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Module I

PERSPECTIVES ON THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS
WHAT IS INTERNATIONAL POLITICS
a. CONCEPT OF POWER IN THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS
b. ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL POWER
c. NATION STATE AND NATIONAL INTEREST

INTRODUCTION

Politics is generally understood as the process by which power is acquired, maintained and increased. Quincy Wright describes politics as “the art of influencing, manipulating or controlling major groups so as to advance the purpose of some against the opposition of others”. In international politics, there are sovereign states whose interests are not identical. Those interests of the sovereign states are called national interest. The sovereign states in order to achieve their interest come into conflict with one another and as a means to achieve the ends, power is generally used. Thus international politics is that aspect of interactions and relations of sovereign states in which the element of conflict or interest is present. It is a process in which nations try to protect their incompatible interest by means of power. In this context International politics can be explained as the process of adjustment of relationships among nations in favour of a nation or group of nations by means of power. The process of this relation consists of the objective which is national interest, condition of relations which is conflict and power which is the means of international politics. The major theme of international politics is power. Power is omnipresent in all national relations. It offers a situation of recurring conflicts and harmony.

DEFINITIONS

With regard to the nature and scope of International Politics, authors are having different opinions. To many the first priority in International Politics is the promotion of national interests. This is being done by influencing and controlling the behavior of other actors including state actors. This can be well achieved through the effective use of foreign policy and there is a long tradition of equating international politics with foreign policy. Feliks Gross is of the opinion that “the study of international politics is identical to the study of foreign policy”. However this view has limited adherents and the majority view is that the subject matter of international politics is broader than foreign policy. Foreign policy can be at best considered as a subcategory of international politics.

Charles Schieicher takes a broader view of international politics by accommodating all interstate relations in the category of international politics. Norman J Padelford and George A Lincoln define the study in terms of interests and goals. To them it is “the interaction of individual nation states in the pursuit of their perceived national interests and goals”. Palmer and Perkins also limit the definition in terms of the state system. According to Hans J Morgenthau it is the “struggle for and use of power among nations”.

Harold Sprout and Margret Sprout associate international politics with conflicts. The element of resistance or conflict is always present in the relation between political
communities. They define International Politics as “those aspects of interactions and relations independent political communities in which some elements of opposition, resistance or conflict of purpose is always present”.

As a subject of study international politics is a relatively recent arrival in the academic circles. The establishment of the chair in International Politics at the university college of Wales in 1919 is a landmark in the development of the study as an independent discipline. The chair was occupied by eminent academicians like EH Carr, CK Webster, Reynolds and Alfred Zimmern. This also coincided with the emergence of USA as a global power. The two world wars and consequent complexities of the global order established the relevance of the study beyond suspicion. The post world war events including the establishment of United Nations Organization, cold war, regional organizations, disarmament movements, increased trade and commercial interactions among nations also necessitated more focus on the study of international politics. The post cold war world witnessed the emergence of multipolarism and multilateralism. Global forums for interstate interactions became more wide and vibrant with the development of globalization. There were also serious concerns including terrorism, human right violations, war, ethnic violence, global financial crisis and natural calamities that required intervention of global community as a whole. This also became an added advantage for the study of International Politics as an independent subject.

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The discussion on International Politics is closely linked with the International relations. Scholars like Hans Morganthaeau and Kenneth Thompson at times used these terms interchangeably. To them international politics is an inalienable part of international relations. According to Hartmann “International Relations include all intercourse among states and all movements of peoples, goods and ideas across national frontiers”. The area of International relations is the complex relations existing among the sovereign states of the world. Generally it is concerned with the study of all events and situations affecting more than one state. The basic assumption of international relations is the necessity of interactions in the state system. Like the individual, state system also suffers from the absence of self sufficiency. It follows that the states are to engage in some or other kinds of relations for their very existence. With the growing number of states, these relations also became complex. These webs of relations are the subject matter of International Relations. Thus it is clear that international Relations cover a wider meaning than mere political relations. No doubt political factors dominate over other factors in international Relations namely economic, cultural and religious factors. Therefore it studies the totality of all relations and of all those factors between, and among the states of the world.

International Relations includes all sorts of relations i.e. Political, economic, cultural, geographical, legal official and non official. So it embraces the totality of relations among people. But International Politics includes only the political aspects of the overall relations. In other words only those relations which arouse actions and reactions are the subjects of
international politics. Thus it can be said that international politics is the political aspects of international Relations. It follows that International Relations is a wider concept whereas the area of international politics is a narrow. The methodology of the study is another area of difference. In international relations the factors are studied chronologically while in international politics the basis of study is what, when and how of the present with a relationship between the past and future. Modern international politics aims at the establishment of peace through the international organization and international relations too are based on this very principle. Thus, concern for peace is the common denominator between international politics and international relations.

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS AND NATIONAL POLITICS

In international politics, the major players are sovereign states. These states have many interests which are not identical. These interests of the sovereign states are called the national interest. The sovereign states in order to achieve their interests come into conflict with one another and as a means to achieve the ends power is generally used. Thus, international politics is that aspect of interactions and relations of sovereign states in which the element of conflict or interest is present. National Politics, like international politics, also involves adjustment of relationship within and among individuals or groups. Politics denotes the struggle for power. Whether it is national politics or International politics, politics is a common word. There are groups of divergent interest in national politics and each aims to further its own interest. This incompatibility of interests generates a conflict. Keeping in mind their own interests the groups tend to strengthen their position by making temporary alliances. However, the conflict always remains restricted to a certain level as the government checks the struggle with the help of laws.

International politics as well as national politics cluster around the interests. However there are much dissimilarity between interests in International politics and national politics. In international politics only interests are permanent and so the states may use direct means to achieve their goals. The use of cunningness, treachery, and sabotage is a part and parcel of international politics. In national politics some ethical norms have to be observed.

In national politics the individuals are under the sovereign authority of the state. The laws are universally binding upon them and the municipal courts have a complete jurisdiction over the laws enacted by the state. Every violation of law is met with a definite punishment. The judicial system administers law in national politics with certainty and clarity. But in the case of international politics international law is no solid law. The sovereign states are governed by this weak law called international law and the International Court of Justice too cannot exercise its jurisdiction as freely as the municipal courts do in regard to individuals. Punishments are rare and cases come to international courts only with the consent of disputing parties.

STAGES OF THE STUDY

According to Kenneth Thompson the study of international politics has passed through four stages.
1. The Diplomatic History Stage
2. The current Events stage
3. The law and Organization stage
4. The contemporary stage

The first stage of the study was dominated by the monopoly of diplomatic historians. It is traced up to the end of First World War. The study was mainly historic in orientation and no concrete theories on the subject were developed. Paul S Reinsch was one of the pioneering figures of this period. Major focus of the study was history of diplomatic relations among nations. The descriptive and chronological studies highlighted the major trends in international politics. But it failed to bring out any concrete conclusions or valid generalizations.

The second stage in the study of international relations started after the Second World War. It is named the current events stage since the focus was on current events. The review of newspapers, journals and periodicals were the major exercises in the study. The scholars emphasized the need for the interpretation of current problems and developments to understand the international politics. The major concern of the first stage was the past and in the second stage the focus was on the present. Here there were no attempts to trace out the historical roots of current international issues. This was a defect of the current events stage.

The third stage is generally called as the legal institutional stage. It was developed simultaneously with the second stage. It continued to exist through the inter-war years and after. The First World War and its consequence forced the scholars to rethink about the modalities of their scholarship and they shifted to a legalistic-moralistic approach. They preferred to look upon war as a sin and accident and suggested international institutions as alternatives to the present order. The scholars became more idealistic and urged for international institutions like League of Nations. The Paris peace conference and subsequent establishment of League of Nations gave strength to their optimism. The major postulates of this stage included;

1. Creation of international institutions for replacing the competitive state system.
2. Development of new international norms for legal control of the behavior of territorial states. The demand is for stringent international law and regulating mechanism to avert war between nations.
3. Eliminations of weapons through global disarmament and arms control. It is believed that this process can effectively ensure global peace.

The important limitation of this approach was its focus on the future. The study ignored the role of past and present in shaping an event and in solving problems. Even though the importance of peace is accepted the method for achieving peace was utopian.

The content and nature of international politics has undergone tremendous changes in post 1945 period. This change also coincided with the end of Second World War. The
idealism in the third stage was set aside for a more realistic and practical approach. Here the emphasis of the study was shifted from international law and organizations to forces which influence and shape the behavior of the states in global arena. This included determinants of foreign policy, techniques and conduct of foreign relations and mode of resolution of international conflicts. The major purpose of the study became the understanding of relations. Thus in 1950’s Realism became the prevalent school of thought.

In the fourth stage the need of theory building in international politics was well understood. A number of scholars came to take the challenge of theory building. New approaches capable of examining and explaining relations among nations were offered and accepted. The role of power in international politics also found a significant role in the study. It is in this context international politics was defined as study of power among nations. The study of international institutions and organizations were released from its idealistic and moralistic kernel to the realm of politics. For example the United Nations Organization was viewed as a political mechanism to direct national rivalries to debating tables and to the normalization process. The development of behaviouralism also influenced the study of international relations. Scientific tools were developed for systematic enquiry. Inter-disciplinary approach was also accepted to the study during this period. Joseph Roucek rightly mentioned “sociological nature of twentieth century”. Thus in the current stage the study of international politics became a complex study of interactions of state and non-state actors in the larger canvass of the global power structure.

SCOPE AND RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

The study of international politics has acquired great significance in the new global order. This is closely linked with the various developments in international politics after the Second World War. The major developments in this direction can be identified as;

1. Rise of number and type of states
2. Massive stock of weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons and the consequent threat to global peace
3. Increased vulnerability of states to external subversion
4. Emergence of non-state actors and their role in international decision making
5. Super power politics
6. Emergence of global forums and regional forums
7. International threats including terrorism and human right violations

Herbert J Spiro identifies a structural change in the pattern of global politics. He observes this change as “a change in units from a few, mainly European, sovereign states as the major actors in international relations to the so called blocs combined in treaty organizations plus the poorly defined new states, plus the secretariat of the United Nations”. The complex concerns of the new states were reflected to the international scenario and this became a dominant factor in deciding international issues. The problems include aggressive
nationalism, ethnic strife, economic backwardness, administrative instability, population explosion and defenselessness.

The entry of new states also altered the landscape of foreign policy. The number of persons involved in foreign policy formulation and action has multiplied. There was also larger democratization of foreign policy which involved the public in foreign policy making. Policy makers were forced to satisfy both international and domestic audience. The role of public opinion in policy making thus changed the very substance of international politics. Now no nation can turn deaf to the ideals of peace, justice and disarmament, which are the cherished values of public all over the world. The shift from secret diplomacy to public diplomacy heavily influenced the course and content of international discussions.

Another major issue that testified the necessity of intensification of global interactions is the development of new technologies. This involves technologies of defense and technologies of communication. The new communication technologies made interstate interactions easy and smooth. Unlimited volume of information is now available for the policy makers. New technologies also accelerated the speed of communication between the international diplomatic agents and national foreign policy makers. New technologies of defense enhanced the destructive capacity of the states to total destruction. The development of nuclear war heads put humanity in continual fear of devastation. At the same time the demand for peace and security also multiplied. It is in this background scholars like Morgenthau, A.L. Burns, C.A.W. Mannings argue that international politics has developed into an independent discipline with peculiar field of enquiry and distinct methods of study.

In the contemporary world the study of international politics has become essential for human survival and human progress. It reveals how men and nations tend to act in given circumstances and so tells us what conditions should be encouraged and what conditions should be discouraged if we are to promote international harmony and well being. What is being witnessed today is increasing global inter dependence in political and economic areas. An internal disturbance in any part of the globe or fluctuations in prices of commodities like oil will affect all countries of the world. Under such conditions the study of international relations will help people to know each other and understand the problems which confront them.

Being a new discipline, there is no unity among authors on the ingredients of International Politics. A report published in 1947 by the Council on Foreign Relations identified five areas for the study. They are;

1. Nature and operation of the state system
2. Factors that affect the power of the state
3. International position and foreign policies of great powers
4. History of recent international relations, and
5. Building a more stable world order.
In 1954 Vincent Baker, undertook a survey for the Carnegie Endowment for international peace and found seven ingredients of the study. They are:

1. Nature and principle forces of international politics
2. Political, social and economic organizations of international life
3. Elements of national power
4. Instruments available for the promotion of national interest
5. Limitation and control of national power
6. Foreign policies of major powers
7. Historical ingredients


CONCEPT OF POWER IN THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Power plays an important role in International relations. The status of state in the International sphere is determined by its physical force. In International relations power may broadly, be defined as the capacity or ability of states or to control their behavior for the purpose of promoting its own interest. According to Hartmann power means” the strength of capacity that a sovereign state can use to achieve its national interests. George Schwarzenegger defined it as “the capacity to impose one’s will on others by reliance on effective sanctions in case of none compliance”.

Power is an essential element of politics. Politics is defined as a process of conflict and conflict resolution. Like national politics, international politics is also engaged in the process of conflict resolution. Here the primary actors are states. They are having varying interests and these national interests are the objectives which motivates the states to act and react in a particular way. The achievement of these interests is proportional to the quantum of power applied and possessed by the national entities. Hence power becomes a determining factor in international politics. This power may be latent and manifest. It may be physical or psychological. Several states create power through their ideologies. In the case of physical power military power is one dominating factor. It should also be coupled with economic power. For example a small state like Japan retains its leading position in the international politics by virtue of its economic power.

The national interests and the struggle for achieving these interests always create a theatre of conflict in the relations among nations. The continuation of conflict in relations poses serious threats to global order and peace which ultimately hampers the very preservation of national interest itself. Consequently conflict resolution becomes an urgent
task for the actor states. The result is better co-operation and harmony in the international scenario. This conflict resolution also needs the application of power in politics. Power also becomes the means by which nations are securing their national interest in conditions of conflict. On the other hand power is the final objective of the state. Every state tries to become powerful. International interactions are efforts to maximize national power by respective states. Power also becomes a vital part of national interest. Thus international politics can be viewed as a game of and game for power.

ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL POWER

There are various elements of national power. These elements are also called determinants of national power. The power position of a nation is the result of many variables.

The elements of national power can be broadly divided into natural, social and ideational elements. Geography, resources and population comes under the natural elements. Social elements include economic development, technological achievements, military strength, political structure, national culture and morale. The ideational elements include ideology, intelligence and leadership.

Hans J Morgenthau has divided the elements of national power into two categories—stable and unstable. Lerche and A.Said has divided the elements into tangible and intangible. Organski has made a distinction between the natural determinants of power and social determinants of power. Palmer and Perkins identifies seven elements of national power. They are; land, resources, population, technology, ideology, morale and leadership.

