

#### **1.1.8 Content and Scope Of Study**

Having delineated the growth of the study of international politics over the years one point emerges clearly that is the constant shift in the focus of



study. While the problem of study has remained more or less the management of conflict among those political units having certain specific interest to fulfill the differences have been, however witnessed with regards to the perception of the sources of conflict, the nature of the conflict and the parties involved in conflict.

Due to this reason, writers during traditional phase (encompassing first four approaches) viewed the reality in a particular manner that their data of analysis is different from the scientific school. For instance state is the major unit of their analysis, which included as to how state formulates its interests (the foreign policy), how these interests are pursued, the diplomacy, balance of power and what are the means through which it supported the national power interest.

The scientific school, on the other hand, introduced various levels of analysis. To quote J Bandhayapadhya there is whole hierarchy of international politics including individual groups, castes and communities, regional organisations, international global organisations governmental and non governmental . Thus the focus of study of this activity of international politics has been shifting. One could therefore agree with Palmer and Perkin that it is study of “the world community in translation” For the sake of clarity it would be in order to explain the subject of study as it has been during different phases of its development. That would provide an understanding with regards to the scope of study.

Paul Reinch’s book “World Politics” (1900) which is “a pioneering attempt” in providing a comprehensive overview of international politics was essentially historical in analysis. State to state relationship including economic and diplomatic relationship provided for the content of study. Similarly the writing of A.J. Grant “An Introduction to Study of International Relations” (1916), D.P. Heatley’s “Diplomacy and Study of International Relations” (1919) and James Bryce “International Relations” (1922) dealt the subject of study around the concept of state relations with other states.

Stephen H. Bailey found general agreement of five major themes relevant for study in earlier thirties: History of international relations, international trade and economics, international organisations and practice of national and international institutions. Grayson Kilk, however, placed entire subject matter under five general headings: (1) Forces which influences foreign policy (2) Means through which foreign policies are conducted, (3) Economic, political, diplomatic and treaty relations among the states (4) Means for the settlement of conflict-international law and organisations (5) International norms governing the behaviour of states and other systematic and structural forces i.e. ideology, geography, technology, decolonisation etc.

By this time, the focus of study shifted from study of relations to the crux of the problem the international politics and factors governing the process that is national power. Professor Hans Morgenthau who published his seminal work,

“Politics among Nations” (1948) systematised the concept of national power. It includes these elements – geography, population, national morale and quality of the government. Thus later realist school emphasised upon study of nation state, national power, quality of diplomacy and balance of power. Scope of study was determined by the levels of activity of nation state in relation with others in an environment where there is no supreme power. The study of environment also got included in study of international politics through slowly and gradually. A.F.K. Organski’s book published 1958 placed. “The Nations, the Unit of Action” at the center of his analysis and included topics; Nation and Nationalism, national goals and their determinants, Power and the context of power. The striking point of difference in Organski’s arrangement is his concern with the behaviour of the participants in future, Stoessinger’s “Might of Nations” in this respect is yet a movement in forward directions as it tried to make a distinctions between perception and reality of policy alongwith other usual topics of study.

However, with the impact of scientific revolution, the content of study of international politics started growing in different directions. In the last two decades, the progress towards the systematisation of the subject of study has been tremendous. These studies do not adhere to traditional focus of nation state as unit of analysis. Rather there has been emphasis on the analysis of processes. David Singer’s emphasis on three level of analysis is as such a seminal land of work as have been the work of preferential theorists like Karl Deutsch and Morgenstern etc. In this context the amalgamation of these two views traditional and modern, which have received respectability as well, attempts to determine the scope of study of international politics on the basis of two major focuses, the study of interaction process, and the impact of international environment on participants behaviour.

Legg and Morrison have listed certain important general concepts and more specific variables currently used by contemporary students of international politics which have to be taken into account in the development of any framework or theory of politics at the international level. It can also be taken as agreed subject matter of study of international politics. According to them “analysis” of international politics should be conducted at three levels: national, regional (international sub-system), and the world level international system), Units of analysis should include, firstly, individual actors, his values and goals, perception of the world, how it operates, intentions and abilities etc. State as unit of analysis should include study of size and resources, population, classes and social structure, economic system, and political system. It should also include specialized foreign policy decision making system with its general organisation, goals, strategies, the instruments of promotion of foreign policy i.e. diplomacy, propaganda, capability of economic diplomacy and military warfare. Finally, study of international politics ought to take international and

regional level factors, for example U.N., NATO ASEAN, EEC etc. Formal authority structure, patterns of goals and cleavages, capability and power, general norms and rules of international behaviour must also be included. Finally, nature of process of inter-action like negotiations, bargaining communication, coalition formation and study of wars etc. must also be included into study.

In summing up, we may say that in view of proliferation of numerous literature on the subject even the above list may prove to be inadequate. Nevertheless, it is definite that scope of study of international politics has widened in both the directions horizontal and vertical and the content of study has swelled in volumes. It has undergone revolutionary changes like the activity of international politics. Altered world environment has totally eroded the conventional form of reference of international politics set forth by the realist school. Even though the issue of subject matter is not finally settled and at times study appears to be electric in nature yet the study of interaction processes and the international environment alongwith domestic system is agreed content of study in international politics.

#### **1.1.9 International Politics—an autonomous discipline**

Whether the study of international politics, which has developed with significant pace in last few decades can establish its claim as an autonomous discipline. This question has been bothering ever since the emergence of this field of enquiry. But time and again it got bogged down under the weight of variety of streams which pervaded the study of international politics. Sir Alfred Zimmern who held chair in Oxford University in thirties, reported to have stated that a student of international politics is the one who does better understand psychology, economics diplomatic history, law, jurisprudence, sociology, geography and so on. His contention was to indicate the relevance of these fields of studies for international politics and thereby to highlight its inter-disciplinary nature. To him everything that went beyond national boundaries was ment to the study of international relations. If the point of international politics to become unified subject is emphasized it will become rather too narrow a subject. That is way in 1955 **Prof. Quincy Wright**, a prominent advocate of distinctiveness of study of international relations, advocated the inclusion of geography, demography, sociology, psychology, ethics, history and philosophy etc. within the fold of its study. One could therefore, say that international politics is perhaps the unique discipline which aspired for the unity of knowledge much before the movement of inter-disciplinary studies in social sciences was launched.

Issue of international politics as a distinctive field of study has, however, remained alive. Some people have tried to evade this question by emphasizing that “what matters is to deal with subject matter and not be unduly concerned

about where the subject matter is institutionally located". These arguments of unity of knowledge or undue concern with the location of the subject could have been convincing had there been some agreed core concepts which provide the shape and distinctiveness to the field of enquiry. It is for this reason that Fuller does not accept international politics as a separate subject of study much less a discipline.

What is a discipline? According to Fuller "any phenomenon characterized as a separate discipline must have a body of data systematised by distinctive analytical method and be capable of permitting prediction with exactitude". Study of international politics lacks on all these levels. To quote Palmer and Perkins, it lacks clear conceptual framework and systematic body of applicable theory; and it is highly dependent upon other better organized discipline. Thus, although the study of international relations has emerged from its earlier status as a poor relation of political science and history, it is still far from being a well organised discipline.

However, such view of the subject is claimed to be based on a formal understanding of pre-requisite of discipline. But they fail to accord satisfactory and balanced treatment. Harry Hansom for example, in his attempt to point out the deficiencies of the field applied a detailed criteria. A discipline according to him must have (1) a distinct matter; (2) agreed abstractions of moods; (3) Concept unequally applicable to field of international politics; (4) Specialised vocabulary with the precise definition; (5) Standardized analytical tools; and (6) a system of centralised cataloguing. By applying these criterion he finds that condition of all the social sciences is no better.

The preferable position with regard to the question therefore, could be to have informal interpretation of the term discipline, that disciplined study of subject matter with or without credentials of separateness. To accept however, the contention of Mortan Kalpan or of Hans Morgenthau would be unacceptable who rely on dictionary meaning of term discipline and claims international politics to be a discipline. Even though the concept of power "provide for the organisation and analysis of the discipline, it does not help to provide distinctiveness to this field from political science. Harry Howe Ranson rightly remarks :

At the core of study of international relations now is the Laswellian question of who gets what, when and how is the international arena. So the field must be concerned with power, in all of its manifestations and of every level of its possession. The field, methods of teaching and the central questions are essentially same as for the study of most other sectors of political science. Thus "political science seems to be natural home of international politics and may be regarded as part of the inter-discipline. It does reflect an increasingly disciplined methodology which brings together contributions of other social sciences in a special way. The most valuable contribution it has made is the integrative functions for all the social sciences. For this reason, perhaps, in the

traditional sense as Stanley Hoffman remarks international relations is an autonomous discipline in a synthetic and architectonic sense rather than an account of its specialized content. Contemporary international politics/relations are different. In the present scenario world has become a global village. Present international relations and domestic politics are intermingled and interdependent. Besides, the era of 'high politics' is somehow overshadowed by 'low politics' of economy, cultural and social relations. International relations are termed as global politics/relations. Global politics is not singularly concentrating on security issues. It incorporates other important issues such as human rights, environment, terrorism, human security, women and child development. All these issues cannot be addressed by the erosion of state's geographical jurisdiction as in the strict realist terms.

#### **1.1.10 Conclusion**

At the core of study of international relations now is the Laswellian question of who gets what, when and how is the international arena. So the field must be concerned with power, in all of its manifestations and of every level of its possession. The field, methods of teaching and the central questions are essentially same as for the study of most other sectors of political science. Thus "political science seems to be natural home of international politics and may be regarded as part of the inter-discipline. It does reflect an increasingly disciplined methodology which brings together contributions of other social sciences in a special way. The most valuable contribution it has made is the integrative functions for all the social sciences. For this reason, perhaps, Stanley Hoffman remarks international relations is an autonomous discipline in a synthetic and architectonic sense rather than an account of its specialized content.

#### **1.1.11 Self Check Exercise**

1. What is International Politics? (4 marks)
2. What is the difference between International Politics and International Relations. (4 marks)
3. What do you mean by International? (4 marks)
4. Discuss the development of discipline of International Politics. (15 marks)
5. What is the scope of International Politics. (15 marks)

#### **1.1.12 Suggested Readings**

1. Hans Morgenthau : Politics Among the Nations
2. Rama S. Melkote & A. Narsimha Rao : International Relations
3. Robert Jackson & Georg Sorenson : An Introduction to International Relations.
4. Parmjit Kaur Gill & Sheveta Sehgal : Dynamics of International Relations : Moving from International to Global, Theory and Issues, (2012).



**REALIST AND IDEALIST THEORY TO STUDY THE INTERNATIONAL  
POLIITICS**

- 1.2.1 Objectives of this lesson
- 1.2.2 Introduction
- 1.2.3 General Background
- 1.2.4 Theoretical Assumptions of Realism
- 1.2.5 Philosophical Basis of Realism
- 1.2.6 Morgenthau's Realist Theory
- 1.2.7 Criticism of Realist Theory
- 1.2.8 Conclusion
- 1.2.9 Self Check Exercise
- 1.2.10 Suggested Readings

**1.2.1 Objectives**

In this lesson we will discuss the prominent theory of International Politics - that is realism. The main objectives are:

1. To understand the meaning of realism
2. To study the main characterstics of realism
3. To discuss the Hans Morgenthau's (Prominent classical Realist thinker) Realist Theory
4. To critically evaluate the realism

**1.2.2 INTRODUCTION :**

Realist approach to study International Politics, which claimed for recognition against the institutional and legal approach during the inter-war period emerged finally after the Second World War, was widely accepted mode of analysis of international politics. And since then it had dominated the study of international politics rather exclusively for more than two decades. The philosophical basis and appeal of the logic of this approach has been so powerful that despite certain theoretical ambiguities of its core concept-power and the method of theory building, it has continued to shape the development of this fled of study for quite some time. The emergent scientific school with all its sophisticate tools



and techniques of analysis could not demolish the propositions put forth by Realist School. As a matter of fact the study of international politics after the systematization of Realist thought by Professor Morgenthau through his seminal work "Politics Among the Nations" is nothing but "the study of dialogue between Morgenthau and his critics."

### **1.2.3 General Background (Idealist approach)**

The academic climate of study of international politics after the First World War has been such that students were urged to devote themselves primarily with the theme of avoidance of another war. Consequently, it spurred such studies which included analysis of ideological and emotional foundations of national and other relevant areas which were thought to be the potent force of war. Wilsonian Fourteen Points Formula, which provided basis for the Peace Settlement of 1919 and the formation of, "**League of Nations**" has helped to create such environment where it was largely believed by the majority that the conflicts may be resolved by recourse to the peaceful means. Naturally, the newly created institution League of Nations and the peaceful means of settlement of disputes were bound to arouse expectations rather disproportionately. The cause of international law and organization as savior of world peace and stability was pleaded by the writers. They tried to establish the point that "**Power politics**", is the passing phase of history, that there is no incompatibility between the interests of various nations, that norms evolved through consensus would moderate the conflicts among the nations. In brief, academic mood before the emergence of the realist approach has been towards institutionalization of international politics through law and organization, and the gospel of international peace against narrow interest of nationalism.

Despite dominant rational-liberal ethos and philosophical soundness of this so called idealist school, the study of international politics during this phase suffered from serious weakness. Students of international politics appeared to be "an emotional and visionary reformer, a special pleader for the creation of ideal world society. Naturally the realities of international politics were totally ignored, which to the later generation of writers, that is the realist, appeared to be decline in understanding international relations. Therefore, these writers criticized assumptions, proposition and claim of idealist school by branding them utopian, and thus, to quote Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff "realist theory is critique of utopianism." *E.H. Carr's book, "Twenty Year Crisis"* which systematically builds up the case of Realistic analysis of

international politics, does it by exposing the hollowness of utopianism during the Inter war period in relation to the hazardous practices which nations had indulged in, due to the influence of utopianism.