1. Geography:

Geography has always been a determining factor in deciding the national power of a state. It is the most stable and constant factor since physical characteristics of a nation do not change normally. Authors like Karl Hanshofer, Rudolf Kjellan, A.T. Mahan, Ratzer, Mackinder, Spykman and Saul Cohen considers geography as the most important element of national power. Geography as an element of national power has the following sub elements.

a. Size: - The size of a state, whether small or great, is an important element of national power. A nation controlling larger area can command more resources including natural resources. It can also accommodate large population which makes it more strong. Most of the states engage in war for territory annexation. In military operations also large size contributes for better defense. Russia and China provides best example for this. By placing strategic industries and military commands far away from the frontiers, big states can ensure effective defense against foreign attack. But size only does not make a state powerful. Even a small country can exert its influence in International relations very much.

b. Topography: Topography provides the geographical setting of a nation. Topographical features determine natural boundaries between nations and set limits to their expansion. The rivers may provide ports, harbours and advantageous transport system. The hills and deserts may provide for natural defense against an attack. At the same time they may create obstacles in nation’s development. At present the role of topography has been
much reduced with the advancement of science and technology. Padelford and Lincoln observes, “The astronomical impact of technology in areas such as communication, air mobility, ICBM systems, nuclear weaponry, intelligence gathering, space satellites, has drastically collapsed the strategic obstacles for the projection of national power”.

**c. Climate**. Climate has an indirect effect on culture, economy, natural resources, and political organizations religion and direct on health and energy of people. Extreme heat and cold are unfavorable for strength.

**d. Location**: Diplomacy and war strategy has its impact on location. Nearness to sea will provide for good harbors and it will increase chance of trade. Insular position has its impact on its diplomacy. Great obstacles in the form of mountains etc. will decrease the chance of trade.

**e. Topography**

Topographical factors are another geographical element that contributes to national power. Topographical factors determine natural boundaries between states. It set limits to the nation’s expansion plans. At times topography can positively contribute to national defense. However with the advancement of modern technology topography has reduced to a lesser factor in national defense. The coming of air mobility, ICBM systems, satellites and nuclear weaponry has minimized topographical disturbances.

**2. Natural Resources:**

Natural resources including raw materials are relatively stable factors that contribute to National power. Natural resources are gift of nature and can be of direct utility. Fertile soil, rivers, forests etc. constitutes the natural resources of a nation. Raw materials are of potential utility. It should be processed or manufactured. For example petroleum is a good raw material for a nation. But it needs a highly specialized technological process to become a utility. Raw materials are important both for industrial production and war. However till the 19th century raw materials were not significant source of national power. Possession of minerals will strengthen the industrial capacity of a nation. For example, Petroleum, an important mineral has created ‘Oil Diplomacy’ in the Middle East. Clemenceau of France has observed, “One drop of oil is worth one drop of blood of our soldiers. Middle East occupies a strategic position in global politics because of its oil resources. Some of the African countries are rich with Uranium deposit and hence they are getting special attention from international actors.

**3. Population:**

People are the most precious element of a state. Voltaire comments, “God is always on the side of the biggest battalions”. Only a populous state can become a first class power in the international system. The best example is China which became a major power due to its vast human resources. During the first and second world wars, the role of infantry was well acknowledged, contributing to the population factor in national power. Prior to 20th century a large population was undoubtedly a significant and important source of national power. But in the 20th century, the link between population and national power is less evident. It will be strength, if the state has the means to utilize its talent, energy and
maintain a proper standard of living. On the other hand more population means more burden to badly administered states. The age group of population, sex etc also must be taken into account. Even in the era of push-button wars, modern armies require a vast pool of man-power. It is not the gun that matters but the men behind it.

Population also contributes to national power in the field of economic production. A large labor force and large number of consumers make a nation rich and powerful. Today what contributes to national power is a well-fed, healthy, educated and well trained population belonging to a suitable age group. This population should also be loyal to the objectives and ideals of the state in which they inhabit.

4. Technology:

Technology is a process by which resources are converted to products. The technological advancement is a tremendous element of national power. Technology influenced strategic factors. It has reduced distances and eroded natural barriers between states. Technology has affected matter of foreign policy. Now Foreign policies are shaped and implemented in a quick fashion. Instant decisions and interactions takes place in the field. Technology has also sophisticated war methods. Japan became a strong economic power with its innovative technologies. Together with Japan, countries like Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan and South Korea proved that technological progress can make a nation strong even in the absence of natural resources.

INTANGIBLE FACTORS OF NATIONAL POWER

1. National Character and Morale:

Morale is a healthy frame of mind characterized by fidelity to a cause. It is the sum total of the individual qualities of men in the form of their willingness to put the nation’s welfare above their own personal welfare. One major element in this context is the willingness to sacrifice. In the worlds of Palmer and Perkins, “Morale is a thing of spirit, made up of loyalty, courage faith and the impulse to the preservation of personality and dignity”. National morale is an important aspect of national power, in the absence of morale, the other factors of national power will not work National morale is not static. There is a point where it breaks. National morale can be manufactured or stimulated by various factors. Factors like National character, culture, popular leadership popular government and circumstances make national morale. Each country has its own national character and morale. For example the Americans were considered to be optimistic, French are polite and the English people are practical. In Russia, China and Germany people are generally obedient to authority and they are hesitant about the foreigners. Even the Versailles treaty (1919) failed to wipe out German morality and they build up a strong state very quickly. The same fate was met by Japanese after the Second World War. But they emerged as a strong economic force in no time.

2. Quality of Leadership:

Leadership is the most important element of national power. Without leadership people can’t even constitute a state. Without it there can be no well developed technology and without it morale is totally useless. The functions of leadership are twofold, firstly it co-
ordinates other elements of national power and secondly, use all the resources for the maximum benefit of the state. The ups and downs in the history of a state can be related to its leaders. A weak and underdeveloped nation can become a powerful nation under an effective leadership. Leaders like Napoleon, Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin, Nehru, Tito, and Mao made a deep impact on world history.

3. Diplomacy:
Diplomacy is considered as the brain of national power as national morale is the soul. According to Morgenthau “Diplomacy of high quality will bring the ends and means of foreign policy in harmony with the available resources of national power”. It will tap the hidden sources of national strength and transform them fully and securely. The quality of diplomacy is the most important element that influences the power base of a state as also its foreign policy.

4. Ideology
Ideas and ideologies form the ideational part of elements of power. According to Synder, Ruchard and Wilson (1949) “an ideology is a cluster of ideas about life, society or government”. It is an action-related system of ideas based on a definite view of the world. In international politics, the period since 1750 is considered as the ‘age of ideology’. Ideology is always linked with national power. Some of the major ideologies of the present are; Communism, Marxism, Gandhism and Democracy. There are also supranational ideologies like Pan-Africanism, Islamic fundamentalism, Europeanism etc. Ideologies boost the morale of a state. It also supports national power by providing specific goals and targets. Ideology helps the government to consolidate public support.

National power is a relative one. The power of one state is to be measured in comparison with the power of other states. National power is also changing. A nation may be strong today, but tomorrow it may become weak. For a long period in history England occupied a pivotal role in international politics. But after the second world this position was taken over by United States of America. The factors of power are also inter dependent. This makes the measurement of power impossible. Palmer and Perkins observes, “National power, like nearly everything else in this world of ours, is relative. A man with a million dollars is not rich in a group of multi-millionaires; a man of forty is old to child of few and youthful to an octogenarian. Similarly, In the matter of power absolute has little meaning. 50 divisions, 300 war vessels 2000 planes all these may represent overwhelming might against one opponent ,miserable inadequate against another”.

NATION STATE.

In the age of internationalism, nation-state system can be regarded as the key stone of International Politics. The nation state system in the words of Palmer and Perkins is “the pattern of political life in which people are separately organized into sovereign states that interact with one another in varying degrees and in varying ways.”The term nation is essentially an ethnic tone base on common heritage, language, culture and a sense of identity among the people. The concept of nation-state evidently implies the territoriality of
statehood, the desirability of homogeneous nationality and the independence from external or internal control of the sovereign power within each national territory. In international Politics, the existence of these sovereign states is termed as nation state system. In order to protect those personal interests, they interact with one another. States have to engage in war if their interests are not protected. To secure their existence the states develop their national power.

The state system is as old as the human history. However the nation state system is of recent origin. The Modern state system originated in the renaissance and reformation period in Europe. Renaissance checked Feudalism and Reformation reduced the influence of Pope in state affairs. The Treaty of Westphalia in the year 1648 may be said to have established and formalized nation state system. By 1648 the state system was fully established in Europe. The result of Westphalia was very significant. It can be considered as the first stage in the evolution of the nation state system. The second stage in the development of the state system lies in between 1648 to1713. This period marked a conflict among France, Britain, Holland and Spain for colonial supremacy. Louis XIV of France was determined to establish an empire. But, soon France had to face a coalition of Britain and Austria at the question of Spanish succession. France suffered heavy losses at the treaty of Utrecht. The agreement reached at Utrecht established such a balance to which Sweden, Russia and Poland could no longer resolve issued in the East without involving west.

Another development was the rise of Frederick the great of Prussia. In order to check the threat of Frederick the great of Prussia, France and Austria form an alliance, which was joined by Russia. In order to establish a balance of power, Great Britain joined with Prussia. The result of these alliances and counter alliances was the 7 years war in which France, Austria and Spain were defeated. The third development was the French Revolution. France under Napoleon becomes an important power. Britain, Prussia, Russia Austria and Sweden by combined efforts defeated France, War ended with Vienna meeting in which the old balance of power was established again. The period between 1815 and 1914 is named the period of Pox Britannica. In cremean war (1854 - 56) Britain and France collectively checked the ambition of Russia to dominate Constantinople. The decline of Turkish Empire in the Balkans led to the rise of many sovereign states in Balkans. The states fulfilled their long cherished goals and nationalism became the basis of their Independence. The first world war spread out the ideas of freedom and national unity. After the II. World War many states in Asia and Africa came into being which do not possesses a natural geographical boundary or a distant territory. Whatever difference may be among the states as the basis of territory, population or culture, the states are considered legally equal to one another.

NATIONAL INTEREST

National interest is a major force in international politics. Every state engages in interstate relations to promote its own interests. However national interest may differ from one nation to other. Generally national interest has three basic dimensions;

1. Security
2. Economic development and
3. Stable world order

All nations are desiring and are in search of national security. It is the foremost national interest of a state actor. Security, survival and stability are the basic motives of the state. This also includes political independence and territorial integrity. Promotion of economic interests is another decisive factor in national interest. All states are pursuing economic goals. National development is an important agenda. In international politics states continuously work for the establishment and promotion of favorable terms of trade and commerce to promote economic development. A stable world order is also a target of every state actor. A peaceful international order is necessary to pursue all other national interests. It is for this purpose states enter into international politics. Each and every war is fought for promoting national interest.

International politics is actually a game to attain national interests. Diplomacy is only a tool in this direction. However when the states stand for their narrow national interests and utilize every forum to win their case is dangerous to the international community. Thus modern international politics demands a harmony between national and international interests. Along with national interests the international community is concerned with international interests which are common to all the states. They have to work together for a peaceful global order. For this purpose the nation states themselves built-up mechanism like United nations Organization, regional organizations and multilateral forums.. These institutions work for a more stable and secure global politics.

MODULE-II

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

a. Realist Theory
b. System Theory, Game Theory

c. Communication Theory, Decision Making Theory

d. Dependency Theory and Integration Theory

INTRODUCTION

The study of international relations takes a wide range of theoretical approaches. Some emerge from within the discipline itself; others have been imported, from disciplines such as economics or sociology. Indeed, few social scientific theories have not been applied to the study of relations amongst nations. Many theories of international relations are internally and externally contested, and few scholars believe only in one or another. Many of these approaches have emerged after the Second World War. Generally the approaches are divided into five categories.

1. Historical approach
2. Systems approach
3. Normative approach
4. Policy science approach and
5. Eclectic approach

Another classification divides the approaches into two broad categories i.e, traditional and behavioural. The idealism and realism are grouped under traditional approaches and the later theorists were considered as behaviouralists. In the present context the major theories discussed are a. Realist Theory b. System Theory, Game Theory c. Communication Theory, Decision Making Theory d. Dependency Theory and Integration Theory

REALIST THEORY

Realism has been the dominant theory of international relations for a long period. The philosophy of political realism was well accepted during the eighteenth and nineteenth century. It was revived after the Second World War. The foundation of the thought was established by Reinhold Niebuhr. He was followed by Kenneth Thompson, Anrold Wolfers, F.Schuman, Spykman, G F Kennan and the like. However Hans J Morgenthau is considered as the major exponent of this school.

Classical realism has been grounded in a pessimistic theory of human nature. It may be grounded either on a theological version (for example, Saint Augustine and Reinhold Niebuhr) or a secular one (for example, Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Morgenthau). Egoism and self-interested behavior are not limited to a few leaders but are basic to human beings. Thus it becomes the core of realist theory.

Although definitions of realism differ in detail they share a clear family resemblance, Realists emphasizes the constraints on politics imposed by human selfishness and the absence of international government. It requires ‘the primacy in all political life of power and security’. Rationality and state-centrism are frequently identified as core realist premises. Power plays a central role in classical realism.
Although realists do not constitute a homogeneous school—most of them share at least five core premises about international relations. Firstly, they view the causes of war and the conditions of peace as central questions. They also regard the structure of the international system as necessary if not always sufficient explanation for many aspects of international relations. According to classical realists, "structural anarchy," or the absence of a central authority to settle disputes, is the essential feature of the contemporary system, and it gives rise to the "security dilemma": in a self-help system. One nation's search for security often leaves its current and potential adversaries insecure, any nation that strives for absolute security leaves all others in the system absolutely insecure, and it can provide a powerful incentive for arms races and other types of hostile interactions. Consequently, the question of relative capabilities is a crucial factor. Efforts to deal with this central element of the international system constitute the driving force behind the relations of units within the system.

Thus, realists view conflict as a natural state of affairs rather than as a consequence that can be attributed to historical circumstances. A third premise that unites classical realists is their focus on geographically-based groups as the central actors in the international system. During other periods the primary entities may have been city states or empires, but at least since the Treaties of Westphalia (1648), sovereign states have been the dominant units. Classical realists also agree that state behavior is rational. The assumption behind this premise is that states are guided by the logic of the "national interest," usually defined in terms of survival, security, power, and relative capabilities. Although the national interest may vary according to specific circumstances, the similarity of motives among nations permits the analyst to reconstruct the logic of policymakers in their pursuit of national interests. Finally, the state can also be conceptualized as a unitary actor. Because the central problems for states are starkly defined by the nature of the international system, their actions are primarily a response to external rather than domestic political forces. According to Stephen Krasner, the state "can be treated as an autonomous actor pursuing goals associated with power and the general interest of the society."

In International Relations, political realism is a tradition of analysis that stresses the imperatives states face to pursue a power politics of the national interest. Within states, egoism usually is substantially restrained by hierarchical political rule. In international relations, anarchy allows the worst aspects of human nature to be expressed. Statesmanship thus involves mitigating and managing, not eliminating, conflict; seeking a less dangerous world. Realism maintains that universal moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of states.