Like idealism, Realism is also policy oriented and normative in character. But it showed greatest respect to the principle of empiricism or of the generalizations about the behavior of the states drawn from the study of history. It holds public opinion susceptible to quick changes, it is an unreliable guide of policy making. Realism stresses that nation state is principle[al tool of analysis of international politics and as there is generally disharmony of interest between the nations and it may lead even to wars, the capabilities of nations or national power therefore, is crucial in international politics' It is needed not only for the management of the conflict but also as an ability to influence the behavior of others., The national objective or inners, therefore, can be defined in terms of power, which contains birth military and non-military components. That is why unlike their predecessors who emphasized on the development of international behavior based upon law and organizations, the realist analysis begins from the assessment of national capabilities which include not only military force but levels of technology, populations,. natural resources geographical factors, forms of government, political leadership, ideology etc.

#### **1.2.4 Theoretical Assumptions of Realism**

Realist theorists assume that there are certain immutable factors which shape international conduct which have uncovered by human reason. They hold that human nature is generally constant or at least not as easily altered as assumed by utopians. Man is basically not a noble soul. He is evil, sinful, power seeker and therefore, reforms of education designed to change the behavior of the man could play a marginal role.

Man being essentially power seeker and that social world is projection of human nature where in role of reform and education is severely limited, the realist assume that power is itself has to evolves a device regulate itself. This mechanism to regulate power or manage power, which is most suitable according to them is the balance of power system, when power is balanced among g certain nations, no nation can achieve international hegemony.

Man by nature being essentially a power seeker and world is a projection of human nature, power is his major determinant of international behavior of state. Although in the study of political science the term power is quite popular, in international politics however, the

absence of institutions and procedures for resolving conflict comparable to those in most domestic political systems make the so-called power element more obvious than at the domestic level. Frederick Schuman says "state necessarily seeks safety by relying on its own power and viewing with alarm the power of its neighbor, "Indeed Morgenthau defines all politics as "*struggle for the power*" or to quote Robert Strausz-Hupe, international politics is dominated by the "quest for power" and that "at any given period of history, there were several states locked in deadly conflict all desiring the augmentation or preservation of their power."

Thus, Realist theory by relying so lying on power as driving force, assumes that leaders desire to purpose their national interest and the interest of all nations lies in expansion of their influence: territorial, economic, political and cultural and that states use their power which is also defined as influence in the protection and furtherance of their interests. The Realist, therefore, also assumes keeping in view the negligible role of reform and education while recognizing the dynamics of power. According to them, Balanced of power is most suitable mechanism as it does not allow for preponderance or hegemony of a particular nation at international level.

Realist also starts the assumption that moral standards cannot govern political action of a statesman on international politics. No doubt, there have been some differences among the adherents of realist school, it is nevertheless acknowledged that a statesman operating in environment characterized by the lack of a centralized authority cannot be expected toll carry same moral standards as applied to national level. However, one must admit that the actions of statesman are generally not devoid of moral considerations. Unlike utopian's, realists do not place emphasis on the role of morality in international politics for they do not believe that politics is function of ethics. Political theory of realism derives from political practice and historical rather than form pre-conceived notions.

#### **1.2.5 Philosophical Basis of Realism**

These assumptions of realism drew their philosophical sustenance from the writings of western and non-western philosophers. In ancient times Chinese philosopher Mencius(372-289)B.C. and other legalists as well as Kautilya in India belonged to this tradition. In analysis of inter-state relations in sixteenth century, Machiavelli devised a theory of politics from political practices of his times. His emphasis upon the double moral standards for the ruler, his concern with power, his assumption that politics is characterized by clash of interests, his

pessimistic view of human nature, all these clearly place him within the realist framework.

Realist conception of human nature of the society and the role of power is directly borrowed from Hobbes. Man had perpetual and restless desire of power which has direct bearing on Realist School. Their perception of society is similar to that of Hobbes state of nature. Only differences, however, is founded that Hobbes prefers to have world government while realists argue for balance of power as suitable mechanism.

Hegel also seems influenced the Realist but only with regard to his view that state's highest duty is its own preservation. Otherwise, Hegelism is unpalatable to the realists. Although the idea of state having its own morality which permeates the thoughts of realists draw itself from Hegelian sources.

Before emerging as a dominant approach the study of international politics, realism understood in narrow sense power reflected in the writings of Trietschke, Nietzsche and Erich Kaufman. German writers clearly spelled realist thought in as development increase and display of power. The realist tradition, however, in international politics is pursued by F.L. Schuman.. E.H. Carr, Martin Wight, George Schwarze, begger, George Kenan, Quincy Wright, Raymond Aaron and Robert Strauze Hupe etc, However Morgenthau's name is particularly associated with this approach as he tried to provide in the status of theory in international politics.

#### **1.2.6 Morgenthau's Realist Theory:**

*Professor Hans J. Morgenthau* in his book "**Politics Among Nations**" published in 1948, addressed himself to a central question as to why nations behave as they do, what are the motivational forces of their action. As a follower of a particular tradition of thought Morgenthau believes that the 'World is imperfect as it is from the rational point of views, is the result of force, inherent in human nature. To improve the world, one must work along with the forces operating and not against them." Therefore by evolving theory of Realism, he concerns himself with "the human nature as it actually is" and "with the historical process as they actually take place." In this context Morgtenthau suggests six principles of his theory of Realism which uphold the moral dignity of the concept of national interest defined in terms of power. These principles are as follows:

**1.2.6.1. Realism is Rational**

Political realism believes that politics, like society in general, governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature. Realism, believing as it does in this possibility or developing a rational theory reflects, that however, imperfect objective laws a human nature are, any improvement that we wish to bring about in society require that we understand these laws which govern the society. These laws operate irrespective of our preference and is indifference to our preferences used. There is nothing that we can do to affect the operation of these laws. Therefore, our attempt should be Morgenthau contends, to discover these laws that is by ascertaining facts and interpreting them through reason. Such objective analyzed laws of politics help to build up a rational theory of politics and help to distinguish between truth and opinion in politics. Such theory, obviously believes that the character of foreign policy can be ascertained and defined only by analyzing the political acts and their foreseeable consequences. Not only this even the acts of particular statesman acting in certain situations can also be assessed by raising such questions: (a) what are the rational alternatives available to the statesman in those particular situations, (b) which of those alternatives preferable to the statesman in the given situation. The task naturally make the complete phenomenon of world politics interesting and a rational proposition.

**1.2.6.2 Concept of Interest is defined in terms of Power**

Realist theory assumes, drawing upon Hobbes concept of human nature, that statesman think and act in terms of interest defined in terms of power, it is natural, for a statesman to think and work for the interests of state as an individual is concerned with his own selfish interest. History, is full of instances in support of this assumption.

This concept of national interest, which determines the behavior of people functioning on the behalf of the state, helps to organize the complex reality of international politics rationally. It helps to determine as to what is the relevance of international politics, and hereby enables us to have theoretical understanding of politics as far as possible. It imposes a rational discipline on the statesman and diplomat that he has to act in accordance with the given framework of national interests.

The concept of national interest is indifferent to personal references and motive of the statesman. To quote Morgenthau statesman may be in habit of presenting their popular support for them. Yet, they will distinguish between their official duty which is to think and act in terms

of national interest. And their personal wish which is to see their own moral values and political principles realized through the world. "In other words political realism requires that a sharp distinction is made by the statesman between the desirable and possible.

Attempt to explain foreign policy in terms of motives and preferences of statesman is futile according to realist theory because actions of a statesman bring dividends in realm of foreign policy, it cannot help to explain the entire dynamics because foreign policy is composed of multiple factors presented in the general of framework of national interest. What is important in this context is to know, not the motives of statesman but it intellectual equipment, his political acumen or his intellectual ability to grasp the essentials of foreign policy, his political ability and resourcefulness to translate the foreign policy into action.

Apart from its rationality, the concept of national interest as the guiding factor of foreign policy helps to minimize the risk ands maximize the benefit and thereby improves the chances of successful attainment of those objective which national sets before itself. To conclude, national interest benefit in terms on being followed in formulation and the execution of foreign policy help to build up rational theory of behavior of states in international politics.

#### **1.2.6.3. Concept of National Interest in terms of Power, is subject to change**

Realism does not allow its key concept of interest defined as power, with meaning that fixed for all time to come. Definition of interest changes with time and circumstances. To quote Morgenthau "power may comprise of anything that established and maintains the control of man over man but the content and the manner of its use are determined buy the political and cultural environment." In other words, interests must be defended in the light of the political and cultural context of a particular period of history and not simply be dependent upon the circumstances that prevail. Because Morgenthau clearly stipulates that contemporary connection between interest and nation state is a product of history and is therefore bound to disappear in the course of history.

Similarly, the context of power and manner of its use is also determined by prevailing political and cultural environment. The emphasis upon the power has to be shifted according to the changing circumstances, national as well as international. Naturally, therefore the environment within which foreign policy must be periodically reassessed and re-examined. It is this manner perhaps, Morgenthau would justify

shift of U.S. China policy from containment and non-recognition to rapprochement and recognition.

#### **1.2.6.4. Realist attitude towards Moral Ideals**

Realist does not deny the significance of moral principles in political actions. But it emphasized that universal moral principles (like truth, kindness, nonviolence etc.) cannot be applied to the states in their abstract universal formulations. These should be filtered through the concrete circumstances of time and place. Thus in precise terms realism suggests the principle of moral prudence. An individual can lay his life for the sake of an abstract moral principle like honors, liberty or justice. A nation has no right to sacrifice itself for upholding such a principle, nor can he state let its disapproval of these moral principle get in the way of successful political action. The basic concern of a nation should be its survival. No statesman acting on behalf of the nation can call upon its entire population to uphold a certain ethical and moral principle involving the risk of war. Political action judges' merit of its action by its consequences and that alone is the supreme value conduct of one's action is politics.

#### **1.2.6.5. Distinction between National, Moral Aspirations and Universal Laws**

According to political realism, the moral aspirations of a particular nation, cannot be and should not be identified with moral laws that govern the universe. Every nation tries to make out and declare that its own aspiration and actions constitute and moral purpose which should be followed as goal. It should, however, be remembered that such utterances or claims are the disguised pursuance of national interest. For instance, U.S. Policy of containment of communism was raised to levels of morals by its propaganda but its actuality power consideration had been dominant.

If a nation seriously decides to pursue moral universal principles in total defiance of requirements of national interest. Such policy is simply wrong by the prescribed standards of realism, it may turn out to be suicidal policy.

Moreover, undue emphasis on moral principles by the leaders tends to make their judgment distorted or in other words if often divorced of reality, On the contrary, if the principles of realism are seriously followed, not only that we would be able to judge our action rather than actions of other states can also be anticipated.



**1.2.6.6. Autonomy of Political Sphere**

Intellectually realist theory maintain the autonomy of political sphere. According to Morgenthau a realist thinks in terms of power as an economist thinks in terms of interest defined as wealth. It does not imply that a political realist is innocent of the existence and relevance of other areas that is economics, sociology etc. As such realism believes in pluralistic concept of human nature and real man consist of economic, political religious, and moral man etc. It insists that while analyzing a political man these other aspects of man should be placed to play subordinate role, and the standards and rules appropriate to political sphere should be applied. Thus political realism for the first Timken argued for autonomy of international politics which should be understood in the "*language of laws*" and "*harsh logic*" of power politics because of "the aspiration for power being the distinguishing element of international politics is by necessity power politics.

To sum up, these six principles of realism attempt to provide a general theory of politics which is ceaseless struggle for power. This struggle for power presents itself in three major patterns of foreign policy, the policy of status quo, policy of Imperialism and policy of prestige. These categories of foreign policy simply demonstrate the quest of states as actors of international politics either to keep the power or to increase the pore or to demonstrate the power. So far as maintenance of peace is concerned it examines all the efforts made so far by placing them in three major categories viz (a) Peace through accommodation of power. (b) Peace through transformation of power, and (c) Peace through accommodation of power. The first two categories which include collective security, disarmament, peaceful means to settle disputers and international government and world community etc. seem to be unworkable in the given dynamics of international politics. He places his hopes on diplomacy that is peace through accommodation and prescribes certain conditions as well. In reality, however, it is balance of power, which is in existence and provides for peace of whatever nature it is. Despite the realistic exposition of the dynamics of international politics. Morgenthau's approach suffers seriously from may inconsistencies.

**1.2.7 Criticism of Realist Theory**

1. Morgenthau's Realist theory suggests that politics is a ceaseless struggle for power which manifests in the form of on going conflict. Even though it appears logical as it is developed on the basis of a particular kind off view of human

nature. Our understanding of international politics suggests that co-operation is as much a significant consideration as conflict is said to be. No nation can be only in a conflict situation in international politics. For instances, Vietnam which had to fight the war for more than two decades in our times, its international politics, cannot be explained only in terms of conflict without taking into account the area of co-operation with the socialist countries. Thus study of international politics within conflict framework would provide only a partial analysis.