Many realists, especially in recent decades, have given near-exclusive emphasis to anarchy, the absence of hierarchical political rule. For example, John Herz argues that anarchy assures the centrality of the struggle for power ‘even in the absence of aggressivity or similar factors’. ‘Structural realism’ is the standard label for such theories. ‘Neo-realism’ is the other term, distinguishing this rigorous structural emphasis from earlier, more eclectic realists. The two terms are usually used interchangeably. Other realists, without denying the centrality of anarchy, also emphasize human nature. For example, Morgenthau argues that ‘the social world but a projection of human nature onto the collective plane’.

International Politics
Realists can be further distinguished by the intensity and exclusivity of their commitment to core realist premises. Here we can think of a continuum of positions. ‘Radical’ realists exclude almost everything except power and self interest from international politics. Carr, Morgenthau and Waltz belongs to this group. The classical realist theory gives equal weight to human nature and international anarchy and is almost universally agreed to offer important insights into some perennial problems of international relations. The Cold War, in this account, was not ‘caused’ by anyone but was the’ natural’ result of bipolarity. Soviet expansion into Central and Eastern Europe was the normal behavior of a country that had been invaded from the west, with devastating consequences. Cold War conflicts in Vietnam, Central America and Southern Africa likewise were not part of a global communist conspiracy but rather ordinary efforts by a great power to increase its international influence. This example suggests a very important interpretative point. Realism is a theoretical account of how the world operates. It can be also used for peaceful purposes. For example, hundreds of thousands of lives might have been saved, and millions of casualties avoided, had the United States pursued a realist bipolar rivalry with the Soviet Union rather than an ideological Cold War.

For Realists the international system is defined by anarchy—the absence of a central authority. States are sovereign and thus autonomous of each other; no inherent structure or society can emerge or even exist to order relations between them. In such an anarchic system, State power is the key variable of interest, because only through power can States defend themselves and hope to survive. Realism can understand power in a variety of ways but ultimately emphasizes the distribution of coercive material capacity as the determinant of international politics. This vision of the world rests on four assumptions.

1. First, Realists claim that survival is the principal goal of every State. Foreign invasion and occupation are thus the most pressing threats that any State faces. Even if domestic interests, strategic culture, or commitment to a set of national ideals would dictate more benevolent or co-operative international goals, the anarchy of the international system requires that States constantly ensure that they have sufficient power to defend themselves and advance their material interests necessary for survival.

2. Secondly, Realists hold States to be rational actors. This means that, given the goal of survival, States will act as best they can in order to maximize their likelihood of continuing to exist.

3. Third, Realists assume that all States possess some military capacity, and no State knows what its neighbors intend precisely. The world, in other words, is dangerous and uncertain.

4. Fourth, in such a world it is the Great Powers—the States with most economic clout and, especially, military might, that are decisive. In these view international relations is essentially a story of Great Power politics.

Realists argue that law can only be enforced through State power. But why would any State choose to expend its precious power on enforcement unless it had a direct material interest in the outcome? Thus States may create international law and
international institutions, and may enforce the rules they codify. However, it is not the rules themselves that determine why a State acts a particular way, but instead the underlying material interests and power relations. International law is thus a symptom of State behavior, not a cause of the behavior.

Idealism believes that a rational and moral political order derived from universally valid abstract principles achieved. It assumes the essential goodness and changeability of human nature. It trusts in education, reform and the periodic use of force to remedy these defects. To the idealist school international organizations will bring out more positive and warm relations among nations. States will work out for common good.

SYSTEMS THEORY

The systems approach is one of the major approaches in the study of international politics. The major thinkers who contributed for the development of systems theory include David Easton, Gabriel Almond and Morton Kaplan. According to Mortan Kaplan a system is most inclusive if it has such recognizable interest as are neither completely identical nor necessarily opposed to each other. A political system should have specific areas of jurisdiction and should provide methods for settling conflicts. To him force is necessary as a last resort to keep the political system intact. Kaplan believes that the most important system is the international system. The behavior of national actors in the field of international affairs is always governed by the basic consideration of national interests. Actors on international scene belong to two categories: national actors and Supra national actors. National actors are the nation states. The Supra national actors are s international actors.

Morton Kaplan identifies six categories of international systems. They are:

1. The balance of power
2. The loose bipolar system,
3. The tight bipolar polar,
4. The universal system
5. The hierarchical system and,
6. The unit veto system

In a situation where too many actors influence international relations, it becomes difficult to strike a perfect balance of power position and loose bipolar system develops. The universal international systems develops when the universal actor like the U.N usurps many of the functions of powerful units in a loose bipolar system. In such a system the universal actor become powerful enough to prevent war among nations, but national actors, retain their individuality. In the Hierarchical international system, the universal actor becomes too powerful and the international community becomes a sort of world state. The unit Veto system develops as a result of weapon development. This system corresponds to the state of nature described by Thomas Hobbes. Here the interests of all are mutually opposed and all are at war with each other.
THE GAME THEORY

A common assertion in the study of international relations is that the choices of actors are interdependent. This interdependence leads to a strategic reasoning which becomes quite complex and unintelligible even for simple interactions. Game theory provides with a comprehensive toolbox that allows in depth explorations of such interactions. Given the actors' basic preferences and their strategic environment, it helps us to infer how they rank the various policies at their disposal, and to determine the expected outcome of the interplay of their policy choices. Aside from this predictive aim, game theory has a strong appeal for anyone engaged in explanation, investigation, or prescription. It often makes intelligible processes that appear puzzling, this without attributing causality to factors such as the incompetence, irresponsibility, or lack of concern of decision-makers. For instance, the well-known security dilemma in Realism can be illuminated by the study of a prisoner's dilemma.

The Game theory has been developed mainly by mathematicians and economists. Martin Shubik, Oskar Morgenstern and Karl Deutsch were among the first to recognize the importance of game theory. It is a method of analysis and also of selecting the best course of action in international politics. The theory has been defined as body of thought dealing with rational decision strategies in situations of conflicts and competition when each participant or player seeks to maximize gains and minimize losses. It is a mathematical model in which the player is placed in a certain fixed situation and tries to make maximum gains from his opponents.

Three principal kinds of game have been identified in the frame work of game theory. The first is called games with identical interests, the second games with opposite interests and the third games with mixed interests. The model which the game theory employs is that of a game strategy and not the game of chance. The game theory has five important concepts. They are;

(1) The number of players; Fewer than two players would not allow any strategic interaction. There is no upper limit: one can go up to n-players, with the n representing infinity. In terms of complexity, a situation with two players is the simplest and then each additional player tends to increase the level of complexity. The passage from two to three players introduces the possibility of coalitions and thus greatly complicates the strategic calculus and its modelization.

(2) The number of possible actions for the different players; In game theory one can define the number of opportunities ,from one to an unknown number n, to make a choice. At each opportunity, or decision node in game, a player may have a variable range of options to choose from. At each node, at least one alternative between two actions is needed, but there is no upper limit to the number of available options.

(3) The measurement of utility; " The state actors in the game always act in tune with the utility of action. They measure the utility in different scales. Classical measurement theory distinguishes four common kinds of scales: "nominal," "ordinal," "linear intervals," and "ratio."
(4) Information conditions; One can make different assumptions on the information players have when they make their decisions. With perfect information, players are fully aware of all the constituents of the interaction and of the previous moves. With imperfect information, game theorists distinguish between conditions of complete and incomplete information. Complete information refers to situations where players are fully aware of all the constituents of the game, but may not know previous moves. With incomplete information, players lack information about some constituent(s) of the interaction. This generally corresponds to situations where one or both of the following assumptions is not satisfied: (1) the players know both their strategies and those of the other players; (2) the players know their payoff functions and those of the other players. Uncertainty about these assumptions refers to what Harsanyi (1992) calls first-order uncertainty. Second-order uncertainty refers to the uncertainty regarding players' beliefs regarding the matters of first-order uncertainty. Both

(5) Solution concept.

COMMUNICATIONS THEORY.

Communication Theory has been developed mainly by Karl W Deutsch for understanding the national scene and has been applied to international politics by Charles A. McClelland and others. Deutsch’s concern was to reduce the importance of the notion of power in Politics and highlight the importance of the flow of information in government decisions. The communications theory treats the Government as decision-making system based on various information flows. The theory is equally important in international politics. Communications has transformed human relation as well as relations between states. It has increased peoples exposition to official and non-official propaganda and strengthened both totalitarian and regimes and democracies. The communication system has undoubtedly increased interdependence of international community. It has made functioning or international agencies like the U.N much easier.

DECISION MAKING THEORY

Many advocates of realism recognize that it cannot offer fine-grained analyses of foreign policy behavior. Waltz denies that it is desirable or even possible to combine theories of international relations and foreign policy. Decision-making models challenge the premises that it is fruitful to conceptualize the nation as a unitary rational actor whose behavior can adequately be explained by reference to the system structure--the second. To reconstruct how nations deal with each other, it is necessary to view the situation through the eyes of those who act in the name of the state: decision makers and the group and bureaucratic-organizational contexts within which they act. The decision making theory offers an alternative view of the process.

The first major attempt at introducing the decision making analysis in the study of foreign policy was made by Richard Snyder and others after the II World war and is specially developed in the area of foreign policymaking. The decision making approach has two fundamental purpose. The first is the identification of crucial structure in the political realm where change takes place, decisions are taken and actions are indicated and carried
out. The second is the systematic analysis of the decision making behavior which leads to action. The action of the state is seen through the action of decision makers. Analyzing the factor that operate on decision makers, Snyder divides them into three main sets of stimuli, the internal setting, the external setting and the decision-making process. He studies the personality factor of the decision maker and the various agencies and processes involved in decision making. The theory takes the study of international politics to the real actor from the abstract states and collective situation. The decision making theory has contributed a great deal to the understanding of the process of foreign policy making. Decision making analysis offers three major types of decision making models. They are;

1, Bureaucratic and organizational politics: Traditional models of complex organizations and bureaucracy emphasized the benefits of a division of labor, hierarchy, and centralization, coupled with expertise, rationality, and obedience. They also assumed that clear boundaries should be maintained between politics and decision making, on the one hand, and administration and implementation on the other. However recent theories depict organizations quite differently. The central premise is that decision making in bureaucratic organizations is not constrained only by the legal and formal norms that are intended to enhance the rational and eliminate the capricious aspects of bureaucratic behavior. There is an emphasis upon a denial of the political character of bureaucracies, as well as on other "informal" aspects of organizational behavior. Complex organizations are composed of individuals and units with conflicting perceptions, values, and interests that may arise from parochial self-interest. Organizational norms and memories, prior policy commitments, inertia, and standard operating procedures may shape and perhaps distort the structuring of problems, channeling of information, use of expertise, the range of options that may be considered, and implementation of executive decisions. Consequently, organizational decision making is essentially political in character, dominated by bargaining for resources, roles and missions, and by compromise rather than analysis. These models may be especially useful for understanding the slippage between executive decisions and foreign policy actions that may arise during implementation.

2, Small group politics: Another decision-making model used by some political scientists supplements bureaucratic-organizational models by narrowing the field of view to foreign policy decisions within small-group contexts. Some analysts have drawn upon sociology and social psychology to assess the impact of various types of group dynamics on decision making. Underlying these models are the premises that the group is not merely the sum of its members and that group dynamics can have a significant impact on the substance and quality of decisions. Groups often perform better than individuals in coping with complex tasks owing to diverse perspectives and talents, an effective division of labor, and high-quality debates on definitions of the situation and prescriptions for dealing with it. Groups may also provide decision-makers with emotional and other types of support that may facilitate coping with complex problems. Conversely, they may exert pressures for conformity to group norms.

3, Individual leaders, Some decision-making analysts focus on the individual policymaker who is the key to foreign policy in a given scenario. Drawing upon cognitive psychology, these models go well beyond some of the earlier formulations that drew upon psychodynamic theories to identify various types of psychopathologies among political
leaders: paranoia, authoritarianism, the displacement of private motives on public objects, etc. Efforts to include information processing behavior of the individual decision maker have been directed at the cognitive and motivational constraints that, in varying degrees, affect the decision-making performance of "normal" rather than pathological subjects. Thus, attention is directed to all leaders, not merely those, such as Hitler or Stalin, who display symptoms of abnormalities. The model characterize the decision maker as a problem solver, naive or intuitive scientist, cognitive balancer, dissonance avoider, information seeker, cybernetic information processor, and reluctant decision maker.

DEPENDENCY THEORY

Dependency theory is a later outcome in the debates on international politics. It points to the notion that resources flow from a "periphery" of poor and underdeveloped states to a "core" of wealthy states, enriching the latter at the expense of the former. It is a central contention of dependency theory that poor states are impoverished and rich ones enriched by the way poor states are integrated into the "world system."

Dependency theory originated in 1949. Hans Singer and Raúl Prebisch where the initial advocates of this theory. They observed that the terms of trade for underdeveloped countries relative to the developed countries had deteriorated over time: the underdeveloped countries were able to purchase fewer and fewer manufactured goods from the developed countries in exchange for a given quantity of their raw materials exports. They argued that the underdeveloped nations must employ some degree of protectionism in trade if they were to enter a self-sustaining development path. The theory was developed from a Marxist perspective by Paul A. Baran in 1957 with the publication of his The Political Economy of Growth. The theory was popular in the 1960s and 1970s as a criticism of modernization theory which was falling increasingly out of favor because of continued widespread poverty in much of the world. Modernization theory held that all societies progress through similar stages of development, that today's underdeveloped areas are thus in a similar situation to that of today's developed areas at some time in the past, and that therefore the task in helping the underdeveloped areas out of poverty is to accelerate them along this supposed common path of development, by various means such as investment, technology transfers, and closer integration into the world market. Dependency theory rejected this view, arguing that underdeveloped countries are not merely primitive versions of developed countries, but have unique features and structures of their own. Many dependency theorists advocate social revolution as an effective means to the reduction of economic disparities in the world system.

The premises of dependency theory are;

1. Poor nations provide natural resources, cheap labour, a destination for obsolete technology, and markets for developed nations, without which the latter could not have the standard of living they enjoy.

2. Wealthy nations actively perpetuate a state of dependence by various means. This influence may be multifaceted, involving economics, media control, politics, banking and finance, education, culture, and sport.

Dependency theorists hold that short-term spurts of growth notwithstanding, long-term growth in the periphery will be imbalanced and unequal, and will tend towards high negative current account balances. Cyclical fluctuations also have a profound effect on cross-national comparisons of economic growth and societal development in the medium and long run. What seemed like spectacular long-run growth may in the end turn out to be just a short run cyclical spurt after a long recession. At the core of the dependency relation between center and periphery lays the inability of the periphery to develop an autonomous and dynamic process of technological innovation. Technology is at the center of stage. The
Dependency theory has been criticized by free-market economists. The major criticisms are:

1. **Lack of competition.** By subsidizing in-country industries and preventing outside imports, these states may have less incentive to improve their products, to try to become more efficient in their processes, to please customers, or to research new innovations.