2. Morgenthau's theory of human nature which he borrows from Hobbes and Machiavelli is subjected to serious questioning by his critics because it is on this basis that he develops the edifice of his theory. Morgenthau is expected to demonstrate the validity of the observation that man is selfish. Mere saying so does not add to our understanding. As this hypothesis about human nature remains unverified, one can say that his theory is even unscientific. That is why Bruno Wiseman calls it "a theory based on absolute unverifiable essential laws."
3. Morgenthau does not subscribe to the normal pattern of theory building starting with the generalization that man is selfish and power seeker which is immune to change. Morgenthau establishes conclusion that states seek power as state is larger collectivity of man. But critical analysis suggests that it is nothing more than a statement and needs to be proved. His analysis and conclusion seem to be drawn to confirm his advanced judgment and thus Morgenthau is prisoners of his assumptions in the sense that these have not been placed for scientific verifiability. One is such baffled that Morgenthau is trying to describe the reality or looking into reality for the illustration of his preconceived ideas.
4. This theoretical weakness becomes glaring when Morgenthau talks about peace as desirable and preferable. In this analysis which is state of permanent conflict such situations can simply be aberration to the rule. Therefore, his commitment to peace as desirable objective is perhaps at platitudinous level. His concern to demonstrate the validity of his preconceived notion that ceaseless struggle for power.

5. Claiming that his theory based on the analysis of what has actually happened he prescribes the laws which govern the behavior of the states. States govern their behavior on the basis of national interests defined in terms of power. But his views on American foreign policy and of others suggest that states in practice which is marginal, but one cannot then accept the deterministic nature of given laws. The principle that state "should" seek power makes this theory rather dangerous. Such theory, which contains prescriptive and analytical elements both becomes inconsistent with itself as well as with reality.
6. Morgenthau's view that human nature is deterministic and non subject to change, provides for serious inconsistency in the context of the particular role from the diplomacy which can assure or the peace in his scheme of thing. How such diplomats can be produced who would turn the course of development governed by such deterministic laws ? Moreover, Morgenthau suggests in the course of the development of his theory that a foreign policy defined not only in terms of its own interests rather it should look at political scene from the point of view of other nations also. Such recommendation is again inconsistent as it does not stand to reason that a state committed to pursue its own interest will be guided by the consideration of the point of view of other states.
7. Power is distinctive element of international politics provides autonomy to the field according to Morgenthau, is subject of serious criticism from various angles. He puts so much emphasis on power, with which his entire understanding of politics is equated that it raises a question whether it is valid to develop a theory based on one concept. As a matter of fact his conception of power desires ends and means relationship. He suggests that national interest must be defined in terms of power and the speaks about power as means as well as an end both. Such view of power has been termed as "power monism" by Stanley Hoffman and under its weight his entire theory crumbles.

As a matter of fact, how the concept of power, which is quite ambiguous in terms of uses made by Morgenthau, can account for the explanation of complexes phenomenon of international

politics ? For instance, the power is used to designate the sum of recourses as well as set of processors. One can also distinguish between potential power and power as capacity and national power. Morton Kaplan, therefore, rightly remarks, "Morgenthau's definition of power would hardly exclude any relationship (not even the relationship in families and business) that does not involve power and is not political. But there are non-political relationship might be identified as separate from the non-political relationship. In view of these, power as an approach, is bound to mean different things to different people. The inevitable result is that power loses its strength as a precise analytical tool and become as ambiguous term.

8. Concept of National interest of Morgenthau is also subject to serious criticism. This can be taken as dependable guide only in stable periods and particularly in such environment where participants are aspiring for limited objectives with limited means. Because anything beyond that having complex resources or power cannot be subjected to a rational analysis or calculation. Moreover, calculation of national interest depending upon perception of the statesman is also bound to change from one statesman to another even though the general environment remains by and large the same. For example, Britain, under Disraeli supported Ottoman Empire but under Salisbury this policy was changed although neither there had been any change in the condition of Turkish empire nor Russia's intentions had undergone any change.

Moreover, Morgenthau does not seem to make any distinction between content of national interest as it is formulated and national interest as it is pursued and interpreted which reduces the usability of his theory. One cannot say that particular even will be interpreted in same manner everywhere and by everyone. Therefore, there is bound to be difference in interpretation and hence national interest cannot be a deterministic concept. As such it is mixture of, or to use the words of Kenneth Waltz, "an uneasy juxtaposition of determinism and indeterminism, and thus it is an ambiguous concept.

9. Morgenthau's theory of national interest is also charged on the grounds of immorality. It is claimed by him that national interest carries its own morality. It means that man must behave in accordance to his interest. Such act alone is moral. To put it differently, no action of state and supremacy of national interest thrives on the assumption of the moral inferiority of other nation's interest. But how one's national interest alone can be moral, and if this is not so, then consensus among the competing interest can provide for higher morality but that is something unacceptable to Morgenthau as politics to him is conflict and not co-operation.

**1.2.8 Conclusion:**

Despite all these weaknesses one cannot underestimate the importance of Morgenthau and his theory to the study of international politics. As a matter of fact it is starting point for any theoretical enquiry. He is pioneer of systematic study of international politics. By its sweeping treatment to the subject as a macro-theory, it acted as precursor of systematic school and thus acted as development link between emotional and subjective study and scientific and objective study of international politics. Although Kenneth Thompson writes that "a decision is yet to be written" even though one cannot deny Morgenthau's contribution to the systematization of data of international politics within a particular frame of reference.

**1.2.9 Self Check Exercise:**

1. Write the name of the Author of the Book 'Politics Among Nations'. (4 marks)
2. Who are the important realist thinkers. (4 marks)
3. Explain the meaning of - Realism is Rational. (4 marks)
4. Critically evaluate the Realist Theory of International Politics. (15 marks)
5. Discuss Morgenthau's Theory of Realism, (15 marks).

**1.2.10 Suggested Readings:**

1. Hans Morgenthau : Politics Among the Nations
2. Mahindra Kumar : Theoretical Aspects of International Relations.
3. Robert Jacksons &: An Introduction to International Relations.

## IDEALISM

- 3.1 Objectives of this lesson
- 3.2 Introduction
- 3.3 Important Assumption of Idealism
- 3.4 Critical Appraisal of Idealism in International Politics
- 3.5 Conclusion
- 3.6 Self Check Exercise
- 3.7 Suggested Readings

### 3.1 Objectives of this lesson

1. To understand the meaning of idealism in International Politics
2. To know the basic postulates of idealism
3. To critically evaluate the theory of idealism.

### 3.2 Introduction

Idealism as a doctrine means that the external world must be understood through consciousness. Idealism loosely, any behaviour shaped by the pursuit of an unattainable objective such as equality or justice. In a general sense, idealism was by those liberals who had sought to bring an end to war after 1918 through peaceful means. They were charged with having advocated a system of international relations that set to achieve the peaceful international environment.

Idealism allegedly dominated the study of international relations from the end of First World War until the late 1930s. It is referred also a utopianism. Idealism is in fact a variant of liberal internationalism. Notable liberal idealists are **Immanuel Kant, Richard Cobden, John Hobson, Norman Angell, Alfred Zimmern, and Woodrow Wilson**. These idealist thinkers were propagating a great variety of idealist doctrines which includes: pacifism, world federalism, humanitarianism, legal institutionalism, international law, and moralism.

Idealism is closely associated with a distinctly Anglo-American tendency to assume that statesmen enjoy broad freedom of choice in the making of foreign policy. The whole case of idealism is based on the general idea of evolutionary progress in society. This idea emerged in the eighteenth century and acknowledged as the major source of inspiration behind the American (1776) and French (1789) revolutions. Idealism envisaged a world order characterised by the absence of war, inequality, tyranny and marked by constant progress in human welfare brought about by the use of reason, education and science. The theoretical position of idealism in international relations is the offspring of the liberal outlook.

The decisive push to set up a separate academic subject of IR (International Relations) was occasioned by the First World War (1914-18), which produced millions of casualties; it was driven by a widely felt determination never to allow human suffering on such a scale to happen again. That desire not to repeat the same catastrophic mistake required coming to grips with the problem of total warfare between the mechanized armies of modern industrial states which were capable of inflicting mass destruction. The war was a devastating experience of millions of people, and particularly for young soldiers who were conscripted into the armies and were slaughtered by million, especially in the trench warfare on the western front. Some battles resulted in tens of thousands and sometimes 100,000 casualties or even more. The famous battle of Somme (France) in July-August 1916 inflicted casualties on that holocaust. The justification for all that death and destruction became less and less clear as the war years went by, as the number of casualties kept on increasing to historically unprecedented levels, and as war failed to disclose any rational purpose. On first learning of the war's devastation one man who had been isolated was quoted as follows: 'Millions are being killed Europe is mad. The world is mad'.

Why was it that the war began in the first place? And why did Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Austria, Turkey and other powers persist in waging war in the face of such slaughter and with diminishing chances of gaining anything of real value from the conflict? These questions and others like them are not easy to answer. But the first dominant academic theory of IR was shaped by the search for answers to them. The answers that the new discipline of IR came up with were profoundly influenced by liberal ideas. For liberal thinkers, the First World War was in no small measure attributable to the egoistic and short-sighted calculations and miscalculations of autocratic leaders in the heavily militarized countries involved, especially Germany and Austria. Why was early academic IR influenced by liberalism? That is a big question, but there are a few important points that we should keep in mind in seeking an answer. The United States was eventually drawn into the war in 1917. Its military intervention decisively determined the outcome of the war: it guaranteed victory for the democratic allies (US, Britain, France) and defeat for the autocratic central powers (Germany, Austria, Turkey). At that time the United States had a President, Woodrow Wilson, who had been a university professor of political science and who saw it his main mission to bring liberal democratic values to Europe and to rest of the world. Only in that way, he believed, could another great war be prevented. In short, the liberal way of thinking had solid political backing from the most powerful state (USA) in international system at the time. These thinkers had some clear ideas and strong beliefs about how to avoid major

disasters in the future; e.g. be reforming the international system, and also by reforming the domestic structures of autocratic countries.

### 3.3 IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS OF IDEALISM

It is clear that Idealism as a approach emerged in the very early stage of IR discipline. In fact early IR discipline of 20<sup>th</sup> century is engrossed with strong forces of Idealism. What are the main assumptions of postulates of Idealism in International Relations, we will discuss in this part of the lesson.

**3.3.1 Politics is the art of Good Governance:** Idealists would argue that politics and also international politics is the art of good governance. International relations should necessarily involve principles of justice, obedience to law/rules which are derived from universal moral principles. A respect for fellow humans, both domestically and internationally.

**3.3.2 Peace, not war, is the normal state of affairs:** Peace not war is normal state of affairs. In Kant's words (In his work 'Perpetual Peace'), peace can be perpetual. The laws of nature dictated harmony and co-operation between peoples. War is therefore unnatural and irrational: it is an artificial contrivance and not a product of imperfect social relations or some peculiarity of human nature. A common thread running through liberal thought, from **Rousseau, Kant and Cobden**, to Schumpeter and Doyle, is that wars were created by militaristic and undemocratic governments for their own vested interests. Wars were engineered by a '**warrior class**' bent on extending their power and wealth through territorial conquest. According to Paine (in the 'Rights of man'); The "War System" was contrived to preserve the power and the employment of princes, statesmen, soldiers, diplomats and armaments manufacturers, and to bind their tyranny ever more firmly upon the necks of people'. Wars provided governments with excuses to raise taxes, expand their bureaucratic apparatus and thus increase their control over their citizens. The people on the other hand, were peace loving by nature, and only plunged into conflict by the whims of their unrepresentative rulers. War was the product of aggressive instincts of authoritarian and unrepresentative elites. Both for Kant and Schumpeter, war was the outcome of minority rule.<sup>3</sup> Immanuel Kant again viewed, 'If, as inevitably the case under this constitution, the consent of the citizens is required to decide whether or not war is to be declared, it is very natural that they will have great hesitation in embarking on dangerous an enterprise' (The Perpetual Peace).



**3.3.3. Idealism is against Secret Diplomacy and Balance of Power:** Idealists were profoundly suspicious of concentrated forms of power, especially state power. When they looked at the international system, they saw power being exercised in the interests of governing elites and against the wishes of masses. 'Secret Diplomacy' was the name they gave to the way unrepresentative elites practised international relations in the pre-democratic era. They disputed the view that foreign policy was a specialised art which was best made by professional diplomats behind closed doors and away from the influences of national politics. If the democratization of domestic politics could produce important economic and social reforms there would be a commensurate improvement in the conduct of foreign policy as a result of popular participation.<sup>4</sup> Idealist regarded the balance of power (BOP) as the most pernicious aspect of secret of diplomacy. BOP was 'a foul thing' which gave no credence to the common interests of humankind and the just claims of small nations seeking self-determination. The balance of power was the product of elite collusion which resulted in international relations being 'arranged' to suit the interests of those who ruled Great Powers.<sup>5</sup> Balance of Power was the veil behind which the armaments industries enriched themselves through state expenditure on weapons of war. It was also a smokescreen which concealed British imperial interests.

**3.3.4 International Morality :** Idealism presents a picture of the future international society based on the notion of reformed international society free from power politics, immorality, and violence. The idealist approach to international relations has always held out the promise of bringing about a better world with the help of education and international organization. Moral nations should try to follow moral principles in their international behaviour, abstain from all forms of traditional power politics, and adopt policies of non-partisanship. By adopting such a course the evil influence of power politics may be progressively minimised. The correct understanding of international society could be acquired through right reason, that the public opinion was prepared for being moulded in accordance with the demand of reason. Educational reforms bring the enlightenment which will create the enlightened international society disliking war and conflict. Idealism is based upon the values that are philosophically sound and are of primary importance. Even the concept of international morality is the reciprocity or mutuality of national interests.<sup>6</sup> Idealists refuse to accept 'power' as the determinant of relations between nations. For them, politics is the art of good government rather than the

art of possible. International relations should necessarily involve principles of justice, obedience to legitimate law or rules which are derived from universal moral principles.

### **3.3.5 Search for Peace and Security and Collective Security System:**

Idealism is against the notion that security can be established through Balance of Power or 'Power Management' at international level. The First World War discredited the laws of both economics and politics. The self operating laws of (BOP System) had failed to prevent the most destructive conflict in human history. The experiences of 1914-18 brought to the fore liberal thinkers and politicians who 'considered the old assumptions and prescriptions of power politics to be totally discredited and who helped to give birth to new procedures and a firm system of international law and organisation preserving peace by a system of Collective Security. The commitment to collective security was designed to prevent this situation recurring by ensuring that in future, the aggressor would be confronted by all member states. Destructive forces of international anarchy could only be brought to an end if the international system was regulated in the same way as domestic society. Collective Security system was, advocated by idealists, means that all the nations who are members of collective security system will defend their fellow nation from aggressive power. Collective security system will under an international organisation. So, idealists also advocated international or 'international law' or 'international legalism'. The collective security system will pursue 'open diplomacy' not secret diplomacy; international cooperation rather conflict; peaceful solution of international disputes. The 'Covenant of League of Nations' was the first international organisation. It is also known as collective security system. The idea of 'league' was largely motivated by 'Idealists' after the end of First World War.

**3.3.6 Wilsonian Fourteen Point Formula:** President Woodrow Wilson (1856-1924) was one of the main architects of the peace architects of peace settlement negotiated in Paris after the First World War. Wilson's fourteen point formula was an attempt to incorporate US constitutional prescriptions globally. The League of Nations was designed as an overarching authority which would regulate the behaviour of states towards each other. Members would be required to submit their disputes to arbitration and, if necessary, use sanctions to compel aggressor state to conform to a peaceful method of conflict resolution. The League would in theory, be run by an alliance of major powers permanently committed to opposing aggression on the grounds of principle. According to President

Wilson, 'There must be not a balance of power but a community of power; not organised rivalries but an organised common peace'.<sup>7</sup> Woodrow Wilson was prominent idealist who proposed 14 point formula. As follows:

1. Open covenant openly arrived at
2. Freedom of the seas alike in peace and war
3. The removal of all economic barriers to trade
4. Reduction of national armaments
5. A readjustment of all colonial claims
6. The evacuation of Russian territory and to independent determination by Russia of her own political development and national policy
7. The evacuation and restoration of Belgium
8. The evacuation and restoration of France and return of Alsace-Lorraine
9. A readjustment of frontiers of Italy along national lines
10. Self-determination for the peoples of Austria-Hungary
11. A readjusting of the boundaries of the Balkan States along historically established lines of nationality
12. Self-determination for the peoples under Turkish rule
13. The independence of Poland with free access to the sea guaranteed by international covenant
14. The formation of a general association of nations under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

These 'fourteen points' contain many idealist principles. In particular the importance of self-determination from colonial rule as well as the need for an international organisation to maintain peace and security.<sup>8</sup> Two major points in Woodrow Wilson's ideas for a more peaceful world deserve special emphasis. The first concerns his promotion of democracy and self-determination. Behind this point is the liberal conviction that democratic governments do not and will not go to war against each other. The second major concern was Wilson's program of creation of an international organisation that would put relations between states on a firmer institutional foundation than the realist notions of Balance of Power. Instead, international would be regulated by a set of common rules of international law. In essence that was Wilson's concept of international relations.

### **3.4 CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF IDEALISM IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS**

1. Idealism fell into disrepute with the collapse of the League of Nations and the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. Although the idealists had sought to use the League system to replace European real politics, in fact it simply became a forum that reflected the competing national interests of the great powers of the day. Instead the League of Nations never became the strong

international organisation that idealists imagined. Germany, Russia's strained relationship with League (Germany joined in 1926, left in 1933, Russia joined in 1934, and was expelled in 1940 because of its war with Finland). Under US isolationist foreign policy orientation, senate did not pass US membership of league, the strongest nation could not become the member of League. Gradual league became defunct and could not fulfill the purpose for which it was formed.

2. Wilson's Norman Angell's (*The Great Illusion*-1909) thinking was based on a liberal view of human beings of human society: human beings are rational, and when they apply reason to international relations they can set up organizations for the benefit of all. Public opinion is constructive force; removing secret diplomacy in dealings between states, inoted, opening diplomacy to public scrutiny assures that agreements will be sensible and fair. These ideas were prevailing in 1920s international environment. These ideas were dominated in the first phase of IR (International Relations). But 1920s and 1930s developments of Fascism and Nazism gave serious set backs to liberal ideas. Authoritarianism also increased in central and Eastern Europe – Poland, Hungary, Romania and Yugoslavia.
3. Liberal Idealism was not a good intellectual guide to international relations, particularly, in 1930s. Interdependence did not produce peaceful cooperation. The League of Nations was helpless in the face of the expansionist power politics conducted by the authoritarian regimes in Germany, Italy, and Japan. Academic IR began to speak the classical realist language of Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes in which the grammar and vocabulary of power was central. The most comprehensive and penetrating critique of liberal idealism was that of E.H. Carr, A British IR scholar. In his 'The Twenty Year's Crisis' Carr argued that liberal IR thinkers profoundly missed the facts of history and misunderstood the nature of international relations. They erroneously believed that such relations could be based on a harmony of interest between countries and people. According to Carr, the correcting starting-point is the opposite one: we should assume that these are profound conflicts of interest both between countries and between people. International relations is in a basic sense about struggle between such conflicting interests and desires.<sup>9</sup>
4. Idealism ignores the elements of power in international relations. Idealism was called utopianism, because they are blamed to ignore the real power-politics in international politics. Their futuristic attitude undermined the part and present real state of affairs in international politics. Their imagination about the 'Ideal World' or ideal international society could not bring the desired fruits. There was a optimistic view of the possibilities for peaceful relations among humans. For

some liberal this derives from a more positive assessment of human nature, at least to the extent that they can learn from their mistakes, but also confidence in the capacity of individual humans to choose rational courses of action in politics, as in other fields such as economics.<sup>10</sup> He here argues that idealism was an expression of the political philosophy of satisfied great powers. It was simply the product of a particular set of social, political, and historical circumstances rather than a timeless moral code devoted to universal ends. When it came to a concrete political problem, it could not find an absolute and disinterested standard for the conduct of international politics. Not all the states keep interest in peace. Those who dominated the international system were more likely to pursue peace because it was in their interests to maintain the international status quo.<sup>11</sup>

5. Even the Neo-liberals (contemporary theory of liberal IR) recognize that cooperation may be harder to achieve in areas where leaders perceive they have not mutual interests. They also believe that states cooperate to achieve absolute gains and greatest obstacle to cooperation is 'cheating' or 'non-compliance'. It means that states are not naturally bound to cooperate. Personal gains are predominant.

### **3.5 Conclusion :**

In the end, we can say that although inter-war idealism was seriously challenged by the breakout of Second World War and by the realists, idealism contributed a lot to the IR. It provides the element of morality to international relations. Realists were too much obsessed by the power factor and they fail to realize the importance of moral values altogether. How it can be said idealism was a total failure – when we see that international society attained its ground through moral values. The continuous growing value of international law, institution is being recognised by the international community. Notwithstanding without moral principles there is the way and objective for international community to achieve.

### **3.6 Self Check Exercise**

1. What do you mean by idealism (4 marks)
2. How idealism is opposite to realism (4 marks)
3. Peace, not war is the normal state of affairs (4 marks)
4. Discuss the main assumptions of idealism (15 marks)
5. Critically evaluate the theory of idealism in International Politics (15 marks)

### **3.7 Suggested Readings**

1. Robert Jackson and Georg Sorensen (2003), Introduction to International Relations. New Delhi: Oxford.

2. Scott Burchill (1995), *Liberal Internationalism*, in Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater, *Theories of International Relations*. Hampshire and London: Macmillan.
3. I. Clark (1999), *The Hierarchy of States: Reform and Resistance in International Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. M. Howard (1978), *War and Liberal Conscience*. Oxford: OUP.
5. Mahindra Kumar, *Theoretical Aspects of International Politics*. Agra-3: Shiva Lal Agarwalas and Co..
6. R.D. Makinlay and R. Little (1986), *Global Problems and World Order*. London.
7. John Baylis and Steve Smith, *The Globalisation of World Politics*. Oxford and New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

**ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL POWER**

1.3.1 Objectives of this lesson

1.3.2 Introduction

1.3.3 Elements of National Power

1.3.3.1 Importance of Geographical Factors

1.3.3.2 Natural Resources

1.3.3.3 Domestic system's Components

1.3.3.4 Bureaucracy

1.3.3.5 Industrialisation

1.3.3.6 Technological Skills

1.3.3.7 Ideology

1.3.4 Conclusion

1.3.5 Self Check Exercise

1.3.6 Suggested Readings

**1.3.1 Objectives of this lesson**

1. To understand the meaning of national power
2. To know about what are the elements of national power
3. To learn how these various elements are responsible for the power of a nation

**1.3.2 Introduction**

Nations are known by the quantum of power they possess. Power may be defined as the capacity to control or influence the minds and actions of others. The capability of influencing other nations directly depends on those elements that make from the power of a nation in relation to other countries. In any country the power is exercised by the agent of the people who are legitimately elected from time to time to run the government. These agents not only control the power but also define the goals and objectives of the country. The national power is based on the two kinds of factors the stable and the fluctuating factors. As a matter of fact the national power can be viewed from three angles - namely geographical factor, domestic system and ideology of the nation.

**1.3.3 Elements of National Power****1.3.3.1 Importance of Geographical Factors :**

Geography constitutes the most stable factor of power in any nation. The geographical setting of a nation namely its location, size, territorial boundaries and topography are the significant determinant of national power.

The location of the state with regard to its climate regions and with respect to oceans has a significant bearing on the natural endowment as well as maritime outlook. The location of a state indicates its status and its power potential. The foreign policy of any state and its role in international scene has its roots directly in the geography of a state.

The location refers to the boundaries of a nation. For instance India is surrounded by vast stretches of ocean on three sides and sheltered on the fourth by the mountains. It is suitable factor that fixes the position of India in the world. Today the USA is playing significant role in international politics because of its land location. Her vast territory of more than three million square miles, extended through twenty five degrees latitude in the temperate climate, her vast plain land covered with rich and fertile soils and moderately high plateaus offer a broad agricultural base to her economy, implying a surplus production of food and commercial crops and rearing cattle stocks. The nature also endowed USA with vast reserves of coal, petroleum, iron aluminum, copper radium and water power. Because of these mineral reserves USA become industrially most powerful country of the world. Added to this USA faces upon the world's two important oceans as business routes, which remain open throughout the year. These oceans not only offer cheap commercial service but also gave protection from the destruction and devastation in the world war. Again it is bonded by two friendly countries Mexico and Canada offering her full support and co-operation. All these factors enabled USA to influence and control the large number of nations as a super power.

Compared to USA the erstwhile Soviet Union which had been a super power was not blessed by all these factors. It had an area of eight million square miles and vast agricultural, forests, and mineral resources, offering her a sound economic base but at the same time it had large stretches of land of Tundra region where the land remains frozen throughout the year. The crop growing period in vast areas of Siberia is too short for the cultivation, which remains frozen is unfit for commercial and military activities. Therefore, USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist



Republic) had to depend mostly on friendly countries in order to generate power for its activities, unfortunately having a common boundary with a number of countries and maintain friendly relations with all is not an easy task and it draws heavily on resources of national power. Recent developments in Soviet Union have made it clear that the Union has disintegrated into vicarious independent nation. State of Russia is geographically still the largest state among all these states, yet it can not claim the status of super power hood now. ?

To a great extent maritime and continental location helps the nations. The states having long sea coasts get certain advantages. The sea can change the economic and political character of country. The sea is a store house of food and raw materials. It can offer cheap communication facilities and lessens the boundary problems along the coast. Now foreign power can attack easily. Due to these reasons the maritime power are more advanced economically than the land-locked state. The land-locked countries (the countries having no access to the sea like Nepal, Bolivia and Afghanistan.) have to depend on their neighbors for trade and other relations with the world. Switzerland and Luxemburg have to depend on Belgium and Netherlands to have an access to the North Sea. The state like Hungary Austria have to depend on Yugoslavia and Rumania for their access to the Black sea and Mediterranean., Any country depending on other states for the sea facilities cannot develop independent economy of geopolitical strength. Great Britain could control the colonies due to her supremacy over the oceans of the world and one part of Britain is more than 100 miles from the sea. India has a long coast line without natural harbors in the east which do not offer any attraction.

Most of the states situated in the northern hemisphere are commercially and economically well advanced and contain a high density of population . These states can utilize their resources for the maximum use and can also enjoy the facilities of marketing. However, these states often face stiff opposition and conflicts leading to wars. Most of the major wars were fought in northern hemisphere. The countries of Southern hemisphere so far did not enter into major conflicts because of their isolation barring few local wars which took place after Second World War.

The state located near to the Equator have to face a tropical climate where the temperature is high and climate is humid. The people in these countries have to work hard. In these areas the rainfall is either less or more, creating great havoc like famine, draught or floods. The climate affects the health of people and makes them economically backwards.

Similarly in the polar regions the people face severe cold which is not advantageous for living. The developed nations of today mainly USA, Britain, France are located in the mid-latitudes congenial for living and industrial improvement. These areas are neither too hot nor too cold for the people. The climate encourages the man to work hard to develop scientific technical and industrial skills.