2. **Sustainability.** Industries reliant on government support may not be sustainable for very long, particularly in poorer countries and countries which largely depend on foreign aid from more developed countries.

3. **Domestic opportunity costs.** Subsidies on domestic industries come out of state coffers and therefore represent money not spent in other ways, like development of domestic infrastructure, seed capital or need-based social welfare programs. At the same time, the higher prices caused by tariffs and restrictions on imports require the people either to forgo these goods altogether or buy them at higher prices, forgoing other goods.

Market economists cite a number of examples in their arguments against dependency theory. The improvement of India's economy after it moved from state-controlled business to open trade is one of the most often cited example. South Korea and North Korea provide another example of trade-based development. When the two states were divided at the end of the Korean War, they possessed roughly identical populations, resources and infrastructure and were at similar levels of development. North Korea pursued a policy of Import substitution industrialization as suggested by dependency theory, while South Korea pursued a policy of Export-oriented industrialization as suggested by comparative advantage theory. In 2013 South Korea's per capita GDP was 18 times that of North Korea. In Africa, states which have emphasized import-substitution development, such as Zimbabwe, have typically been among the worst performers, while the continent's most successful non-oil based economies such Egypt, South Africa and Tunisia, have pursued trade-based development. Free market theorists say that dependency policies only aggravate the disparity between the developed nations and the underdeveloped countries.

**Integration Theory**

Integration theory generally means a bunch of theories directed at an integrated world model. These theories include, Functionalism, neo-functionalism, Rational choice theory, international federalism, Inter governmentalism and supra-nationalism. Some thinkers also tend to include dependency theory in this category.

**Functionalism:** Functionalism is a system used by cultures which concentrates on and emphasizes the functional interactions of cultures and societies. The main idea is that each culture or society can be viewed as a system that consists of similar elements and that function either separately or together. If one of these elements was altered or removed, then this would affect the other elements and the system as a whole. In international relations arose principally from the experience of the Second World War and a strong concern about the obsolescence of the State as a form of social organization. Rather than the self interest of nation states that realist see as a motivating factor, functionalists focus on common interests and needs shared by states but also by non state actors in a process of global integration triggered by the erosion of state sovereignty and the increasing weight of...
knowledge and hence of scientists and experts in the process of policy making. In the functionalism theory, international integration the collective governance and interdependence between states develops its own internal dynamic as states integrate in limited functional, technical, and/or economic areas. International agencies would meet human needs, The benefits rendered by the functional agencies would attract the loyalty of the populations and stimulate their participation and expand the area of Emile Durkheim and Robert Merton are the major figures associated with this theory.

Neo functionalism is a theory of International Integration, which is aimed at integrating individual sectors in hopes of achieving spill-over effects to further the process of integration. Principal Figures Related to Neo-Functionalism are Jeffrey Alexander David Mitrany and Jean Monnet. Neo-functionalism is non normative and tried to describe and explain the process of regional integration based on empirical data. Integration was regarded as an inevitable process, rather than a desirable state of affairs that could be introduced by the political elites of the involved states' societies. Neofunctionalism assumes a decline in importance of nationalism.

**Rational Choice theory:** According to Rational choice theory Institutions are rules that determine the decision-making process. In the international arena, institution has been used interchangeably with 'regime', explicit or implicit "principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors expectations converge in a given issue-area. Rational institutionalists also regard institutions as themselves being rationally chosen by actors who view the rules as facilitating the pursuit of their goals. Institutionalism claims that the international integration is an institutionalized process in which states incorporate multinational institutions in their decisions and create common rules that integrates each other.

Federalism on a global level, as a system based on the principle of subsidiarity in which policy responsibility is shared between different levels of decision-makers in global institutions to ensure a collective effort for the common concern of peace, security and development while respecting and retaining the legitimate sovereign status of nation states” International Federalism strides towards building and strengthening regional governance structures along federal lines are being made throughout all regions of the world. For example African Union (AU), Organization of American States (OAS), Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). International Federalism theory imply that a constitution that can create a common legal system helps the integration process in other areas like the economic and culture integration in a legal framework.

**Intergovernmentalism:** Intergovernmentalism is also a theory on international state integration which rejects the idea of neo-functionalism. The theory, suggests that governments control the level and speed of the state integration. Any increase in power at supranational level, results from a direct decision by governments. Integration, driven by national governments, is often based on the domestic political and economic issues of the day. The theory rejects the concept of the spill over effect that neofunctionalism proposes.

**Supra-Nationalism:** Supra nationalism is a method of decision-making rather than a theory in International organizations, where power is held by independent appointed officials or by representatives elected by the legislatures or people of the member states. Member-state governments still have power, but they must share this power with other actors. Furthermore, decisions are made by majority votes, hence it is possible for a
member-state to be forced by the other member-states to implement a decision against its will; however, unlike a federal state, member states fully retain their sovereignty and participate voluntarily, being subject to the supranational government only so far as they decide to remain members. Few international organizations today operate on the basis of supra nationalism; the main exceptions are the European Union and the South American Community Of Nations, often called Supranational Unions, as they incorporate both intergovernmental and supranational elements.

Module-Ill

LIMITATIONS OF NATIONAL OF POWER

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

INTRODUCTION

The principle of sovereignty is the foundation of modern state system. Every state is supposed to be sovereign so that they are no more bounded by outward commitments.
Sovereignty proposes an all powerful state which can take decisions independent of other state actors in the system. However this idea is also a major source of instability in the international system. This creates a security dilemma in international politics. Consider the idea of external sovereignty. According to this principle no entity can dictate to a state what it should do. Although this principle does not extend equally to all actors because some states are more equal than others, one can usefully restrict the notion to the Great Powers. A state is a Great Power if it is able to protect its external sovereignty from encroachments by other great powers. This means maintaining capabilities to fight a major war. Even in a hierarchical system, there will be a set of states near the top of the power pyramid, and these states will have approximately equal capabilities.

Among these states, there is no higher authority that could regulate their interrelationships. Thus the condition among great powers is best approximated by anarchy. Anarchy involves two features that make up the self-help system: (1) no authority to enforce agreements, and (2) possible recourse to force by actors. Since there exists no legal authority to enforce contracts, this means that all agreements must be self-enforcing, The lack of enforcing authority implies two problems the state system must faces. Firstly no actor can be sure that a potentially dissatisfied state would not break the “rules” and seek a revision through violence. Under conditions of anarchy, the use of force is always a distinct possibility. This means that each actor must ensure that he has enough capabilities to meet such possible threats. He could seek the assistance of allies or friends also. As the actors continually try to match each other’s forces, both end up no more secure but with far less resources. Secondly in a self-help system one cannot simultaneously improve one’s own security without reducing that of others. That’s because the extent of one’s security is always the extent of the insecurity of one’s opponent.

Another mechanism that is used to secure state security is collective security. The idea is to form a coalition of states under the principle that an attack against one is an attack against all, requiring a collective response to the aggressor. The coalition members also agree to abstain from attacking each other. The idea is that such a system would enhance the security of its members much better than the self-help anarchic alone where each actor must rely solely on his own resources for defense. Further, unlike deterrence that relies on threats and may exacerbate the security dilemma, collective security systems encourage cooperation instead of competition. This also reduces the risk of war.

**COLLECTIVE SECURITY**

Before the First World War the international state security issues were sorted out with the mechanism of balance of power. World War I pointed out a fundamental flaw in the balance of power system. When the system failed, the result was dangerous and catastrophic. The incredible levels of destruction in the war led most nation-states to reject a balance of power system as the basis for international security. Instead, the victorious states sought to institutionalize a system of collective security. This was institutionalized by the League of Nations. The achievement of this “collective security” would be based on the principle that an attack on one is an attack on all. Any state contemplating aggression would
face the sure prospect of struggle not simply with the prospective victim, but with all other
members of the system, who would make any necessary sacrifice to save the state attacked.

The League of Nations and the United Nations are two post-World War agencies
under which the collective security system has been used as machinery for joint action for
the prevention or counter of any attack against an established international order. The
objective of collective security is to frustrate any attempt by states to change the status quo
with overwhelming force because a change in the status quo entails a change to the world
order of independent sovereign states. This was meant to muster overpowering collective
force, which could threaten and then applied to end aggression by revisionist states and
other would-be aggressors.

MEANING AND NATURE OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

According to George Schwarzeberger, collective security is a “machinery for joint
action in order to prevent or counter any attack against an established international order”. The
term implies collective measures for dealing with threat to peace. Van Dyke sees
collective security as a system in which a number of states are bound to engage in collective
efforts on behalf of each other’s individual security. Onyemaechi Eke identifies the concept
of collective security as “an idealist one which hinges on the prevention of hostilities by the
formation of an overwhelming military force by member states to deter aggression or, by
implication, to launch a reprisal attack capable of defeating the recalcitrant member.”
According to him, collective security “connotes the institutionalization of a global police
force against abuse of order and breaches, which can lead to insecurity. It is an arrangement
in which all states cooperate collectively to provide security for all by the actions of all
against any state within the groups which might challenge the existing order by using
force.”

Collective security occupies a major place in the study of international politics. The
concept of collective security is commonly regarded as most effective tool in making peace
and deterring aggression. It implies collective measures for dealing with threats to peace.
The idea of collective security evolved from an international understanding that peace can
be maintained only by the joint pledge of the states to take action against a state which
resorts to war and poses a threat to world peace. Ernest A Gross, observes: “there is no
alternative to collective action for the achievement of security. The opposite of collective
security is complete in security”. In short the nations unite under the collective security
system and take care of the security of each of them collectively. Morgenthau puts the
principles of “one for all and all for one”. The concept is best seen as “security for
individual nation by collective means”, that is, by membership in an international
organization made up of all or most of the states of the world pledged to defend each other
from attack.

According to Palmer and Perkings, “a collective security system, to be effective,
must be strong enough to cope with aggression from any power or combination of powers,
and it must be invoked if and as aggression occurs.” The principle of collective security
involves a willingness to apply sanctions as and when necessary and even to go to war.
Collective security will never work unless all the nations that take part in it are prepared
simultaneously to threaten with sanctions and to fight, if necessary, an aggressor. It must be open to those states which are willing to accept its obligations in good faith. Collective security is based on four principles:

1. All countries forswear the use of force except in self-defense
2. All agree that peace is indivisible, an attack on one is an attack on all
3. All pledge to unite to halt aggression and restore the peace, and
4. All agree to supply whatever material or personnel resources that are necessary to form a collective security force associated with the United Nations or some Inter Governmental Organizations to defeat aggressors and restore the peace.

DEVELOPMENT OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

The idea of collective security was extensively discussed during the World War I, and it took shape in the 1919 Covenant of the League of Nations. The covenant of League of Nations contained detailed provisions for collective security system. It provided for an effective network of cooperation between various nation and people to ensure collective security. But the league failed to implement the collective security measures. This was one of the major reasons for the outbreak and spread of Second World War.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Palmer and Perkings observed that the League of Nations was a complete failure as an instrument for enforcement of collective security. The major reason for the failure is attributed to the American approach to the organization. United States of America failed to join the League from the start itself. This was combined with the growth of Soviet Union outside the League as one of the major powers. Palmer and Perkings believed that “the open defiance of Japan, Italy and Germany combined to destroy any hopes that the League would-be effective in major international crisis.”. The Manchurian crisis gives the best example to the collective security system in the League of nations. Japan occupied part of China. After the invasion, members of the League passed a resolution calling for Japan to withdraw or face severe penalties. Given that every nation on the League of Nations Council had veto power, Japan promptly vetoed the resolution, severely limiting the League of Nations’ ability to respond. After two years of deliberation, the League passed a resolution condemning the invasion without committing the League’s members to any action against it. The Japanese replied by quitting the League of Nations. A similar fate was awaiting the organization in 1935. Italy invaded Ethiopia in 1935. Sanctions were passed, but Italy would have vetoed any stronger resolution. Additionally, Britain and France sought to court Italy’s government as a potential deterrent to Hitler. Thus, neither of these countries enforced any serious sanctions against the Italian government. In these two instances, collective security did not work because of lack of commitment on the part of other states and an unwillingness of the International Community to act in concert.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Learning from the failure of leagues collective security system, United Nations organization arranged for much more extensive and much more far reaching provisions of
collective security. Article 1 of the UN charter refers to “effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of peace”

Chapter seven of the charter (Articles 39-51) makes detailed provision regarding collective security. Article 39 of the charter authorizes the Security Council to “determine the existence of any threat to the breach of peace or act of aggression” and to “make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken”. Article 41 authorizes the Security Council to decide measures “not involving the use of armed force” to be used to give effects to its decision under Article 39. It may call upon the members to take such measures as the severance of diplomatic and economic relations. Article 42 empowers the Security Council to take military measures involving the use of air, sea or land forces. Article 43 provides for making available armed assistance. Under Article 45 the member states are obliged to provide national forces for combined international enforcement.

The principle of collective security is found in Article 48 and 49 of the Charter of the United Nations which states that, “the action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine; such decisions shall be carried out by the members of the United Nations directly or through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.” The idea behind the collective security system is that members of the organization advancing the collective security system are bound to spring to each other’s defense in case of attack. Thus the United Nations charter has developed a comprehensive system of collective Security. The members of the UN accepted a commitment to abide by and give full support to the decision of Security Council in the Matter of collective measures.

The enforcement action undertaken by the United Nations against North Korea that invaded South Korea in 1950 marks the first time the organized community of nations in accordance with the principles of Collective Security, has employed armed forces against an aggressor. When the United Nations found out that North Korea exhibited aggression against South Korea, it called upon members of the United Nations to send troops and other assistance to South Korea and it asked the United States President to designate a Supreme Commander of the UN Forces. Thus the United Nations demonstrated that even though it had no armed forces at its disposal, as provided for in Article 43 of the Charter, it was not impotent in the face of open aggression.

On June 25, 1950 North Korea attacked South Korea and thus precipitated, as Palmer and Perkins comments “the greatest international crisis since the end of world war”. The matter was brought to the notice of the Security Council immediately. At its meeting on June 25, the Security Council passed a resolution by 9 to 0 vote (Yugoslavia abstained and the Soviet Union was absent in the Security Council) that North Korea was an aggressor and this action constituted a breach of peace. The resolution called upon the parties to immediately stop hostilities and demanded withdrawal of North Korean forces to the 38th parallel. It also requested all UN members to render every assistance to the UN in the
execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities. The absence of Soviet Union, which was boycotting the Security Council during this period on the issue of communist China’s admission to UN, made it possible for the Security Council to take this decision as there was no soviet veto.

Sixteen member states provided troops under a United Nations Joint Command. This United Nations force was primarily dominated by America. On September 15th 1950, United Nations troops landed an attack against the invading army of North Korea. They effectively cut the North Korean army in half and pushed them out of South Korea. The UN force then advanced into North Korea – despite warnings from Communist China. This resulted in a Chinese attack on United Nations troops and between November 1950 and January 1951, the Chinese managed to push back the United Nations force. Later the war degenerated into an equal war with neither the United Nations nor the Chinese managing to gain the upper hand. In 1953, a ceasefire was agreed which exists to this day. South Korea regained its independence.

The United Nations received much support for taking action against an aggressor nation. Sixteen UN nations supplied fighting units and five sent military hospitals and field ambulances. Australia was one of the very first to contribute military personnel from all three services. The single largest UN contributor was the United States of America (USA) which at one stage had 140,000 personnel deployed in direct combat roles in Korea. Great Britain, Canada, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Colombia, Ethiopia, South Africa, New Zealand, Turkey, Greece, Thailand, Philippines and Luxembourg sent fighting units. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, India, Italy contributed military hospitals and field ambulances to the cause. Thus the Korean experience showed that the UN can effectively assure collective security with the help of member states.

Another major initiative on collective security is the Iraqi war. On 2nd August 1990, the Iraqi army invaded Kuwait and established its control over the state. A week after its invasion, Iraq annexed Kuwait and declared that the existence of Kuwait as an independent nation had come to an end. Kuwait’s name was changed “Iraq city of Kuwait.” All the nations of the world criticized Iraq’s military invasion of Kuwait. The UN Security Council by 15-0 vote resolved that Kuwait annexation was illegal and all nations were requested not to give recognition to Iraq’s illegal action. Iraq was asked to drawback its decision to annex Kuwait.

The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in, 1990, set into motion a series of actions by U.N. member states that catapulted the United Nations Security Council into the limelight. Between August 2 and December 31, 1990, the Council adopted 12 resolutions that progressively applied elements collective security of the Charter. After condemning the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and demanding Iraq’s withdrawal, the Council decided to impose economic sanctions against Iraq. The Council authorized states with maritime forces in the area to “use such measures as may be necessary” to ensure strict implementation of the sanctions as related to shipping. Finally, in Resolution 678 (1990), the Council authorized states “to use all necessary means” to implement previous Council resolutions.
On 27th Feb 1991, Iraq withdrew from Kuwait and on 28th February and American President Bush declared that Kuwait is free. Gulf war against Iraq in 1991 can be cited as the first example of the Collective security measures under taken by the UNO as conceived in the UN charter itself. The collective action was supported by all the UN members

PROBLEMS OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

The idea of collective security was well appreciated by many thinkers. They hoped that this would maintain international peace and security. Karen Mingst averred that collective security is borne out of some salient assumptions. These assumptions are that: wars are prevented by restraint of military action; aggressors must be stopped; the aggressor is easily identified; the aggressor is always wrong; aggressors know that the international community will act against them. Van Dyke says; “they wanted states to abandon narrow conceptions of self interest as a guide to policy and to regard themselves as units in a world society having an interesting preserving law and order everywhere.” Many state leaders and diplomats believed that collective security is an alternative to wars. They developed many institutional mechanisms to ensure the smooth working of collective security. The United nations Organization itself is such a mechanism to ensure collective security in the international politics. However these ideas could not work out as a result of numerous problems associated with the concept of collective security.

Some other scholars feel that the concept of collective security is misguided. They see it as conceptually muddled and naively unrealistic. Although they are pledged to defend each other, many countries will refuse to do so, if such an act is not in their own best interests or thought to be too risky or expensive. In addition, they argue that collective security arrangements will turn small struggles into large ones, and prevent the use of alternative. It leaves lesser space for negotiations and pacific settlements. Collective security replaces the less costlier and effective non-violent settlements with military confrontations. There is always a danger that alliances formed by the purpose of collective security can also serve as a basis for an aggressive coalition. Other problems associated with the collective security system are;

1, States do not regard themselves as members of one society having a common vital interest in protecting and preserving each other’s rights. For example if Paraguay and Bolivia destroy themselves in a war Japan or Egypt will have no intrest. There is no doubt that states have demonstrated willingness to ally themselves with certain other selected states and thus to pledge to defend certain selected frontiers in addition to their own, but the principle of “one for all and all for one” does not commend itself.

2, Another challenge to collective security is that its risks are great. Governments of nation-states can enforce law against individuals with little risk or fear. In international politics the situation is very different. Disparities of power are much greater. Theoretically, it might be easy for a world society to defeat aggression by a smaller power, but when one of the great powers turns aggressor? It is one thing for a government to enforce a law against an individual and another thing for the United Nations to try to enforce the law against a state which may be almost as strong as the rest of the world combined. The development of nuclear weapons makes the problem more grave and serious. An aggressor
with such weapons could virtually wipe from the face of the earth a number of the members of the collective security system. Faced with such a possibility, a member whose own most vital interest was directly threatened might choose defiance rather than surrender. But a member whose own vital interests were not directly threatened would be unlikely to be so bold. Nor do states want to commit themselves in advance to undertake such risks, regardless of the identity of the aggressor and of his victim.

3. Another problem with collective security is the issue of veto power of the UN system. The veto principle of the Security Council of the United Nations was originally meant to ensure commitment of the five permanent members to the United Nations. It was also meant that no superpower is against any UN action, which can lead to outbreak of hostilities. The superpowers were expected to exercise collective responsibility for the maintenance of global peace and security. But today there are many unilateral actions by some permanent members of the Security Council with veto powers against countries they perceive as threats to international peace and security. A good example is the invasion of Iraq by the United States and Britain, “this wave of American-styled security by domination in place of collective security creates both anxiety and curiosity over the weakness of the United Nations Collective Security. The enforcement action undertaken by the United Nations against North Korea that invaded South Korea in 1950 was made possible only because the Soviet delegate at the time was boycotting the meetings of the Security Council. Critics argued that had he been present, he presumably would have vetoed any action against North Korea. To them, the action of the United States and of other United Nations members who supported enforcement actions does not necessarily reflect a commitment to resist aggression simply out of belief that the Principle of Collective Security deserved support. Arnold Wolfers says “instead of being a case of nations fighting any aggressor anywhere and for no other purpose than to punish aggression and to deter potential aggressors, intervention in Korea was an act of collective military defense against the recognized number-one enemy of the United States and of all countries which associated themselves with its action.”

4. The activities of powerful regional organizations have posed serious problem to United Nations Collective Security System. Members of such organizations demonstrate divided loyalty often times with more concern to the regional organization than the UN. Members of regional security have often abandoned the UN Collective Security System in preference to regional security system. Palmer and Perkings agree that the United States and western powers, in their attitudes of placing more emphasis on national and regional defense than on collective security as the obligation to the Charter of the United Nations are fundamental problems of unanimity of the Council and by extension, the cause of failure of security regime. In many instances of states and regional conflicts, members of regional security abandon the UN. The double allegiance of members of the United Nations, especially by the veto-wielding ones, concretely depicts moral failure.

5. The loose institutional mechanism of UN is another setback for the collective security project. The United Nations calls for necessary measures to maintain international peace and security, including the obligation of states to place at the disposal of the United Nations agreed power necessary for an international peace force to be equipped with agreed
types of armaments. Thus there is no institutionalized collective security regime, under the U.N. Collective Security mechanism depends on the willingness of member states to promote the U.N. peace agenda. One of the problems of here is the unwillingness of countries to subordinate their sovereign interests to collective action.

6 Another problem which have resulted in the failure of the United Nations Collective Security system is the overdependence of the Security Council on the member-governments for assistance. They heavily depends on the so called major powers for security enforcement. This overdependence has made these nations act unilaterally in conflict situations without approval of the Security Council of the United Nations. In some situations, they flout the orders of the Security Council not to act unilaterally. The Iraq crisis and the role of the coalition forces, which was molded by the United States and Britain is clearer example. The big powers of the world will only agree to cooperate with the United Nations in relation to collective security as long as it serves their interests.

7 United Nations Collective Security is criticized as one sided system whereby lesser and medium powers are ignored during aggression. Many argue that the United Nations has not completely applied the Principle of Collective Security on a universal scale. To them, collective security would be meaningful only if it applied to great as well as lesser powers. Thus these scholars have overly criticized the unrepresentative stature of the Security Council. They question the non inclusion of any African country in the membership of the UN Security Council considering the fact that Africa makes about one third membership of the U.N. The lack of geographical spread of members of the Security Council, no doubt, has a negative effect on the function and strength of the Council on the role of maintenance of global peace and security. The major issue here is that such members that feel their voices are only heard but of no policy consequence in protecting their interest feel withdrawn in U.N. actions of Collective Security.

CONCLUSION

Collective Security is an institutionalized mechanism for the maintenance of international peace and security. It offers a platform of nations to defend and develop. It has reduced tensions among states in the international community. It has done much by providing the framework for keeping conflicts from becoming major threats to international peace. However much more is left to be done. Collective should be more reliable measure for the states to secure their defense against an aggressor. As Palmer and Perking pointed out, for Collective Security to be effective, it must be strong enough to cope with aggression from any power or combination of powers, and it must be invoked if and as aggression occurs. The direction of the United Nations Collective Security system has always been dictated by the world big powers especially the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. Small and medium powers feel left out in the Collective Security arrangement as they can only benefit from the system only when the interests of any of the "big gives" are at stake. However, its weakness does not dismiss the system as wholly unuseful. The UN Collective Security system remains relevant and needed, but its radical defects must be attended to by admitting the added duty to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. It is of great importance, to institute a confidence-building
measure among the members of the United Nations so as to establish the requisite solidarity and cooperation for enduring global peace and security.

**PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES**

Peace is one of the major goals in international politics. The formation of the League of Nations and United Nations Organization is closely linked with the search for global peace. Peace being the objective, the path should also be peaceful. Thus the founders of the international organizations also focused on peaceful means to control global conflicts. Basically war is considered as the right trajectory for settling disputes among states. But with the growth of global politics and international political organizations, alternative dispute settlement mechanisms were established and practiced. Thus the UN forum devised many methods of pacific settlement of disputes. Collective security and military enforcement will be the final attempt after recourse to the pacific alternatives.

The first article of the UN charter identifies the aim of the United Nations as “to bring about a peaceful settlement of disputes among nations in order to maintain International peace and security”. The important methods of peaceful settlement of disputes provided by the UN Charter are as follows.

1. **Negotiation;** Direct Negotiation is the simple and common method of settling disputes. Negotiations are conducted through diplomatic representatives, foreign ministers or head of states or through conferences. It is an attempt on the part of the contesting parties to settle the disputes by mutual discussions and deliberations. This can be the first stage of the peace process.

2. **Good offices and mediation;** When the parties in the dispute are unable to reach an agreement through Negotiation a third country or third person may offer its “good offices” or services to facilitate settlement. If the disputing parties accept the offer of good offices of a third country, then the third country simply acts as a transmitting agency. If the third country offers its suggestions to settle a dispute, then it becomes a mediator. Mediation on the other hand, is a method under which the third state, whose good office is accepted, makes suggestion and assumes the responsibility to settle the dispute. The mediating state assumes the role of a middle man. The mediator makes every attempt to reconcile the opposite claims of the disputing parties. However, the suggestions of the mediator are not binding on the contesting parties.

3. **Enquiry;** Enquiry and conciliation are more effective than good offices and mediation. The first Hague conference of 1899 recommended the use of commissions of enquiry. Many treaties have made provisos for it. The duty of the commission of enquiry is to investigate the facts so as to clarify the issues and elucidate facts. It can hear both sides of the dispute, call witness and experts and on that basis presents its conclusions and recommendations. But it has no power to make the award binding on the disputant parties. Therefore, it investigates and makes suggestions when requested by the disputant parties.

4. **Conciliation;** Conciliation is a method under which an outside party promotes an agreement between disputant states. The Conciliation Commission hear and ascertains facts and it may ask for compromises or concessions before advancing its proposals for settling a dispute. Conciliation differ from Enquiry and mediation. The main object of enquiry is to
clarify the issues and elucidate the facts leaving the parties to settle a dispute. Conciliation on the other hand aims at bringing the parties to an agreement offering suggestions and recommendations. Conciliation differs from mediation because under it parties refer the issue to a committee or a council which ascertains the facts and makes suggestions for settling the dispute. Mediation, is a method under which the mediator assumes responsibility for the settlement of a dispute. Mediation is performed by an individual. Whereas conciliation is effected by a council, board, committee or commission.

5. **Arbitration.** Arbitration is a sort of semi-Judicial process. Here a dispute is determined through a legal decision of one individual or of a tribunal chosen by the parties. The disputant parties bound to respect the award of the arbiter. Arbitration involves four important elements. They are (1) settlement of disputes between nations through voluntary action. (2) By Judges of their own choice. (3) On the basis of respect for law (4) obligation to accept the award as binding. Disputant Parties can demand reconsideration of the award.

6. **Judicial settlement.** Judicial settlement, is a form of arbitration. It is known as adjudication. Arbitration and adjudication differ from each other in the following respects. Arbitration is cheaper and simple than adjudication’s) Arbitration is more elastic than adjudication’s) through adjudication, only legal disputes are settled. While arbitration tribunal settles both legal and politics issued) Arbitration is performed by person or states while in adjudication the agency is a permanent body of court) Arbitration has a character of voluntary Jurisdiction but there is no such thing in adjudication. Adjudication of disputes obviously requires the prior creation of a court to which disputes may be submitted. League of Nations set up a permanent court of International Justice. It is continuing in the the UNO. The International court decides all cases referred to it by the disputant parties.

**UN INITIATIVES ON PACIFIC SETTLEMENTS**

Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter deals with peaceful settlement of disputes. It requires countries with disputes that could lead to war to first of all try to seek solutions through peaceful methods such as "negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice." If these methods of alternative dispute resolution fail, then they must refer it to the UN Security Council.

Under Article 35, any country is allowed to bring a dispute to the attention of the UN Security Council or the General Assembly. This chapter authorizes the Security Council to issue recommendations but does not give it power to make binding resolutions; those provisions are contained Chapter VII. Chapter VI is analogous to Articles 13-15 of the Covenant of the League of Nations which provide for arbitration and for submission of matters to the Council that are not submitted to arbitration. There is a general agreement among legal scholars that resolutions made under Chapter VI are not legally binding. One argument is that since they have no enforcement mechanism, except self-help, they may not be legally binding. Some States give constitutional or special legal status to the UN Charter and Security Council resolutions. In such cases non-recognition regimes or other sanctions can be implemented under the provisions of the laws of the individual member states.

**EVALUATION OF UN INITIATIVES ON PACIFIC SETTLEMENTS**

Observers of the UN tend to fall into one of two camps when examining its role in the peaceful settlement of disputes. The first sees greater potential for the Organization provided that member States would utilize the processes contemplated in the Charter. This group tends to be institutionalist or functionalist in its political philosophy, positing the United Nations as an independent actor in global politics, one that can influence and settle
disputes and thereby contribute to international peace. Chapter VI offers the non-forcible means to this end; lack of coercive measures does not diminish the UN's effectiveness. The optimists typically cite two categories of UN accomplishments - a history of UN diplomatic interventions that have defused tensions in certain situations; and the results of some UN peacekeeping operations. The optimists always emphasize the UN as a unique forum for the airing of disputes and the possibilities for neutral fact-finding.