The size of a state is another attribute in determining the power status. The large size of a state is more or less an assets for the development of the nation's capability and increasing its sphere of influence. The great powers of today. USA , Russia, France, and China have vast extensive areas. During the height of the colonial period, Great Britain enjoyed Great power status because of vast influence and control on the Afro-Asian states. The Soviet Union before disintegration in 1990 with 865 million square miles proved to be a source of strength. At that time the USSR frustrated and defeated the aggressor because of its size. The geography renders the conquest of Russian territory a liability for the conqueror. The USA with 30 miles square miles had a definite geographical advantage in becoming big power. A large size is linked generally with variety of natural resources capable of providing substance to a large number of population. The existence of abundant mineral resources scattered over different places in their extensive areas has given raise to wide and stable industrial base spreading over different reasons. In the nuclear war also the size helps the country to dispense the industries to various regions and construct nuclear installations at different spots. A country like Belgium and U.K. cannot take such steps due to their size. The size of USA and USSR contributed much to emergence their super power status. As a matter of fact the g geopolitical strength depends on the effective size as in some countries most of the areas may not be put into use. In Canada, the effective areas is confirmed to southern fudge and long distance and lack of communication facilities have a considerable part of the eastern and north eastern Siberia almost empty. Similarly, the vast Saudi Arabian deserts is more a handicap than benefit.

Thus, the geographical location of a country remains a fundamental factor a permanent importance which the foreign policies of all other nations must take into account.

#### **1.3.3.2 Natural Resources**

The natural resources is an other important element in the category of geography to act as factor for national power. It includes rivers, lakes,

waterfalls, fertility of the soil, food and raw materials including coal, cotton, raw wool, minerals. The utility of these raw materials and natural resources depend on the man's utilization and his resourcefulness. The raw materials get a shape when man employs his labor, capital and new technology.

The natural resources like water, lakes and waterfalls could be used to maximum extent as it provides cheap transport and hydro-electricity. In India people face every year flood havoc because they have yet to tame the rivers and utility water which is otherwise getting wasted.

The capability of a nation also depends on the production of foodstuffs, the countries which face scarcity of food-stuffs are vulnerable to foreign pressures. The insufficiency of food production in India often served as a restraint of its ability to pursue an effective foreign policy. The countries having abundant food material can use it as a weapon to purpose their national interest. The Soviet Union had also faced the problem of food scarcity due to the vagaries of climate conditions.

#### **Raw Materials :**

The industrial development of a nation ultimately depends upon the minerals and raw materials that a country possesses. These resources contribute for the industrial revolution. The nations are keen to exploit the raw material in order to increase their power in war and peace. However, it must be noted that mere possession of the raw materials will not produce power. The raw materials are to be exploited to the maximum extent for the betterment of a nation. The most important raw materials for every nation are iron, oil and coal. The countries can go with their developmental activities even with the coal by extracting oil from it. The Union of South Africa is experimenting to extract oil from coal due to the deepening oil crisis. For sometime the oil producing countries exercised tremendous influences in international politics. Similarly uranium and thorium are also likely to acquire same status keeping in view nuclear technology advances.

#### **1.3.3.3 Domestic System's Component :**

The working of domestic system depends on its population, its national character and morale and nature of its leadership, and industrial capacity and technological know how.

(a) **Size and structure of population** are datum points from which the modern state must reckon its political power position. The dynamics of population growth furnish valuable insight into the current and prospective power relationships of nations. Infact, man power is the

basis of military power. The size of the population determines the size of the armed forces and the quality and quantity of their weapons. Sheer number of men have counted heavily in their struggle for power throughout history. Rome marshaled on well trained reserved of man power larger than that of any other power of the ancient world. Conversely the decrease of Roman population and subsequent reliance upon foreign mercenaries weakened the fiber of Roman power and the fall of the empire was followed by a period of protracted population crises.

Throughout history decline in population has entailed decline in national power, Aristotle once observed that Sparta perished because of lack of Population. Similarly, Polonius held that de-population of the country-side and emptying cities were fundamental causes of the decline of Greece.

The history struggle for supremacy were waged by populous state and victory seems to have favored rising populations in the struggle for power in fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Italian principalities and city republics fell prey in turn to the emergent nation states- Spain and France whose military strength and economic might sprang from their more numerous better integrated people. The supremacy of the Austro-Spanish empire throughout tenth century was based on a population larger than that of any rival European state. The peak of French man power in relation to the rest of Europe lies somewhere between the conquest of Louis XIV and those of Napoleon. Germany's first bid for world power in 1914 was backed by the combined force of Reich, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey. The coalition at the height of its fortunes controlled between one hundred and fifty and one hundred and sixty million people. The History of the Second World War appears to confirm the saying attributed to Voltaire (a French revolutionary) "God is always on the side of the biggest battalions." It was vast military man power estimated variously as two or three times greater than the Germans which enabled the Soviet High command to maintain strong strategic reserves and reportedly threw fresh troops into battle, Germany could muster 3.9 million people without counting her newly acquired territories in the Baltic and South Eastern Europe during Second World War. No one knew better than Germans themselves how greatly Russian human reserve exceeded their own. These are some of the viewpoints in favor of large population.

Mere number of people however cannot be considered as a prime factor of geopolitical strength. Large number of population can be a

source of weakness. As an instance, we may quote India with its huge population outstanding economic development. In the country a large majority of people remain below the poverty line. Therefore, it is not the size of populations but the quality of population which has to be taken into account. It is for this reason alone that USSR with 240 million people in the past and USA with only 203 million people are much more powerful than China and India. The effectiveness of people depends upon a number of factors such as its composition, education and technological skills, rural and urban structures and the political ideology.

Age and sex composition of the population also play an important role in the nation building activity. Population composed of young population has the potentialities of a higher rate of growth. Japan in the first half of present century had a young population and this helped in its economic and industrial growth. Analysis of age structure of the population of India reveals that her population is very young. If the population is over aged or has an imbalance as in Britain and France, they have to depend on other countries to get their work done.

The nation must possess a balanced sex-ratio. If the young men outnumber women in any country. It may create social problems like maladjustments and psychological delinquency. Similarly, if the women outnumber men it may also create unfortunate conditions such as battle of the sexes. After second world war Germany suffered from acute shortage of men.

With the advent of industrialization and consequent developments the birth rate increased and the death rate decreased leading to an unprecedented growth in the world population. The rapid increase in the population may lead to lowering of the standards of living, migration and frictions as is being witnessed today in different parts of the world.

**(b) Political System :**

The domestic system as component of national power depends on race relation nationality, religion and language and finally the nature of the government and its efficiency. In South Africa, earlier the majority of the population was left out from entering into higher position due to apartheid laws. The segregation of population on the basis of color of race may weaken the national power as indicated by the on going racial warfare between white and the blacks. Similarly the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka can also be viewed. People settled in a country other than their country of origin do create geopolitical problems. A large number of foreign nationals

in Sri Lanka, Malaya, Burma, Union of South Africa and India, Mujahirs in Pakistan do create problems of political instability and economic crises.

The political strength of a nation depends on the uniformity of the region. Multi-religious groups often create frictions and intolerance. As a result the power of the nation declines. The national integrity and independence are often put to serve stress and strain by a religious minority on the edge of the border. Similarly multilingualism also acts as a divisive force. In India, as many as twenty two different languages are spoken out of which eighteen are now recognized by constitution and there is no unanimity for a common language. Often one notices the linguistic agitation in the country dividing the North and South. This is also not conducive to national strength.

**(c) National Character and Morale**

These terms are commonly used to denote the prominent characteristic of the people. It is generally said that the Americans are known for their initiative and enterprising spirit, the British for commonsense, the Germans for their toughness, the French for their exuberance etc. Morale of the nation plays a vital part in nation-building and for the success of the war. The Russians could make the stagnant agricultural country more productive one due to their morale. During the Second World War, Churchill the then Prime Minister of Great Britain fought the war with a slogan "we shall fight on the beaches we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills and we shall never surrender". This slogan provided the British people a new zeal to fight against the aggressor and win the war. The national character however depends on the type of leadership and industrial and technological advancement of the country.

**(d) Leadership**

A country gains importance through its leadership. A country may possess all the elements of power but it may not play significant role due to its weak leadership. India could overthrow the York or British imperialism mainly because of the leadership of Gandhi ji. Similarly, Winston Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt, Hitler, Nehru, Castro and Mao showed their leadership to the world. Good political leader always try to avoid war and work for peace through the act of diplomacy. A weak and confused diplomacy always ruins the advantage of national power.

**1.3.3.4 Bureaucracy**

In addition to the political leadership the political organization, the bureaucracy and the army also play a great role in establishing

leadership. The decisions of political executive become effective only when the bureaucracy works and implements the policies in earnest spirit. Similarly the nations is known by the success in the warfare. In times of peace and win propaganda is used change to war people's co-operation and to remove international barriers. Propaganda has great value in war times. Every belligerent nation makes use of this instrument. Today India is counted as a significant power in South Asia because of its victories of Pakistan in 1965 and 1971.

#### **1.3.3.5 Industrialization**

The effectiveness of national power is measured by the industrial development. Every political giant today is also an industrial giant. Industrialization provides better standard of living and helps the nation to build military hardware and highly sophisticated equipment. The USA and the earlier USSR have been highly industrialized states. Today, Japan and Germany have also attained high status due to their heavy industrialization.

#### **1.3.3.6 Technological Skills**

Every nation tries to develop its technological skills. Technology is the product of human energy and intellect. Technology is the main source whereby the nation can tame the rivers, build bridges, tunnel the mountains, extract oil from coal, hydro-electric power etc. The availability of atomic energy for peaceful and development purposes would make the life of a nation comfortable. Technology as a sourced of power is more known at the time of war. In the modern warfare it is not the divisions of the army that helps for winning the war but the sophisticated technology the country uses.

#### **1.3.3.7 Ideology**

Ideology forms an important aspect of national power. Lerche and Said define ideology as a self-contained and self-justifying belief system that incorporates and overall world view and provide a basis for explain all reality. Schleicher viewed ideology as a system of abstract ideas held by an individual which purports to explain reality, expresses values goals and certain programs of action for the retention or attainment of the kind of social order in which its proponent believe the goals can best be realized. There various ideologies are like liberalism,, democratic socialism, communism, fascism, nationalism, Gandhism, internationalism and non-alignment. There are various religious ideologies like Christianity, Hinduism, and the like.

Hans Morgenthau enumerates three types of ideologies namely ideologies of status quo, ideologies of imperialism and ambiguous ideologies.

A policy of status quo is generally accepted to maintain peace. The countries already powerful have little of gain but change in status quo and the developing countries also prefer status quo, for enable them to concentrate on nation building.

The ideology of imperialism has been supported by the expansionist countries on the basis of biological arguments. On the international plane it amounts to dominate as the "White man's burden" to rule over them.

Sometimes the ideologies of anti imperialism have been used to disguise the aggressive policy. The USA's appeal to the developing nations to keep a watch over the communist expansionism is mainly meant to divert the countries from its policy of expanding influences.

The nationalism as an ideology attracted the people who were under the yoke of colonial rule. The Afro-Asian countries borrowed the idea of self determination to gain independence. Similarly, the ideological of non-alignment has been propagated and supported with a view to keep both the ideology block at an equidistance.

Every ideology whether based on economic or religious ideas forms an important element of nation power. In the days of power politics according to Morgenthau the political actor seeks to indoctrinate his audience with his ideology or his part's ideology.

#### **1.3.4 Conclusion**

To sum up all these elements make the nation powerful and enable it to play its role international scene. With the exception of USA all the countries are having one drawback or the other. The countries which are endowed with the raw material are not in a position to play the effective role because of non-exploitation of the raw materials lack of technological and scientific know-how and also lack of effective planning on the part of these countries. Countries like Japan are playing significant role even though they are not having sufficient raw materials and this may be due to effective leadership and long term planning. Any nation can play its role effectively provided it balances the raw materials and the economic development.

#### **1.3.5 Self-Check Exercise**

1. What is the meaning of National Power. (4 marks)
2. How important are the geographical factors for the power of a nation. (4 marks)



3. What do you mean by National Character. (4 marks)
4. What is National Power? Describe elements of national power.  
(5+10 marks)

**1.3.6 Suggested Readings**

1. Manindra Kumar : Theoretical Aspects of International Politics.
2. Rama S. Melkoet & : International Relations.  
A. Narsimha Rao

**THE CONCEPT OF BALANCE OF POWER: THEORY AND PRACTICE**

- 1.4.1 Objectives of this lesson
- 1.4.2 Introduction
- 1.4.3 Balance of Power : Problems of Definition
- 1.4.4 Various meanings of Balance of Power
- 1.4.5 Purposes of Balance of Power
- 1.4.6 Assumptions of Balance of Power system
- 1.4.7 Devices to maintain Balance of Power
- 1.4.8 Critiques of Balance of Power
- 1.4.9 The Balance of Power in practice
- 1.4.10 Conclusion
- 1.4.11 Self Check Exercise
- 1.4.12 Suggested Readings

**1.4.1 Objectives of this lesson**

1. To understand the definition and various meanings of the term Balance of Power.
2. To study the purposes and assumptions of Balance of Power
3. To know about various devices used in the Balance of Power
4. To study the critical analysis of the system of Balance of Power.