In the other camp lie the sceptics of Chapter VI, and often of the UN as an institution. They judge the UN a failure as an actor to end conflicts and any notion of collective security a farce. Typically realist in their political approach, the sceptics argue that the UN can reflect only the individual preferences of member States. Other than perhaps as a forum for negotiation, the Organization itself can exert little successful effort to further international peace and security. The sceptics point to studies showing a marginal, if not negligible, UN contribution to the resolution of disputes, especially those involving uses of force. The cases offered by the optimists are either exceptions to the general proposition or perhaps proof of it, insofar as they rarely show the UN definitively settling a conflict.

At its core, Chapter VI offers a process for bringing parties to a political settlement of their differences. The last half-decade of UN action provides evidence that realists must acknowledge of a Council able to take a more active part in addressing the merits of a conflict. The end of the Cold War has enlarged the responsibility and significance of UN as an international forum of debate and discussions. Peace keeping has now gone beyond guarding boarders. The peace keeping missions has taken executive functions for the parties. They also successfully delivered humanitarian aids to the suffering millions in the war affected areas. The Security Council has developed the 'Friends' process as a way of spreading the burden and consolidating expertise on peace-making. A small group of States, typically consisting of some of the Permanent Five as well as interested regional actors, actively follow the dispute, draft resolutions, and consult frequently with the Secretary-General and the interested players, both in New York and in the affected region. This new mechanism for direct Council engagement can contribute to a revival of its role in solving disputes.

**MODULE-IV**

**DIPLOMACY**

A. THE FUNCTIONS OF DIPLOMATIC
B. PERSONAL DIPLOMACY
C. SUMMIT DIPLOMACY
D. DIPLOMACY IN THE POST-COLD WAR PERIOD.
E. DECLINE AND REVIVAL OF DIPLOMACY

**DIPLOMACY**
At the boundary where states meet the outside world, diplomacy emerges. Diplomacy involves the presentation of the interests and actions of the state to an international audience. It includes a wide variety of activities, including formal interactions with other states over treaties and agreements, public statements by spokespeople to explain the state’s actions, and positions taken in international settings such as the United Nations general assembly. These activities share two features in common: firstly they are all at some level official products or byproducts of state behavior, meaning that diplomacy is essentially connected to the business of the state; and secondly, they all involve situating state behavior within the framework provided by international law. Diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of groups or states. It usually refers to international diplomacy, the conduct of international relations through professional diplomats with regard to issues of treaties, trade, war and peace, economics and culture.

The term diplomacy has two principal meanings. Firstly, diplomacy is used in the sense of means or method of conducting the foreign policy of a nation. Secondly, diplomacy is also used to refer to the process of formulation and conduct of foreign policy of a nation. The essence of diplomacy consists in bargaining for a nation’s interest and securing it best by skilful and opportune use of the resources of the nation. Generally, diplomacy is supposed to secure the maximum advantage for a nation by means of negotiation and compromise.

Diplomacy may be defined as the management of international relations by negotiation or the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed. In other words it is the process of representation and negotiations by which states customarily deal with one another in terms of peace. Sir Ernest Satow writes “Diplomacy is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the government of independent states”. E.A Johnson opines that diplomacy is an instrument and machinery which is used to influence and reduce misunderstanding to avert international crisis”. Morgenthau is of the opinion that diplomacy is the promotion of the national interests by peaceful means”.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines diplomacy as “The management of international relations by negotiation” or “The method by which these relations are adjusted and managed”. However, Quincy Wright defined diplomacy in the popular sense as “The employment of tact, shrewdness, and skill in any negotiation or transaction” and in the more special sense used international relations as the art of negotiation, in order to achieve the maximum of group objective with minimum of costs, within a system of politics in which war is a possibility”. This definition indicates that the term diplomacy is used to describe both the methods used by agents conducting the foreign affairs of a state and the objectives which such agents seek to achieve. In the first instance, it is almost equivalent to the term negotiation, implying methods of persuasion rather than coercion and is therefore contrasted with war. Negotiation, however, under conditions where physical coercion is practically impossible, as in business or domestic government is not usually called diplomacy. Secondly, diplomacy is almost equivalent to foreign policy and implies devotion by its practitioners to the national interest of their respective states. It is therefore, contrasted with
international relations which implies that it is an end superior to the national interests of the state.

**ORIGIN NATURE AND SCOPE OF DIPLOMACY**

The art of diplomacy is as old as the existence of human communities. Sending of emissaries to open negotiation was a common practice regulated by custom. The Greek city states frequently dispatched and received with due accreditation, those who presented their cases openly before the rulers or assemblies to whom they were sent. By the 15th century, the principle and method of Greek City states have developed. As the middle age proceeded, the sovereignty of individual states, presentation of credentials began to be required if an ambassador wanted to be received by a sovereign power. At the beginning of 16th century, the practice of accreditory diplomatic envoys had started spreading to other countries of Europe in the atmosphere of alliances and dynastic struggle for power. It was only when the treaty of Westphalia of 1648 established a new order of relationship in Europe that classical diplomacy in Europe began. The sovereignty and independence of individual states was established as the principle in which the classical diplomacy was conducted by the members of the ruling class who had more in common with each other than with majority of their own people. It was conducted according to well defined rules and conventions. It was then a personal and flexible type of diplomacy. In post revolutionary Europe, acceptance of an established monarchical order gave way to emphasis on liberty and individual rights. This was in the spirit of the slogan of the French revolution of 1789 which reverberated throughout Europe. The slogan was liberty and equality. Henceforth, diplomacy was exercised not in the interest of a dynasty but the nation as a whole.

After the First World War, demand grew for open diplomacy that will be accessible to public scrutiny. In the wake of the new emphasis on the sovereignty of the people, the electorates claiming to control the government wanted to know what agreement was being made with their name. For example US refused to be a member of the League of Nations in spite of the role played by their president Woodrow Wilson. Nowadays the openness of agreements guaranteed in principle by the United Nations rule that all agreement concluded by member states must be registered and their texts deposited with the Secretary General.

Diplomacy is a social activity. It connects a public language to the business of the state, giving meaning, reasons, and explanations for state action. It is therefore embedded in a social context of reasons, rules, and meanings that exist prior to the interaction. Meaningful diplomacy puts these resources to work in order to explain and justify the actions of the state. Schauer describes giving reasons for behavior in society as “the practice of engaging in the linguistic act of providing a reason to justify what we do or what we decide.” Public diplomacy is the international variant of this activity. It relies on the existence of international rules, norms, and laws to make sense of state action. Public reasons are the “epistemic requirements for justified action.”

Diplomacy is a strategic behavior governed by states’ views of their interests. The choices that the state makes in selecting from these resources are revealing of the character or identity of the state itself, or of its strategic public presentation of its identity. France, for
instance, in its intervention in Ivory Coast, explained itself in relation to the international rules and norms on humanitarian intervention and especially the actions of the United Nations. The political power of this diplomacy came from its ability to counteract narratives of imperialism and neocolonialism. Diplomacy draws on these resources external to the state in order to make meaningful state action. This view implies a relationship between states and international rules in which the two are mutually implicating. Rules and norms define the possible actions available to states and states articulate those rules and norms by making reference to them in their explanations of their interests and behavior. For instance, humanitarian intervention is defined and governed by existing rules and precedents, and these rules change as states make use of them in justifying their actual interventions.

The second feature of diplomacy is that it is a practice of states, and not of other kinds of actors. This follows naturally from the formal structure of the activity and its connection to the inherently state centric structures of public international law. Only states are obligated under public international law, and only states are therefore qualified to claim credit or to earn demerits. Diplomacy generates a constant stream of claims regarding compliance which at once reinforce the idea of the rule of law. States’ references to law and lawfulness in explaining their actions often mask rule-violation and also often construct new law, and often do both at the same time. The function of international law in these cases is to provide the resources for public diplomacy, and individual rules are consequential only insofar as they are invoked by actors and deployed in the public domain.

The key relation in diplomacy is not between the speaker and the audience but rather between the actor and the structure of international legal resources. The fact that the audience for diplomacy need not agree with the claims being made by the state suggests that the most important product of diplomacy is not persuasion, consensus, agreement, socialization, learning, or acculturation. The endpoint of diplomatic interaction is a consensus or shared understanding of either the rules in question or the interests and needs of the other party.

Prior to First World War, diplomacy was largely secret. The general public were not informed as to the nature of negotiations. But after the war the belief began to circulate that the diplomacy should be open and public. In old diplomacy the diplomats were responsible only to the executive and the executive being unaccountable; they decided the guidelines for diplomats. The general public was not informed as to the nature of negotiations conditions, attitudes and beliefs. Later open diplomacy was practiced. Open diplomacy was a reaction against the totalitarian and secret approaches to diplomacy. The attack on traditional diplomacy was led by Woodrow Wilson who specifically mentioned that “open covenant of peace openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understanding of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view. Many argue that secret diplomacy practiced by the then states was a root cause of the First World War.

**DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION**

Diplomatic recognition is an important factor in determining whether a nation is an independent state. Receiving recognition is often difficult, even for countries which are
fully sovereign. For many decades after its becoming independent, even many of the closest allies of the Dutch Republic refused to grant it full recognition. Today there are a number of independent entities without widespread diplomatic recognition. The Palestinian National Authority has its own diplomatic service, however Palestinian representatives in most Western countries are not accorded diplomatic immunity, and their missions are referred to as Delegations General. Other unrecognized regions which claim independence include Abkhazia, Transnistria, Somaliland, South Ossetia, Nagorno Karabakh, and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. These nations tend to be much more diplomatically isolated.

FUNCTIONS OF DIPLOMAT

There are many functions performed by a diplomat, some of these include: diplomatic representation, protection of his nationals, exchange of roles on matters of mutual interest, political and parliamentary negotiations, and most importantly, preservation and projection of the national interests of his country generally. The functions of diplomatic missions are spelt out in the Vienna convention of 1961. Article 3 of the convention states as follows: The functions of a diplomatic mission consist of the following:

- Representing the sending state in the receiving state.
- Protecting in the receiving state the interest of the sending state and its national within the limits as permitted in the international law.
- Negotiating with the government of receiving state.
- Ascertaining by all lawful means conditions and developments in the receiving state and reporting them to the sending state.
- Promoting friendly relations between the receiving and sending states and developing cultural, social and technological relations.

Joseph C. Grew, former United States Ambassador to Japan, commenting on the work of professional diplomat, said, “He must be, first and foremost, an interpreter, and this function of interpreting acts both ways. First of all he tries to understand the country which he serves – its conditions, its mentality, its actions, and its underlying motives, and to explain these things clearly to his own government. And then contrariwise, he seeks means of making known to the government and the people of the country to which he is accredited the purposes and hopes and desires of his native land. He is an agent of mutual adjustment between the ideas and forces upon which nations act”. The work of a diplomat may be broken down into four basic functions:

(i) Representation: A diplomat is a formal representative of his country in a foreign state. He is the normal agent of communication between his own foreign office and that of the state to which he is accredited. In the eyes of many citizens of the country in which he is stationed, he is the country he represents, and that country is judged according to the personal impression he makes. In the course of representing his country a diplomat equally provides necessary information and advice to foreign policy decision-makers which will help to shape the direction of foreign policy adopted.
(ii) Negotiation: Diplomats are by definition negotiators. As such, they have
including “the drafting of a wide variety of bilateral and multilateral arrangements
embodied in treaties, conventions, protocols, and other documents of political, economic
and social nature. Their subject matter ranges from the creation of the international security
organization, through territorial changes, establishment of rules to govern international civil
aviation, shipping and telecommunications, and the adjustment of international commercial
relationships, such particular matters as immigration, double taxation, water way rights,
tourist travel, and exchange control. Most agreements between states are still bilateral and
are concluded through negotiation between the foreign offices by the use of ordinary
diplomatic channels.

(iii) Reporting: Reports from diplomats in the field are the raw materials of foreign
policy. These reports cover nearly every conceivable subject, from technical studies to
appraisals of the psychology of nations. Diplomats must, above all be good reporters, if
they have the ability to estimate trends accurately, if they keep an eye out for all useful
intelligible form, they may be worth a king’s ransom.

(iv) Protection of Interests: A diplomat is expected to seek to further the best
interest of his own country..While it is assumed that the interest of each state will be so
interpreted that they will harmonize with those of the international community, it is not the
function of the diplomat to make the interpretation. His duty is to look after the interest of
his country as interpreted by policy-makers back home and in accordance with treaties,
other international agreements, and principles of international law. He also has the more
specific duty of attempting to assist and protect businessmen, seamen and all other nationals
of his own country who are living or traveling in the country in which he is stationed or
who happen to have interests there. He seeks to prevent or correct practices which might
discriminate against his country or its citizens.

The termination of the diplomats or the diplomatic mission may occur due to several
factors.1. A diplomat may not agree with the home government’s policy in relation to the
country in which he is posted. In such a case, he may ask for a transfer to another country or
resign his post. 2. A mission may be terminated or wound up on account of differences or
strains characterizing the relations between his home country and the country of his
posting.3. The diplomat may be recalled by the home government or brought home for
consultation generally because he has become unpopular in the country of his positing and
the government in that country requires his government to recall him.4. Sometimes the
diplomat becomes so much unacceptable to the country of his posting that the government
of that country dismisses him and even sends him back to his home country. In times of war
or on account of dangerous provocations such as spying, passing strategic or military
secrets to his home country the diplomat may be handed back his passport and asked to go
home.

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

Diplomatic immunity, is a fundamental principle of customary international law, and
it originated to protect representatives of foreign governments based abroad from
retaliation in time of international conflicts and to promote civilized international relations.
Diplomats are granted several special privileges and immunities. They represent heads of their nations. Hence, some privileges and immunities are necessary in order to help them maintain their status and dignity. Further in order that they carry out their duties freely and satisfactorily it is desirable that they enjoy a measure of freedom from the local laws and restrictions. The following privileges and immunities are granted to diplomats.

1. Diplomats, their families and members of their mission are personally inviolable.

2. Diplomats generally enjoy exemption from direct taxes, customs duties etc.

3. Diplomats enjoy exemption from civil and criminal jurisdiction. If they happen to commit crimes of a grave nature, the government of the country where they are appointed may request their home governments to recall their diplomats for trial or proper action at home.

4. The correspondence of the diplomats is inviolable. They are entitled to privacy in matters of correspondence and telephones.

5. The premises or the buildings of the embassies together with their furnishings, equipment, archives, etc. are considered to be a property of the nations represented by the diplomats. These are inviolable.

6. In case of war or severance of diplomatic relations between two nations the diplomats are assured safe return to their home countries.