**1.4.2 Introduction**

The concept of "**balance of power**" Which elevated itself to the levels of theory is one of the oldest and most controversial of all concepts of international politics. The concept of the balance of power developed gradually with the emergence of state system. It could be traced implicitly in ancient Indian and Greek history though the concept had to wait until two world wars of his twentieth century to be formally articulated. The modern concept of balance of power was closely associated with scientific progress made in seventeenth centeenth century which reached its zenith Newtonian conception of universe in equilibrium. In the realms of astronomy and mechanics the central principal is precisely one of

balance. Theorists of international social reality also employ "balance as a central organisation are driven." And yet, theorizing made painfully slow progress in spite and possibly because of the great popularity made painfully slow progress in spite and possibly because of the great popularity of the concept.

#### **1.4.3 Balance of Power : Problems of Definition :**

Balance of power is not a precise and easily measurable concept. It has been interpreted in different ways by scholars and practitioners of international politics. Ernst B. Hass in a seminal article criticized it as too vague a concept for use by political scientists. He found at least eight distinct meanings described the term as:

- (a) equilibrium resulting from equal distribution of power among nation states ;
- (b) equilibrium resulting from an unequal distribution of power among nation states ;
- (c) equilibrium resulting from the dominance of one nation state ;
- (d) a system providing relative stability and peace ;
- (e) a system characterized by instability and peace ;
- (f) another way of saying power politics ;
- (g) a universal law of history ; and
- (h) a system and guide of policy makers .

Inis L. Claude agrees with Ernest Hass when he says that "the trouble with the balance power is not that it has no meaning, but that it has too many meanings."

Though, as seen above the concepts of "balance of power" is riddled with ambiguities, yet we can not discard the balance of power concept despite its imprecision, because it is near the very core of international politics.

We shall discuss balance of power in a descriptive and as an analytical aid to our understanding of the mechanism of international regulation. Before we come to defining the balance of powers system :

- (a) A multiplicity of sovereign political actors.
- (b) The absence of a single centralised legitimate and strong authority over these sovereign actors.
- (c) Relatively unequal distribution of status, wealth, size (powers) among the political actors that make up the system. This permits the differentiation of state into at least three categories : great powers intermediate power and smaller nation states.

- (d) Continuous but controlled competition and conflict among sovereign political actors what are perceived as scarce world resurces and values.
- (e) An implicit understanding among the reulers of the great powers that the perpetuatin of the existing power distribution bendfit them mutually.

Keeping these pre-requitsties in mind we can sum up this part of our discussion in the words of James, E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgaff.

"It is theoretically possible to conceive the balance of power as a situation or condition or a universal tendancy or law of state behaviour, as a guide for statesmanship and a mode of system maintenance characteristic of certain types of international system. As long as we think in terms of equilibrium rather than superiority, these four usages need not to be inconsistent with one another".

"Concerived as a situation or a condition, balance of power implies an objective arrangement in which there is relatively widespread satisfaction with the distribution of power. The universal tendency of law describes a probability and enables one to predict that members of a system threatened by the emergence of a "disturber of the balance" that is a power seeminlgy bent upon the establishment of an international hegemony, will form a countervailing coalition. Balance of power as a policy guide persciribes to statement who would act "rationally" that countervailing coalition against the disrupter of equilibrium. Balance of power system refers to multinational society refers to multinational society in which all essential actors preserve their identity, integrity and independence through the balancing process.

#### **1.4.4 Various meanings of Balance of Power**

As earlier stated, the balance of power different things at different times. Let us consider the various meanings attributed to the term:

##### **1.4.4.1 Balance Of Power As A Situation :**

The balance of power sometimes means equiliubrium. In this sence the terms describes a situation in which power relationship between states or groups of states is one of rough or precise equality. Often the term is also interpreted as a factual situation in which competing powers are not balanced to a condition of disequilibrium. As Nicholas J. Spykman put it, "the truth of the matter is that states are interested only in a balance which is in their favor. Not equilibrium but a generous margin is their objective.....The balance desired is the one which neutralize

other states, leaving the home state free to the deciding force and the deciding voice."

#### **1.4.4.2 Balance of power as a policy :**

It is also identified as a policy of promoting the creation or the preservation of equilibrium. This is based on the principle that power is dangerous. It is believed that in a multi-state system, the only policy which may prevent the undesirable behaviour of other nation states is that of confronting power with counter vailing power.

Some times a distinction is made between balance of power as a condition and balance of power as a means of producing or maintaining a condition by using such terms as "**balance of power policy**" or the policy of balance to express the letter. It is also identified as a principle which may or should guild policy. On the other hand, since balance of power is also used to describe a situation of disequilibrium, it is in also used to designate a policy of atttemption to achieve such situation. The balance of power is come times taken synonymous with struggle for power. It is in this sense that Morgenthau and Thompson use this term; the balance of power 'consists in the attempt on the one nation to contract the power of another nation by increasing its strength to a point where it is at least equal, if not superior to the other nation's strength."

#### **1.4.4.3 Balance of power as a system :**

Balance of power is also viewed as a system of international politics. According to Inis Claude" perhaps the most common use of the phrase balance of power mean not a certain type of power configuration, or a certain type of power configuration, or a certain "precinct of policy", but a certain kind of arrangement for the operation of international law in a world of many states." Many scholars of international politics like A.J.P. Taylor and Charles Lerche have spoken of balance of power as a system, through each one holds a different view point about the nature of the system. Where some have stressed the automatic or self-regulating character of the balance system, others believe that it is a system wholly dependent upon manipulations carried out by the shrewd statesman.

#### **1.4.4.4 Balance of Power as a Symbol :**

Many writer use the term "balance of power" not as a concept but as a symbol of realistic and prudent concern with the problem of power in international relations. "This usage is based on negative contentions that disregard for balance of power shows a neglected factor in international politics. To put it otherwise the recognition of the power factor is bound to

result in foreign policies based of power. The contention is guided by the realist philosophy.

#### **1.4.5 Purposes of Balance of Power**

This various meaning is attributed to the concept of balance of power is to provide for maintenance of peace and security of those actors involved in this process of balancing. For Vernon Von Dyke though the peace is often stated as main purpose of balance of power, it is security which is most fundamental with all their resources and abilities. This diplomacy of balance of power process with all their resources and abilities. This diplomacy of balance of power is directed primarily towards creation of a favorable distribution of power, which may be the maintenance of existing equilibrium or status quo, of changes in status quo or disallowing preponderance of a particular power. In brief the states as actors in the balance of power system are motivated by the demands of national interests which remain unfulfilled in the given distribution of power, states would normally not hesitate in resorting to war to recreate a favorable balance.

However, so long as the desired balance of power could be maintained by the diplomacy of deterrence, arms, race, alliances and other such methods, and preponderance of a particular power dissatisfied with given balance of power is disallowed, one could say that the purpose of balance is to maintain peace and stability. The balance of power systems become unstable and create power, for example, Germany after peace settlement of 1919. In this context one must point out that equilibrium does not help to strengthen balance, rather it creates situations of conflict and war. What is, therefore, unique in this system is use of such a balance forces which lean in favor of a particular state against other.

#### **1.4.6 Assumptions of Balance of Power System:**

As peace and security in international politics can never attain to the levels of absoluteness the balance of power system from Congress of Vienna to First World War (1815-1914) helped to provide for relative peace and stability. In other words, during this period major wars were avoided and given structure of international system were maintained. Drawing upon the experience of this phase of history, Professor Quincy suggest five major assumptions of balance of power system, on the basis of which it functions :-

##### **1.4.6.1 The first major assumption "is the assertion of the dominance of state system.** The states are committed to project

and consolidate their vital interests in international politics. These interests are generally territorial integrity, independence, security and preservation of its domestic, economic and political system. It is true that at a certain point of time a state may decide to place its priorities differently as it is exclusive domain of the state to determine which its vital interests are and what means are to be allocated for its furtherance. However, generally states do not compromise their territorial sovereignty, independence and other attributes of statehood and these are invariably fundamental concepts.

**1.4.6.2** Second assumption is that the states being placed in a competitive system are always haunted by the fear that their basic interests may be threatened. To protect themselves against this, the state remain concerned with overall distribution of power, their place in international system, while engaging themselves with the enlargement of the capability base, it is assumed in this state dominated system that the capacity of state to launch attack for promotion of its personal interest is function of the relationship operating between the actor states. Absence of perception of threat would imply that there is no need to protect anything and would obviously make a balance of power system non-functional. This assumption therefore implies full mobilization of its national power resource base.

**1.4.6.3** Third assumption is that balance of power system helps in the protection of fundamental interests by threatening others with initiating wars and by providing active support to the victim to win in case aggression occurs. It assumes that states may go down treating each but shall not go for war unless they feel militarily superior.

**1.4.6.4** The fourth assumption of balance of power is that the power potentials of the actors can be calculated. The competing states can have, according to balance of power theory, fairly assessment of each other's power potentials. This fairly accurate measurement power position can be utilized in balancing or shaping the distribution of power in its own favor by formulating a foreign policy on that basis.

**1.4.6.5** The fifth assumption that the statesman in balance of power system formulate their foreign policy decision on the basis of intelligent calculation of given power balance and of its requirement

viewed basically within power consideration. In other words, foreign policy and diplomacy is highly rational process rationally perused on the basis of adequate information.

All these assumptions obviously present balance of power as a rational theory which does not allow any unpredictability to creep in. An examination of these assumptions would however, make it clear that first four assumptions see to be theoretically sound as they draw their philosophical sustenance from the power politics school.

The fifth assumption, however, is not simply contradictory in itself but also questions the logic and rationality base of other four assumptions and makes them untenable. Fifth assumption claims that decision makers would formulate their foreign policy on the basis of intelligence understanding or power considerations. In other words, the vital interests of the states are to be protected by balance of power obviously stipulated in advance and there shall be general consensus among the decision makers of various states. Absence of these two conditions which is a reality in the field of international politics makes the claim of fifth assumption untenable. Therefore, to claim rationality in balance of power model is to expect something that is non-existent. Moreover it can not be claimed that an intelligent person must make a choice for a sound policy. To conclude, balance of power of its theoretical assumptions but because of the inherent dynamics of power games which took care of the moral factors and other considerations and it is in this context that it devised certain devices to maintain itself.

#### **1.4.7 Devices to maintain Balance of Power:**

Balance of power system is dynamic in character and history shows that states do follow this principle in practice. In order to restore a favorable balance of power or distribution of forces, states have always been engaged in continuous interaction and thereby evolved certain devices, to maintain balance of power. These techniques are as follows:

##### **1.4.7.1 Alliances and counter alliances**

The system of alliance is as old as the history of organized human communities. It is the most commonly applied technique of the balance of power. It has been a traditional instrument to improve the power position of a state and to weaken that of another. According to Morgenthau, 'Alliances are necessary for function of the balance of power operating within a multiple-state system.' The various security pacts are clearly designed to improve the military power position. The chief object of any alliance is the



improvement of power. In fact, such alliances have enabled the middle and small powers to survive history.

Alliances generally lead to counter alliances: After all, an outside power will not remain silent when an alliance is specifically or indirectly against it. The Warsaw pact of 1955 was developed as a sharp reaction to the Atlantic Alliance (NATO) of 1949. Alliances or counter-alliances may be general specific, regional or local. Alliances are normally built up out the recognition of common interest. They are protected against an identified enemy. They tend to break up with the fulfillment of objectives, i.e. the disappearance of the enemy from the scene. Alliances may be offensive and defensive. Both these form aim from an opposing alliance, as aggregating military power. However, alliances and counter alliances have played a major role in the preservation of the balances of power. But they have also contributed to the creation of suspicion and instability.

#### **1.4.7.2. Compensation and Partition**

The technique involves the redistribution of territory in such a form so that international equilibrium is not affected. Each Great Power becomes a beneficiary and weak state becomes an obvious victim. Generally the question of such redistribution arises at the conclusion of war. But it may also arise even during the peace time. Every Great power wants to ensure that such redistribution does not unduly strengthen the other power, thereby upsetting the balance.

#### **1.4.7.3. Armament and Disarmament**

Armament is the best way to improve the relative power position of a state. It is the typical instrumentally of an unsaid and dynamic balance of power. Arms have been welcomed as useful addition to national power on a unilateral basis. The more armed a state is the more weight it will carry in international relations, and the more favorable balance it can expect in further inspiration for arm race.

Like armament and disarmament can destroy or restore a balanced of power. Disarmament is somewhat similar to the technique of territorial compensation. Disarmament has been utilized from time to time by victorious powers to keep a favorable balance of power. The Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963, the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 are the examples to use disarmament as a technique to preserve the balance of powers.

**1.4.7.4. Divide and Rule**

This technique is designed to keep the competitions weak by dividing them or keeping them divided and thereby maintains a balance of power. The aim of all colonialists has been and remains to divide and rule. Sino-Soviet conflict and French American conflict are kept under close supervision by the super power in the interest of this technique of balance of power.

**1.4.7.5. Buffer States**

The establishment of a buffer state has also operated as another technique of the balance of power. Such a state is usually a weak one. It is located between two powerful neighbours. It always keeps them safety apart, and thereby contributes to the peace and stability, and thus maintains the balances of power. Tibet was a buffer state between the imperial China and the British India. After 1945, the cease fire zone or neutral zones have indirectly served the cause of buffer states in a new world situation. They also prevented a direct confrontation of super power, and there by maintained a stable balance of power.