7. They have inviolable right of passage through third friendly countries while on duty.

The extent of privileges and immunities enjoyed by diplomats depends upon the principle of reciprocity. If a nation displays courtesy and consideration in the treatment of diplomats from another nation its diplomats are generally shown the same courtesy and consideration by the other nation.

Three theories seek to justify diplomatic immunity. They are personal representation, the theory of extraterritoriality, and the theory of functional necessity. The theory of personal representation was the first justification propagated to justify diplomatic immunity. Under the theory of personal representation, diplomats acting on behalf of a sovereign state embody the ruler of that state. An affront to the representative of a sovereign state under this theory constitutes an affront to the foreign state itself.

The second theoretical justification advanced to justify diplomatic immunity is the theory of extraterritoriality. Under this theory, the diplomat legally resides on the soil of the sending state despite the fact that the diplomat lives abroad. Consequently, the foreign envoy is not subject to the law of the receiving state due to a lack of a local residence. Although this legal fiction received widespread support from international legal scholars and in judicial opinions, authorities have recently questioned and subsequently rejected the theory as a basis for a broad construction of diplomatic immunity. The third theory is the most widely accepted current justification of diplomatic immunity. It is about functional necessity. This theory provides that the diplomat is not subject to the jurisdiction of local...
courts, because this would hamper the functions of diplomatic relations. The functional necessity theory justifies immunity for the purpose of allowing diplomats to conduct their business. Accordingly, diplomatic immunity protects the diplomat's ability to carry out that work efficiently. The privilege does not, however, afford protection and benefits to the diplomat as a person.

The Vienna Convention establishes four categories of diplomatic personnel, with different levels of immunity allotted to each. The diplomatic agent is the head of the mission or a member of the diplomatic staff of the mission. Diplomatic agents are not subject to arrest or detainment. They are completely immune from the criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state, as well as from civil jurisdiction for acts committed within their official capacity. They are, however, subject to local jurisdiction for certain private acts. The family of the diplomatic agent enjoys the same immunity status as the agent. The administrative and technical personnel employed by the mission possess the same immunity as the diplomatic agents with respect to criminal jurisdiction. The Vienna Convention limits the immunity of administrative and technical personnel with respect to civil jurisdiction, however, to acts performed within the course of their duties.

The service staff, who performs domestic services for the mission, is only immune for acts performed in the course of their domestic duties. The final category is the private servant, who provides domestic service for a member of the mission and who is not an employee of the ending state. Private servants have only the immunity that the receiving state concedes, with the caveat that the receiving state must exercise its jurisdiction over private servants in a manner that does not interfere with the performance of the functions of the mission. In addition to the immunities provided for in the Vienna Convention, article 41 imposes a duty on the persons who benefit from such privileges and immunities to obey the laws and regulations of the receiving state.

PERSONAL DIPLOMACY:

When the foreign ministers, prime ministers or heads of the states directly participate in diplomatic negotiations this is termed as personal or summit diplomacy. Resort to such a diplomatic style is warranted in case the matters of serious concern are involved. During World War II this diplomatic style came to frequent use among the allied and axis powers. There were many personal meetings between Churchill and Roosevelt. The Atlantic charter (1941) was the result of the personal diplomacy. Many conferences that have been held in post war period of nonaligned states were summit conferences. The Afro-Asian conference at Bandung (1955) is one of the most successful milestones of personal diplomacy in which the world saw a political awakening of high magnitude in the developing states. Some of the examples of summit meetings are Bhutto- Indira Gandhi meeting at Simla in 1972. Rajiv Gandhi- Gorbachev meeting at New Delhi in 1986 and Shaik Haseena-Devagowda meeting at New Delhi in 1996.
In personal diplomacy the representatives are assisted by a number of experts of different branches while the information rendered by experts makes the representatives up to date the presence of the head of the states or governments makes the experts confident. The agreements reached in such conferences are sure to be ratified as it has commitment of the highest officials of the states. Personal diplomacy also suffered from some defects: 1. The failure of personal diplomacy leaves no alternative to resume negotiations. 2. The presence of a high dignitary like head of the state or government arouses much public expectations and inspires the press. If the negotiations fail, public may cause embarrassment to the government. Whereas the presence of diplomats in foreign capital is a normal thing and the failure of negotiations remains usually unnoticed.

CONFERENCE DIPLOMACY

Conference Diplomacy has now come to stay as a permanent factor of international relations. In conference diplomacy the normal channels of diplomacy like diplomatic and consular establishments are by passed and the conferences are made as an important diplomatic channel. The states through conference are able to postpone their hostilities for the time begin and thus succeed in avoiding the armed conflict. Even before the First World War, conference diplomacy was a popular phenomenon in international relations and it was adopted and successfully tried. The treaty of Westphalia (1648) is one of the most glaring examples of conference diplomacy by diplomacy. The League of Nations had unsuccessfully tried to make conference diplomacy as one of the important means to maintain world peace. The United Nations Organization also attached much importance to such diplomacy. In conference diplomacy opposite camps can be brought around a table and open discussion can be conducted to dissolve the differences among nations. It is open and parliamentary in character and the procedure is flexible and there are very many possibilities for the representatives to establish personal friendship. But there are some defects for the diplomacy by conference. The representatives who participate in a conference are the representatives of their sovereign government. They are assisted and watched by the experts of auxiliary services. They are briefed by their respective governments on all those aspects where they have to agree and disagree. Nothing is left at their discretion. So the conference is merely show because the members are strictly controlled by the heads of the government.

PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY

Preventive Diplomacy is a major development in modern period. Preventive diplomacy refers specifically to diplomatic action taken, at the earliest possible stage, “to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur”. Preventive diplomacy remains highly relevant along the entire conflict spectrum. There are several reasons for the development of preventive diplomacy. Foremost is the recurring and devastating impact of armed conflict on individuals, societies and economies, coupled with the recognition that failure to prevent conflict is extremely costly. A number of recent engagements have reconfirmed that through a combination of analysis, early warning, rapid response and partnerships, it is possible to defuse tensions in escalating crises and assist parties in resolving disputes peacefully.
The United Nations Organization is the premier forum for preventive diplomacy. Pursuant to Articles 10 and 11 of the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly has broad authority to consider conflict prevention in all its aspects; develop recommendations as appropriate; or call the attention of the Security Council to situations that are likely to endanger international peace and security. In the face of political tensions or escalating crises, preventive diplomacy is often one of the few options available, short of coercive measures, to preserve peace. It is also potentially a high-return investment. The biggest return comes in lives saved. However, prevention also makes strong economic sense. The World Bank has calculated that “the average cost of civil war is equivalent to more than 30 years of gross domestic product (GDP) growth for a medium-size developing country”. The most severe civil wars impose cumulative costs of tens of billions of dollars, and recovery to original growth paths takes the society concerned an average of 14 years. By contrast, prevention efforts can be much less costly: the United Nations Office for West Africa, which has played an important role in prevention efforts in Guinea, the Niger and elsewhere in the sub region, has a regular budget of less than $8 million per year.

**Track II diplomacy**

Track II diplomacy is a specific kind of informal diplomacy, in which non-officials engage in dialogue, with the aim of conflict resolution, or confidence-building. Track II diplomacy has been used for centuries to communicate between powers. Most diplomats work to recruit figures in other nations who might be able to give informal access to a country's leadership. In some situations, such as between the United States and the People's Republic of China a large amount of diplomacy is done through semi-formal channels using interlocutors such as academic members of think tanks. This occurs in situations where governments wish to express intentions or to suggest methods of resolving a diplomatic situation, but do not wish to express a formal position. Sometimes governments may fund such Track II exchanges. Sometimes the exchanges may have no connection at all with governments, or may even act in defiance of governments; such exchanges are called Track III diplomacy. On some occasion a former holder of an official position continues to carry out an informal diplomatic activity after retirement. In some cases, governments welcome such activity, for example as a means of establishing an initial contact with a hostile state of group without being formally committed. In other cases, however, such informal diplomats seek to promote a political agenda different from that of the government currently in power.

**DIPLOMACY IN THE POST-COLD WAR PERIOD.**

In the earlier periods, the conduct of diplomatic relations was strictly on a state-to-state basis. It was conducted between diplomats and government officials. In the post cold war period diplomacy has changed its nature and course. In post cold war international politics diplomacy acquired a public and democratic dimension. Secondly it acquired a human face.. For most democracies, the days are past when their Embassies were concerned only with maintaining “good relations” with the host government, irrespective of its character. Human rights were not high in the hierarchy of Embassy priorities. Today, Ambassadors and diplomats are much more likely to engage the people of the host countries and not only government officials, and to make consistent messaging on human rights and
governance a central part of their country mission, as agreed with authorities at home. Modern diplomacy operates through multiple channels. Diplomatic relations are only one international channel: everywhere, international networks of contacts are forming around issues, interests, and tasks, and have become the working landscape for internationalists and democratic activists. With regard to democracies, the goal of diplomacy has changed into the support of “Popular, Accountable, and Rights-regarding governments ("PAR")”. The approach eschews interference, but advocates that “the best way to help bring governments up to PAR is to connect them and their citizens in as many ways as possible to governments that are already at PAR and provide them with incentives and support to follow suit”. It is in this spirit that in contemporary diplomacy, Embassies and Consulates become vehicles of public diplomacy and outreach, and brokers promoting contact and communications between the peoples and nongovernmental organizations and groups of both sending and host countries.

Democracy development and human rights are among the most active topics of modern diplomatic communication. In addition to encouraging and facilitating some of these connections, Embassies are called upon to promote and defend the rights of people to so communicate. They also intervene when necessary to defend and support threatened human rights defenders and democratic activists, either demonstrably in public view, or, as the case merits, privately, below the radar.

DECLINE AND REVIVAL OF DIPLOMACY

Many foreign affairs experts believe that the international system is undergoing a momentous transition affecting its very nature. For indicators of this change, they point to the end of the bipolar world of the Cold War, the changing nature of the nation state on which the existing international system is based, the rise of new national power relationships, as well as the growth in the number and the role of non state participants in the international arena. These experts also note the impact that the changes in worldwide communications, due to advances in technology, have had on international relations. This change in the nature of international politics also affected the nature and course of diplomacy. Changes of international agendas were determined by growing hopes for benefits of diplomacy. Thus, for example, the end of the Gulf War in 1991 not only illustrated successful cooperation mechanisms among the US-led coalition forces of regaining Kuwait from Iraq, but it also symbolized the hope of using this model in the future. But during ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia most hopes died. The international community was not able to effectively prevent the humanitarian crisis and restore peace. Preventive diplomacy failed due to the international organizations dependence “on external constraints, including interests of their leading members”. Moreover, as Raimo Väyrynen admits, “their division of labour was too primitive to permit an early and effective action”. By the end of the Cold War, international agendas changed considerably -changing with them the character of diplomacy. Diplomacy has become more complicated, global and fragmentary.

Thus the diplomatic environment of the 21st century is marked by change and uncertainty. Particular features of this new diplomacy include:
• The expansion in the number and variety of international actors. Empowered by the ICT and social media, these actors now extend beyond traditional NGOs to more amorphous civil society groups.

• The development of a new international security agenda focused on the security of the individual within the state and including issues such as climate change or pandemic disease that go well beyond traditional concepts of international security. Here comes the stronger debates on human security.

• The resurgence of more traditional geopolitical agendas as states compete for power, resources or territory.

• The progressive fragmentation of the rules and norms governing international political and trade relations as more confident emerging states increasingly assert their own values and rules. One consequence will be a continuing weakening of multilateral institutions.

Whilst diplomats must now share the stage with a broad range of actors and institutions, states remain important actors in international affairs. Government diplomacy therefore remains a significant factor in protecting national interests, developing global governance and promoting international peace and security. Diplomats will cease to be gatekeepers guarding the borders of the foreign, becoming instead boundary spanners integrating the different landscapes and actors of the diplomatic environment. Contemporary diplomacy is engaging an increasingly wide range of actors alongside professional diplomats. This reflects the growth of civil society and their claims for participation in the processes of world politics.

The global financial crisis has re-awakened long-standing concerns with commercial diplomacy and hence there evolved a strong relation between diplomats and the business community. How to accommodate these interests, whether in multilateral or national diplomacy, is one of the key challenges facing modern diplomacy. This phenomenon has given rise to a number of images that seek to capture the ways in which international processes are changing such as ‘multi stakeholder ’ and ‘network’ diplomacy. These acknowledge the growing interaction between the agents of the state and international organizations and non-state actors, whether located in civil society or the business community.

In this context the debate on the revival of diplomatic functions focus on an Integrative Diplomacy framework. It stresses the importance of the growth of international policy networks and, consequently, the importance to effective diplomacy of collaboration between professional diplomats and the representatives of a variety of international actors. The breakdown of the distinction between domestic and international affairs means that the national interests of a country now involve the ‘whole of government’ and, therefore, the importance of coordination between government agencies. Foreign ministries should see themselves as part of this ‘national diplomatic system’ and consider their changing role in this light. The increasing demands of regulatory diplomatic agendas will imply increasing involvement of financial and other ministries in international policy.

To the current reassertion of the need for diplomats to adopt a commercial role, are joined the need to enhance what has long been seen as consular diplomacy in an era where crises impact on a globalised, increasingly mobile citizenry. Additionally, the practice of
public diplomacy has assumed centre stage. From the perspective of the general public and
the growing range of actors claiming a voice in diplomatic arenas, the diplomatic processes
and structures that have developed over the years are incapable of responding to the
complex range of interlinked issues. At a deeper, normative, level a skepticism regarding
what diplomats are, what they do and, particularly, how they do it has become more deeply
embedded as the widespread rejection of the norm of secrecy exemplified in the WikiLeaks
saga testifies.

This deeply entrenched dichotomy between aspiration and performance, claim and
counter claim, is represented in the wealth of metaphors and images that diplomacy has
generated. Advocating the utilization of social networking sites by the British Foreign and
Commonwealth Office, former Foreign Secretary David Miliband has claimed that they
have opened up the ‘secret garden’ of diplomacy. In an article in the Financial Times,
Richard Haass has argued the case for ‘messiness’ (a variety of forms) as a partial solution
to the problems confronting multilateralism. A former Canadian diplomat, Daryl Copeland,
promotes the virtues of ‘guerrilla’ diplomacy whilst Carne Ross, ex-British diplomat,
argues the necessity of ‘independent’ diplomacy as an alternative to the pursuit of national
interest inherent in state-based diplomatic practice.

Geopolitics continues to shape the international order, embracing huge shifts in the
global economy. But the power configurations that this produces are uncertain and reflect
the contemporary manifestations of two characteristic impulses of international relations:
the realities of competition and the requirements of cooperation. The scope of these issues
and interrelationships that they have created are captured in the concept of wicked issues
reflecting the linkages between, for example, fragile states, organized crime and terrorism
that constitute central challenge for 21st century diplomacy. Wicked issues are essentially
unique in nature and consequently every diplomatic ‘solution’ has to be tailored to specific
circumstances.