**1.4.7.6. Intervention and War:**

The technique has been frequently employed to maintain or restore the balance of power. But it has to be admitted that it is an extreme step, and generally restored to as a matter of last refuge. Intervention takes the form of a dictatorial interference into the affairs of another country in order to enforce some specific demands. It is obviously a policy which can only be restored by the Great powers in relation to a weak state. The bipolar system has certainly widened the opportunity of intervention within the prescribed sphere of influence. American intervention has definitely taken place in the interest of maintaining or restoring the balance of power. The balance of power theory has also admitted the possibility of pre-emptive war in order to forestall the danger of rising consolidation of power.

**1.4.8 Critiques of Balance of Power:**

The balance of power theory has encountered much criticism from many scholars of international politics for reasons other than semantic vagueness. According to Nicholas J. Spykman the theory inadequately explains the practice: The truth of the matter is that states are interested only in a balance (imbalance) which is in their favor. Not equilibrium but a generous margin in their objective. There is no real security in being just as strong as a potential enemy; there is security only in being a little stronger. There is no possibility of action if one's strength is fully checked

there is a chance for a positive foreign policy if there is a margin of force which is freely used."

Again Morgenthau has found the balance of power deficient on several grounds. It has failed on a number of occasions, since the end of the eighteenth century to preserve the independent existence of states. The multistage systems precluded a single state from achieving universal domination has been preserved only at the price of frequent and costly wars. He finds the balance of power (1) uncertain as no completely reliable means of measuring, evaluating and comparing power exists; (2) unreal because statesmen try to compensate for its uncertainty by aiming for superiority ; (3) Inadequate for explaining national restraint during most of the years from 1848 to 1914 because it does not give credit with regard to influence of their basic intellectual amenity and moral consensus than prevailing to Europe. Charles, P. Schleicher also believes that "peace is most in jeopardy when power is rather evenly balanced and war less likely when there is a preponderant power."

Ernest B. Hass has observes in an article on balance of power in "**Journal of Politics**" that the balance of power as a policy guide assumes a high degree of flexibility in national discussion-making. The vigilant states must change according to changing power calculations. They must be ready to intervene or enter into coalition almost immediately to preserve the balance and do this regardless of ideological affinities, economic interests and domestic political attitudes. Hass has also questioned the degree to which policy makers, especially in domestic countries can enjoy the kind of flexibility which the balance of power theory would seem to demands.

Some writers believe that cultural homogeneity of the European state system form the seventeenth through the nineteenth century was an important precondition for the successful operation of the balance of power. All international analysts agree that in the century the state system encompasses states with different cultural background. Moreover, internationalist ideologies now challenging what for a long time has been the most powerful political force on the world senenationalism. This obviously helps complicate the operation of the balance of power.

In spite of the fact that the balance of power theory is often regarded as crude, unsophisticated, simplistic or obsolete theory of international politics, it is difficult to deny its importance for an adequate explanation of what actually happens in the international system and as the basis on which foreign policy is formulated and conducted.

#### **1.4.9 The Balance of Power in Practice**

Through the concept of balance of power could be traced in ancient Indian and Greece literature if flourished in the period between 1648 (the peace of Westphalia) and 1789 (the French Revolution) although the period between congress of Vienna (1815) and the Russo-Japanese War (1905) could be considered as the Nonetheless it was its first phase of golden age of classical balance of power. It was in the course of Spanish War and the period leading up to it that the principle of the "balance of power" was rendered increasingly explicit in diplomacy. The war waged expressly in the name of the "balance of power of the anti-French coalition which by and large, succeeded in imposing its will in the shape of the separation of the French and Spanish Crowns. The treaty of Utrecht (1713) which ended the war contained a clause by which the "balance of power" was elevated from a political slogan to a principle of international order. Most important still, the treaty imposed an obligation on its signatories to maintain that balance.

The French Revolution destabilized the European classical balance of power system with the advent of the Napoleon Bonaparte on the France political horizon who gave a militant and messianic character to the slogans like "liberty, equality, fraternity" and the fusion of nationalism with popular sovereignty. His military campaigns were directed towards the creation of a new world order. This went against the rules of classical balance of power behavior that wars should be kept limited, and no attempt should be made by any one great power to conquer and destroy any other great power.

To restore the balance of power legitimacy and moderation to highly disturbed international system the European nations convened the Congress of Vienna (1815) after the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo under the diplomatic leadership of Prince Metternich of Austria and Czar Alexander of Russia a new area of balance of power was structured. It lasted until the beginning of the World War I.

The period from 1815 to 1914 can be called the second golden age of the classical balance of power. The great powers of this period i.e., England, France, Prussia, Austria-Hungary and Russia followed what one another has termed as the practice of stable and ideologically homogenous international politics. This meant the European rulers were in ideological agreement concerning the nature of acceptable relations between rulers

and ruled. They also called for a combined action against popular, nationalist movements as that would have threatened the national and international status quo. This was the main reasons for wars being reduced to the minor status of violent but limited politico-military tools for the adjustment of marginal dispute among nation-states and it was during this period that international law of war flourished. But by the late nineteenth century the order of Vienna began to give way under the impact of new and challenging social forces. The technological breakthroughs in the industrial revolution resulted in a major transformation in the international political system.

#### **1.4.10 Conclusion**

The twentieth century which witnessed two major world wars and Cold War can be called a revolutionary age although now it has come to an end with the demise of Soviet bloc. It also saw the rise of two super powers, the United States and Soviet Union spearheading the free-enterprises capitalist and communist ideology respectively. Since Second World War, the superpowers had been looked in the race of producing destructive nuclear weapons which in turn has contained the cold war conflict below the threshold of global nuclear war. In the aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) which brought United States and the Soviet Union to the brink of nuclear war we had seen the stalemated war of attrition in Vietnam, the unfolding of a deep and uncompromising conflict between Soviet Union and the China and also a global attempt to restore the classical balance power of system. Until the dismemberment of soviet bloc which now has given rise to a kind of unipolar world.

#### **1.4.11 Self-Check Exercise**

1. What is the definition of Balance of Power? (4 marks)
2. Explain Balance of Power as a system. (4 marks)
3. Name various devices being used in the Balance of Power system (4 marks)
4. Discuss meaning and assumptions of Balance of Power. (15 marks)
5. Explain various devices and criticism of Balance of Power system. (15 marks)

#### **1.4.12 Suggested Readings:**

1. Mahindra Kumar : Theoretical Aspects of International Politics
2. Hans Morgenthau : Politics Among the Nations
3. Kenneth Waltz : Theory of International Politics

**CONCEPT OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS**

- 1.5.1 Objectives of this lesson
- 1.5.2 Introduction
- 1.5.3 Collective Security (what it is)
- 1.5.4 Development of the idea of collective security
- 1.5.5 Characteristic features of collective security system
- 1.5.6 Main Assumptions and critical appraisal
- 1.5.7 Collective security and International Organisations
- 1.5.8 Conclusion
- 1.5.9 Self Check Exercise
- 1.5.10 Suggested Readings

**1.5.1 Objectives of this lesson**

- 1. To understand the meaning of collective security
- 2. To discuss the characteristics of collective security
- 3. To study the main assumptions of collective security
- 4. To know about how collective security system functions in international relations?

**1.5.2 Introduction**

Security is essential precondition of an ordered human existence. State being an organized human collectivity, it seeks to create the environment of security, internally as well as externally so that the people may pursue their social and economic goals without undue anxiety and fear. It has not been a very easy task for their government particularly in international environment. The community of states, which is theoretically and legally equal, is in fact a hierarchy, the order of which is determined by capability and power that it possesses. Therefore, the efforts of states to create environment of peace and security while serving its interest, creates a situation of conflict. These conflicts in the past and in our time have often resulted in war among the states. But the states have also aspired to live under peace and harmony- a situation in which the use of force is either totally abolished or minimized. This interest of theirs has not been only at polemical level. Efforts were made towards this direction

in the past but this goal remains as elusive as ever. Collective security system is one of such attempts made by the members of international society in our time.

Particularly after the realization of inadequacies of Balance of Power System which breeds competition and rivalry and creates war, the efforts were initiated to evolve a mechanism within which the power could be tamed for general security and peace, collective security, disarmament and peaceful resolution of conflict are some of the concepts which were initially conceived in this context. These concepts promise to provide durable peace in which the power is so managed in international politics that the chances of war would be minimal. For this reason, these approaches have been termed as approaches to peace. But being non-feasible in practice and also that they themselves became the issue of diplomacy, they are viewed as problems of international politics by the students and the practitioners of diplomacy.

Indeed it is questionable, if the proposed mechanism of collective security may provide actual peace. Whether that is just "peace" and could it satisfy the aspirations of all participant states, this we will examine in the course of discussion. Our primary purpose at this point is to provide a detailed exposition of this concept which has been quite popular not only with the students and the reformers of international politics but also with the practitioners who tried to devise the plan to make the system of collective security functional.

In this chapter the concept of collective security has been dealt with view to explain, says to what are its definitional component, meanings, main assumptions. Its implications and its impact on international politics also need a discussion. It will help to understand as to what extent it has been successful. Naturally such analysis will bring us closer to identify the inherent contradictions and weaknesses of this approach and its predicament.

### **1.5.3 Collective Security (What it is)**

The concept of collective security is most specialized a technical term in the vocabulary of international politics. The term itself suggests the fundamental meaning of the concept, that is the security of all the nations, where one is for all and all is for one. Security is its primary goal. That is attained through the collective means of military and non-military resources of the member state. In its efforts to become operational, Collective security seeks to create an institutional framework

joined by all the states by pooling their resources together for the maintenance of the security of all states.

#### **1.5.4 Development of the idea of Collective Security**

It is generally believed that President Woodrow Wilson is the enunciator of the concept of collective security in the international politics. Revising the draft constitutional of the World War International Organization prepared by colonel House, Mr. Wilson made a forceful plea for the establishment "of an organization of peace which shall make it certain that the combined power of the free nations will checks invasions of the right.

Indeed, it is due to his efforts that the principles of Collective Security became the cardinal feature of the League of Nations, which he thought would be able to provide order in international society. But the origin and development of the idea can be traced back to the seventeenth century Treaty of and Osnabruick William Penn's scheme for European Order.

It would not be however, irrelevant to recall that the interest in creating its durable basis is not sudden development. Modern international system which was in operation for a century (1818-1915) was based upon the balance of power system. The old Concert of Europe with the European powers had developed as machinery for attempting to contain international conflict after 1815. However, it simply failed by 1914. Some argue that Germany had precipitated in this crisis by not giving enough time to other European powers to settle the crisis by negotiations and the opposing alliances went action almost automatically even though there had been a section who believed that a new balance of power may be created. By the end of nineteenth and early twentieth century there had been a powerful section including the practitioners who believed that new conceptual structure was needed to regulate the lawlessness of the states. The collective Security emerged as an alternative to balance of power system.

Balance of power system had although created a group if its critics such earlier but it became a distinct trend by the early twentieth century. President Theodore Roosevelt's assertion of 1902, that it is incumbent upon all the civilized and orderly powers to insists upon proper policing of the world, and also his Nobel Prize address initiation a "League of peace" could be cited as evidence of their criticism of balance of power system besides his preference for collective security system.



Again in 1910 Dutch Scholar C. Von Vollenhoven insisted upon the creation of international enforcement machinery based upon this concept. Thus by the time of the outbreak of first world war, a distinct group had emerged on the international scene, determined to rectify the system's proven inability to prevent war. The idea of the collective security system was one of the weapons in their hands.

President Woodrow Wilson who projected himself as the greatest protagonist of the idea of collective system had felt very strongly that war of 1914 was created by the verily nationalism of Europe and it was result of manipulation of power by immoral men. However, he could command a leading role because he commanded biggest battalions by 1918 and America was most powerful nation. Moreover on the European continent it there had been a feeling of favor of Collective Security System and Britain had already prepared a blue-print before the U.S. forces joined the war.

For these reasons we find a consensus in favor of collective system and readiness on the part for States to create an organization powerful enough to implement those principles which could ensure for durable peace. It remained a constant theme in international politics since the creations of League of Nations. After its demise, United Nations once again made a determined bid to provide a new life to the idea of the collective security system.

#### **1.5.5 Characteristic features of Collective Security system**

The basic philosophical assumption of the idea of collective security is that conflict among the states is bound to occur. Although they can be resolved through peaceful means, it is possible that they may result in war also. As the wars endanger peace and security they ought to be prevented by the superior force compared to that of the causes and consequences of war. It simply tries to create a superior force by pooling the collectivity, and in that sense it is specialized instrument of international policy which is directed to forestall the arbitrary and aggressive use of coercive power. This provides certain unique characteristics of the collective security system.

- (a) The first and foremost characteristic feature of collective security is that it does not allow the aggressive use of force. Whatever the differences are among the states, they can be resolved only through peaceful means.
- (b) It believes in the deterrent effect of the force. A nation planning to initiate an aggression normally does not change his mind on human consideration but on the considerations of

overwhelmingly superior power which should be ready to strike back. Such overwhelming force would naturally become the trustee of world peace and security.

- (c) Collective security system insists, therefore, pooling of the efforts and resources of all the states. It emphasizes that all the nations must pledge themselves to stand together against aggressor nations by isolating and overwhelming it with superior power.
- (d) The system of collective security believes upon the principle of indivisibility of peace. How so ever, small a nation may be the attack inflicted upon it may not be of any consequence, but it can create situation of greater insecurity by spoiling the fabric of international order.
- (e) Collective security is not designed against any particular nation or a group of nations nor is it for the benefit of nay one. It believes that all the nations are innocent yet they cold are aggressor, by raising war illegally, and that is to be prevented.
- (f) Collective security, therefore, by implication attempts to perpetuate status quo, an attempt towards the maintenance of existing state of affairs. Peaceful changes are compatible but forceful chance of the order or the existing situation is something for which the states are called upon to oppose by the superior force of the collectivity.
- (g) The most significant feature of collective security is the deterrent effect to this system. It contends if the things go according to the plea perhaps the use of force will not be necessary at all. Simple display of the highest force or the force of collectivity would be enough to deter the aggressive force.

These characteristics apparently make it is rational system having possibility of being successful provided certain requirements which it places upon the nation state and international system is fulfilled. Inis Claude Categorizes them in two broad categories: Subjective and Objective.

Subjective requirements according to him relate "to general acceptability of the responsibilities of Collective Security" and the "Objective requirements" are related to the suitability of global situations to the operations of collective system.

The basic purpose or philosophy of these requirements, if they could be fulfilled by the actors of international politics, would result in calculation of certain values in the behavior of the state which would make collective security system successful, by managing "power" in international society in a rational manner.

### **Subjective Requirements**

1. The idea of "**indivisibility of peace**" must be believed and practiced by all the governments and its people. The principal of geographical remoteness of aggression is irrelevant in this context. If any conflict occurs in an remote corner it cannot be ignored because the fabric of mankind is so tightly inter woven that a breach any where threatens disintegration everywhere."
2. "**The idea of world community**" must guide the behavior of the states. To use Inis Claude's word's: "The people of the world must identify their particular interests so closely with the general interests of mankind that they go beyond mere recognition of interdependence to a feeling of involvement in the destiny of all nations."
3. States must renounce the use of war as an **instrument of national policy**, but at the same time must not be mere pacifists. They should be prepared to wage the war for the fulfillment of international obligation. Obviously, in this context nation states must sacrifice their immediate interest of particular gains for the success of the preferable system of collective security.
4. States must be willing to accept commitments involving sacrifice of their freedom of action. For certain situations may demand restraint on their freedom of action may be implication weaken collective security system. It, therefore, establishes the preeminence of international authority to determine the use of coercive power, which has been traditionally the jurisdiction of national sovereignty.

### **Objective Requirements**

Objective requirements deal with the power situations, legal situations and organizational goals in order to realize its objective.

1. Ideal power distribution according to the collective security is one where there is greater diffusion of power or equal distribution of resources of power. In such situations : state

would not tend to go for war due to the possibility of equal relation from other states. Existence of one or two preponderant powers as is the case in our times places serious restraint on its successful functioning.

2. It demands universal membership of all the states. It does not share the view that the probable aggressors may be excluded or denied membership as it is difficult to identify the probable aggressor. Moreover, it will reduce the membership of the system also.
3. It demands compulsory membership of the major powers because exclusion or abstention of some states might weaken this system by reducing the chances of effective application of sanction which are necessary instrument to strengthen the system of collective security. It is also possible that aggressor state may have the blessings of major power on its side if they are outside this system.
4. It also requires effective implementation of disarmament to attain the ideal situation of equal distribution of power.
5. It encourages greater economic interdependence among the states particularly for the reasons that it could be useful corrective measure against a state which is violation the provision of collective security.
6. Apart from these requirements it creates a legal and institutional framework where in the states must accept basic principles of security and authorize the emerging organization to invoke such principles and take necessary action against the aggressor state.
7. Lastly, the states must decide to create such organization based upon the equality of state. It must not be subservient to the interest of any particular group of states.

At the outset these general requirements appear to be feasible having ample theoretical basis. But a simple security makes it clear that requirements are too demanding. Subjective requirements try to inculcate certain values which helps in creating a world order where the coercive power is centralized and certain norms of behavior viz., the peaceful resolution of conflict, international peace as national interest, are accepted as prerequisite objective requirements. While arguing for equal distribution of power, it attempts to impose certain constraints on use of force. Collective security system tried to operate between the world order

on the one side and Balance of power on the other. But it did not succeed in attaining its objective of peace, precisely for the reason that the major assumptions upon which the general theory of collective security is based, does not take into account the process of actual politics.

#### **1.5.6 Main Assumptions and Critical Appraisal**

1. The first assumption of collective security system is that all the nations would agree upon identifying as to who is the aggressor and launch immediate action to the extent of waging a war. In real practice, it is generally very difficult to identify the aggressor. The discussion over Korean issue can be cited as evidence to this effect.

Lack of a proper definition of aggression has compounded our problem of locating the aggressor. The suitable examples in case would be Japanese attack on Manchuria, Italy's attack upon Ethiopia. The latest example is Arab-Israeli wars where it has been always difficult to reach at a general agreement about aggressor and that has usually prevented action in accordance with the provisions of collective security system.

There is another dimension of the problem which goes unnoticed by the collective security systems. When one is supposed to do if he is constantly being threatened by a superior power but without actual use of the military forces? Can one invoke collective security provisions? the history of international politics is replete with such instances. There have been ideological penetration, use of economic means of coercion etc. which helped in attaining objective which one could achieve through aggression.

It can perhaps function if some small power has initiated act of aggressive action. It would be however, difficult to implement collective security measures if the war has been initiated by the big power. Such a situation would require advance preparation and if that is initiated then the collectively can be termed as an aggressor. Therefore, unless the ideal situation of equal distribution of power is achieved, collective security will remain a weak system.

2. Second assumption of collective system is that there is *universal interest in preventing the occurrence of war*. This proposition cannot be testified by historical facts. It is erroneous to believe that the aggressor nation will not have any friends and the members of the collectivity will remain unaffected by the friendly ties economic, a political and other relationship while stipulating action against the aggressor. Moreover this proposition can be falsified by a simple assertion that it is curiously contradictory to assume on the one hand that all nations are equally a

capable of becoming aggressors and on the other that they are equally interested in stopping aggression when it occurs.

**3.** Its belief in the *universal ability to oppose the action is also doubtful*. To put it differently, it assumes that these nations are free to join in action along with others to oppose the aggressor, and also their force would be superior enough to over when the aggressor.

However, testing this assumption against hard realities, one would share the view that a small nation having powerful aggressor nation as its neighbor is unlikely to join any action against such states under collective security system. These nations are firstly too weak to defend themselves successfully and other nations are too distant to prevent their fall if the attack is launched. The other nations can promise their liberation after the conquest is completed, but liberation is likely to prove even more destructive than the initial conquest.

It is for these reasons, the *neutrality* as a policy has been most acceptable to such states; and whenever they were faced with such a situation of taking decisions in favor of collective security measure, they managed to construct on some pretext of other to avoid the embarrassment, for example, French attitude towards Korean Crisis.

There are economic consideration also which act as restraints on the behavior of states and does not provide enough freedom of action is generally envisaged by collective security system, it can be assumed that states may have economic ties with the aggressor state. Whether these state may have economic ties with the aggressor state. Whether this state would prefer to abrogate this relationship for the sake of security of others ? Can they re-establish the economic relationship after the abrogation of ties and after having fought with it ? Since re-establishment of ties is bound to create some amount of misunderstanding states usually try to avoid taking such decisions. In this respect the principle of economic interdependence, which collective security system seeks to use as an instrumental strengthen itself, becomes a restraint on the freedom of actions of states.

Thus the analysis of three assumption makes it clear that it is difficult to assume that all nations are either interested in stopping aggression or the able to join in aggression. Moreover, in collective security system one point which is overlooked is the fact that it seek to preserve and status-quo for a particular point of time in history which may amount at least for some unjust pattern of international structure. If the given imbalance are not corrected by the peaceful means, then the

aggrieved state may tend to operate against the system and other states and bound to oppose it. Such a system in final analysis imposes preeminence of legal norms over justice and not peace through justice. Thus collective security cannot be expected to work though the remaining two assumptions, the preponderant power of collectivity and peace based on preponderant power are correct."

### **1.5.7 Collective Security and International Organizations**

Whether collective security system has failed due to its contradictions inherent or else the mankind has not able to translate this idea into reality ? Partly the question has been answered that it has an idealist plan divorced from the subtle realities of world politics. But before we accept the finality of this observation it must be admitted that the opinion is not generally shared. There was a group, which sincerely believed upon the feasibility of this system provided its requirements are fulfilled. For these reasons there has been concerted effort to establish collective security system at the time of the creation of the League of nations and also under the United Nations.

#### **1.5.7.1 Collective Security Under the League of Nations**

After the end of First World War, the issue of the security of all nations, avoidance of war and the settlement of disputes through peaceful means, were some of the issues which resulted in the creation of the blue print for international organization. League of Nations, as this organization came to be known was essentially a legal structural apparatus to give institutional expressions to the basic principles of collective security and made a serious effort to attain the real of collective security.

Article 10 of the Covenant gave legal expression to this concept. It is the obligation of every state joining the system of respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all member of the League. "It was followed by article 10, which said any war or threat of war whether immediately affecting any of the members of League or not is hereby declared a matter of concern of the whole league." It also defined as to what constitute an act of war (article 16) and responsibilities of the member states from economic sanction to military action.

The Covenant, however, failed to live upon the expectations. There were various flaws in it which were utilized by the states to resort to the use of force without violating provisions of the Covenant. Then there was impracticable role of unanimity which prevented Assembly from taking

any action. In brief, it lacked power and strength to implement these provisions. The quote Claude :

"The covenant was far from a perfect design for collective security. It imposed inadequate legal restrictions upon potential aggression and extracted insufficient commitments on enforcement actions from member states. The League which it created was deficient in legal authority and practical competence for making the international decision required for management of collective security system."

Thus, within a few years the covenant crumbled down due to excessive commitment constrained in article 10 and 16 as reflected in the resolutions passed by the assembly which watered down these sanctions leading eventual collapse of collective from 1922 onwards.

#### **1.5.7.2 U.N. and Collective Security**

While the second world war was still continuing the allied powers were making the efforts for a new international organization. The United Nations Charter provides a satisfactory constitutional for a collective security system as compared to the arrangements under the covenant. Article 2 Para 4 of Charter prohibited the threat or use of force in clear terms and thus, it was clear development over covenant which had allowed for the partial use of the war. In order to avoid ambiguity in the use of force under the pretext of defensive measure. Security Council was made responsible according to article 51 and 55 to control and supervise the use of force. Elaborate mechanism of sanctions and economic penalties were formulated and Security Council was authorized to identify the aggressor, determine the action and arrange for the military force to be placed at the disposal of the organization.

In spite of the fact that it appears to be a determined effort to achieve the goals of collective security, the U.N. system also suffered with many weaknesses. For example, it did not devise any mechanism for agreed allocation of military force which the states shall contribute to strengthen the coercive power of the United Nations. The peaceful resolution of conflict and disarmament, which prerequisites of successful collective security system, are not given any special attention under the Charter. concessions in the form of Veto powers which made U.N. system workable, established the great power dominance in Security Council as Claude says, "extensive decision making competence conferred upon the Security Council is drastically reduced by the extensive decision blocking competence conferred upon the real powers" that is totally incompatible with the requirements of the doctrine of collective security system.



In practice we also find the United Nations like League of Nations, refrained from taking actions as stipulated in the Charter, and as such there has been no attempt to develop the collective security system. Great power relationship and the prevalent international environment was reasonable for the the state of affairs to a great deal. But it was largely because of the fact that the balance of power mechanism was so strongly entrenched in practice.

It must be made clear at this point, that the emergence of regional security arrangement viz. NATO, Warsaw Pact, created some confusion toward the understanding of collective security and at the same time weakened it also. These arrangements should not be confused with collective security system. Their purpose is to oppose an aggression which might arise from the other group or the nations outside such arrangements of "selective security" and not the security of all. Since there has been a great deal of emphasis upon this concept in post-second world war years, it encouraged sectarian approach to peace and divided the world in many regional groupings. In such situations it became difficult to per sure the collective security approach satisfactorily.

Thus, the Korean war could be cited as the best example in the context. The United for Peace Resolution, for example, could be passed by the General Assembly to manage this crisis as there was no unanimity among the great powers of the Security Council. It asserted that the two third majority of the assembly to name the aggressor and to take required measures. In reality, it was the repudiation of the principle of all against one and permitted the possible involvement of the great powers in the war from the side of the nation which may be declared an aggressor.

Thus, the Korean war despite being of collective security measure become a traditional war between the western powers on the one side and China and Soviet Union on the other. Similarly in the case of Suez Crisis (1956) and Lebnon Crisis (1968) the collective security system could not be evoked in that manner. Whatever the United Nations talked about, it was a superficial tribute to this idea.

Even after recent quiet crisis international military force created by pooling the resource of various countries to liberate Kuwait from the forceful occupation of Iraq. These actions were undertaken after U.N. passed such resolutions but in reality it was in repudiation of charters provision governing collective security system. Secretary General Boutrous Ghali report on re-structuring U.N. asking for special military under U.N

to prevent regional conflict suggest that the collective system is on verge of change.

### **1.5.8 Conclusion**

Therefore, collective security system was emerged after the end of first World War. This international system was advocated by theory of idealism which became popular during the end of this World War. Although this system propounds peace rather than war; cooperation than conflict; open diplomacy than secret diplomacy, yet both League of Nations and United Nations could not become largely successful in implementing it.

### **1.5.9 Self-check Exercise:**

1. Explain the meaning of collective security system. (4 marks)
2. Explain the circumstances which led to the birth of collective security system. (4 marks)
3. Compare collective security system with the Balance of Power system in 4 points. (4 marks)
4. Define collective security? Discuss main assumptions of collective security system with critical evaluation. (15 marks)

### **1.5.10 Suggested Readings.**

1. Rama S. Melkoet & A. Narsimha Rao : International Relations.
2. Mahindra Kumar : Theoretical Aspects of International Politics.