Two perspectives on diplomacy have competed for attention in the last two decades,
rooted in differing perspectives on the global environment.

1. **Statist perspectives:** It define diplomacy as a set of processes and structures,
bilateral and multilateral, relating to communication, negotiation and information sharing
between sovereign states. At the national level, the focus is on the traditional agents of
diplomacy: foreign ministries and their networks of overseas missions. As such, there is a
strong predisposition towards an ideal type of diplomacy predicated on centralized control,
separation from domestic political environments and mediated through distinctive
organizational structures and processes dominated by the agencies of professional
diplomacy.

2. **Globalist perspectives:** This perspective emphasize the diminished significance of
the state and the patterns of intergovernmental relations surrounding it. At its most extreme,
the emergence of ‘globalist’ argumentation that came to be designated as ‘first wave’
globalization writing, proclaimed the growing marginalization of the state and its
institutions. The enhanced importance of non-state actors (NSAs) was reflected in the
growth of ‘non-state diplomacy’ whether this focused on the international activities of
multinational business enterprises or transnational social movements related to ever-
expanding and interlinked policy agendas. In other words, the application of the term
‘diplomacy’ to the activities of NSAs tended to separate the realms of governmental and
non-governmental activity. And whilst the emphasis on global society and global
governance sought to provide an image of world politics distinct from the traditional
agendas of ‘international relations’ at least in its earlier manifestations, it did so at the
expense of analyzing the changing role of the state and its institutions.

**FUTURE OF DIPLOMACY**
The environment of diplomacy is changing. The most important question is how to keep pace with this reality. One method for all countries does not exist. However, the main idea is to promote a faster transition to the new, or modern, form of diplomacy. First of all, foreign affairs institutions must try to adjust to new trans-institutional cooperation and nets of coordination. This especially concerns the adoption of advanced information technologies. Secondly, foreign affairs institutions should delegate a part of their functions to other stakeholders which are able to contribute constructively to the formulation and implementation of security policy. Thirdly, we should provide new specialists in foreign affairs institutions, changing the balance between specialists and generalists. For example, diplomats are more often taking part in anti-terrorist policies. Diplomats-generalists of foreign affairs offices are usually unprepared for such assignments. Maybe this is the reason for points of view such as „foreign ministries and diplomatic services are not as useful as once they were.”

In addition to the usual features of compiling and evaluating available information, communication, negotiations and dispute resolutions, participation in multilateral institutions, economic development, a diplomat must also be a kind of entrepreneur, manager and coordinator. In short, there is clear orientation and adaptation to diplomacy which could be described as “the model of coordinated synergy”. The major proposals are:

- The delegation of functions of share representation to other actors;
- Movement to redefinition of the balance between generalists and specialists;
- Active cooperation between businesspeople and diplomats;
- The growing role of specialists in fields such as business, power industry and IT;
- The global information environment is defining the work of the foreign office;
- Fast exchange of information minimizes the importance of previously planned policy;
- The focus on immediate solutions, growing importance of multilateral cooperation formats.

**MODULE-V**

**FOREIGN POLICY**

a. DETERMINATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

b. IDEOLOGY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FOREIGN POLICY

c. WAR AS AN INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

**INTRODUCTION**

“Foreign Policy is the use of political influence in order to induce other states to exercise their law-making power in a manner desired by the states concerned: it is an interaction between forces originating outside the country’s borders and those working within them”. Prof. F. S. Northedge.

Foreign policy analysis is the study of the conduct and practice of relations between different actors, primarily states, in the international system. Diplomacy, intelligence, trade negotiations and cultural exchanges all form part of the substance of foreign policy analysis. At the heart of the field is an investigation into decision making, the individual decision makers, processes and conditions that affect foreign policy and the outcomes of these decisions. By virtue of this approach, foreign policy analysis is necessarily concerned with...
the boundaries between the external environment outside of the nation state and the internal or domestic environment, with its variety of sub-national sources of influence.

Foreign policy of a state is concerned with the behaviour of a state towards other states. It refers to the ways in which the central governments of sovereign states relate to each other and to the global system in order to achieve various goals or objectives. Through its foreign policy it endeavours to persuade others in accordance with one’s own ends. It is primarily in proportion to its national power that its persuasive power is effective in this regard. However, even a powerful state cannot afford to enjoy a solo flight in this regard. It has to take into account, not only its own objectives and interests, aspirations and problems, but also those of other states. This process involves intricate processes of diplomacy short of war. It is also based on the observations regarding the traditional behaviour of a given state. Moreover, a state while implementing its foreign policy cannot afford to ignore the rules of International law and canons of international morality. The whole essence of this prelude is that the term foreign policy cannot be studied in isolation from the factors that determine it. According to Padelford and Lincolin, “Foreign policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete course of action to attain these objectives and preserve interests”:

So foreign policy is the bundle of principles and practices that regulate the intercourse of a state vis-à-vis other states. Through foreign policy a state seeks to achieve a variety of objectives. The objectives sought to be attained by a state are of different types and categories, yet there are certain objectives which are uniformly pursued by all states i.e. Political independence and territorial integrity, economic well being and, prestige and status of a nation. They have been classified into short range, middle range and long-range objectives.

Foreign Policy Analysis is the systematic study of and research into the processes and theories of foreign policy. It is that branch of political science, which deals with the study of and research into the processes and theories of foreign policy. Foreign Policy Analysis involves the study of how a state makes foreign policy. Because Foreign Policy Analysis involves the study of both international and domestic politics, the academic discipline is located at the intersection of international relations theory and public policy. Foreign Policy Analysis also draws upon the study of diplomacy, war, intergovernmental organisations, and economic sanctions, each of which are means by which a state may implement foreign policy.

THE STATE, NATIONAL INTEREST AND FOREIGN POLICY:

Foreign Policy Analysis’s starting point is the state and its interactions with other states, be this through direct bilateral relations or through multilateral institutions such as the United Nations. In keeping with the realist paradigm, Foreign Policy Analyses (FPA) is understood the state to be a unitary actor, that is to say, one in which it is not necessary to analyse the role of the discrete components of government (be it the executive or the legislature) in order to assess a state’s foreign policy. In this context, a key concept in FPA is that of the ‘national interest’. This is a much debated term. However the national interest nonetheless remains a central preoccupation of foreign policy decision-makers and a reference point for interpreting state action.
Hans Morgenthau defines national interest as synonymous with power and, as such, both the proper object of a state’s foreign policy and the best measure of its capacity to achieve its aims. What constitutes national interest, how it is determined and ultimately implemented are crucial to understanding the choices and responses pursued by states in international affairs. Realists assert that the character of the international system, that is to say its fundamentally anarchic nature, is the most important guide to interpreting foreign policy. The pursuit of security and efforts to enhance material wealth place states in competition with other states, limiting the scope for cooperation to a series of selective, self-interested strategies. In this setting, the centrality of power – especially manifested as military power – is seen to be the key determinant of a state’s ability to sustain a successful foreign policy. Geographic position, material resources and demography are other important features in this equation as well.

Realists believe that all states’ foreign policies conform to these basic parameters and that, above all, scholars need to investigate the influences of the structure of the international system and the relative power of states in order to understand the outcomes of foreign policy decisions. Calculations of national interest are self-evident and can be rationally arrived at through a careful analysis of material conditions of states as well as the particulars of a given foreign policy dilemma confronting states.

There are three levels for foreign policy analysis.

1. Individual Level Analysis.
2. State Level Analysis and
3. System Level Analysis

**INDIVIDUAL LEVEL ANALYSIS**

The individual level analysis of foreign policy states with behaviourism: the ‘minds of men’ and foreign policy decision making context. Individual-level analysis can be approached from three different perspectives. One is to examine fundamental human nature. The second is to study how people act in organizations. The third is to examine the motivations and actions of specific persons. Individual-level analysis is based on the view that it is people who make policy. It analyzes the policy-making process by examining how people (as a species, in groups, and individually) make decisions. The analysis consists of different approaches, that includes

a. The human nature approach
b. The organizational behaviour approach, and
c. The idiosyncratic behaviour approach

The human nature approach examines basic human characteristics, including the cognitive, psychological, emotional, and biological factors that influence decision making. The original studies of foreign policy in the 1950s and 1960s were explicitly aimed at challenging the realist assumptions that were the dominant approach to International Relations at the time. Rather than examine the outcomes of foreign policy decisions, behaviourists sought to understand the process of foreign policy decision making itself. In particular, scholars like Robert Jervis, Harold and Margaret Sprout investigated the role of the individual decision-maker and the accompanying influences on foreign policy choice.
This emphasis on the individual decision-maker led to a focus on psychological and cognitive factors as explanatory sources of foreign policy choice.

The organizational behaviour approach studies such factors as role (how people act in their professional position) and group decision-making behaviour, including group think. The idiosyncratic behaviour approach explores the factors that determine the perceptions, decisions, and actions of specific leaders. A leader’s personality, physical and mental health, ego and ambitions, understanding of history, personal experiences, and perceptions are all factors. The application of perceptions to policy can be explained by exploring operational reality and operational codes.

**STATE LEVEL ANALYSIS**

State-level analysis assumes that since states are the most important international actors, world politics can be best understood by focusing on how foreign policy is influenced by the political structure of states, the policy-making actors within them, and the interactions among the policy actors. Foreign policy is not formulated by a single decision-making process. Instead, the exact nature of that process changes according to a number of variables, including the type of political system, the type of situation, the type of issue, and the internal factors involved. States are complex organizations, and their internal, or domestic, dynamics influence their international actions.

One set of internal factors centres on political culture: the fundamental, long-held beliefs of a nation. Another set of internal factors centres on the policy-making impact of various foreign policy-making actors. These include political leaders, bureaucratic organizations, legislatures, political parties and opposition, interest groups, and the public. Each of these influences foreign policy, but their influence varies according to the type of government, the situation, and the policy at issue. Usually, heads of government are the most powerful foreign policy making actors. Bureaucratic organizations are normally the second most powerful actors.

**SYSTEM LEVEL ANALYSIS**

To be successful, countries usually must make policy choices within the context of the realities of the international system. Therefore, system-level analysis examines how the realities of the international system influence foreign policy. Many factors determine the nature of any given system. Systemic factors include its structural characteristics, power relationships, economic realities, and norms of behaviour. One structural characteristic is how authority is organized. The international system is horizontal, based on state sovereignty, and therefore it is anarchical.

There are, however, relatively new centralizing forces that are changing the system toward a more vertical structure. Another structural characteristic is a system’s frequency, scope, and level of interaction. The current system is becoming increasingly interdependent, with a rising number of interactions across an expanding range of issues. Economic interdependence is especially significant. When analyzing power relationships, an important factor is the number of poles in a system and how the pattern of international relations varies depending on how many power centres, or poles, a system has.
The current system most closely resembles either a unipolar system or limited unipolar system dominated by the United States. The context of power is another system characteristic. One contextual factor is the applicability of power in a given situation. Another aspect of the context is the intricate interrelationships among almost 200 countries and the need of even powerful countries for diplomatic reciprocity, the cooperation of others on a range of issues. It is therefore wise, before using power, to calculate the long-term impact of the attitudes of other countries. Norms are the values that help determine patterns of behaviour and create some degree of predictability in the system. The norms of the system are changing. Many newer countries, for instance, are challenging some of the current norms of the system, most of which are rooted in Western culture.

**FOREIGN POLICY AND POWER**

Traditionally, foreign policy makers have assumed that it is the very nature of the international system itself – being anarchic, that is without any recognised central authority – which compels states to pursue a relentless quest for security and wealth. With states in direct competition with one another to achieve security and wealth needs, cooperation between them is ultimately tactical and limited to a series of selective, self-interested alliances. A ‘security dilemma’ prevails, whereby efforts by one state to increase its sense of security through arms acquisition or other defensive measures merely inspire other states to adopt similar strategies, and ironically perpetuates a general sense of insecurity among all states. In this contentious setting, the centrality of power – especially manifested as military power – is seen to be the most important factor in determining a state’s ability to sustain a successful foreign policy. Power is defined as the ability of a state to cause another state to take actions which are to the first state’s advantage and which the latter state might not otherwise pursue.

Christopher Hill suggests that there are three ways of interpreting the role of power in foreign policy: as an end in itself, as a means to an end and as a context within which states operate. There are two basic ways that this can be achieved: through direct action (force or coercion) or through indirect action (influence or persuasion). The coercion involves compelling the target state through overt threat or outright intervention into its vital affairs. This could include military demonstration, such as the mobilising of troops, or actual military strikes and even invasion. It may also involve vital economic targets, such as cutting off oil supplies or a trade embargo, which have the effect of strangling the target state’s economy. Persuasion is more nuanced in that it involves compelling the target state through diplomatic means, appeals to rationality or universal principles and other sources of influence. These could include appeals to cultural affinity or historical partnerships, with the Anglo-American ‘special relationship’ being one of the most enduring.

Joseph Nye characterises this ability of a state to induce others to adopt its own foreign policy preferences as ‘soft power’, while coercive means ‘hard power’ (‘hard power is the ability to get others to do what they otherwise would not do through threat of punishment or promise of reward. Soft power is the ability to get desired outcomes because others want what you want.’). The sources of a state’s power can be found primarily in its military and economic capabilities which give it the means to exercise coercive and non-coercive influence. Other factors that influence a state’s ability to pursue a successful foreign policy are its geographic position, the material resources available to it and the size of its population. The society’s level of economic development and the pervasiveness of
new technologies, especially as generated through local ‘research and development’ programmes, are additional indicators of power.

**FACTORS WHICH AFFECT THE FOREIGN POLICY OF A COUNTRY**

The foreign policy of a country is influenced by so many factors; some of the important factors which influence the foreign policy of a country or constitute the inputs of the foreign policy. They are.

**National interest.**

Classic approaches to foreign policy focus on the formulation of aims and objectives based upon ‘national interest’. National interest is defined by Hans Morgenthau as synonymous with power and, as such, both the proper object of a state’s foreign policy and the best measure of its capacity to achieve its aims. What constitutes national interest, how it is determined and ultimately implemented are crucial to understanding the foreign policy choices and responses pursued by states. For realists like Morgenthau, the fundamentally anarchic condition of the international system is the most important guide to decision making in foreign policy. Classic assumptions of rationality, which are founded on the belief that foreign policy aims) of decision makers are self-evident, further reinforce the realist view. **Balance of Power**

The ‘balance of power’ can be seen as the primary mechanism for ordering the international system and keeping it in equilibrium. Simply put, states act to offset an accumulation of power by one or more states by joining up with like-minded states. This coalition strategy is both descriptive – it reflects the historical conduct of states in Europe – and normative – it can be taken as a foreign policy imperative for maintaining international peace. The idea of a balance of power has exercised considerable influence over foreign policy making though, due to its underlying assumptions of systemic anarchy, some have suggested that it fosters the very sense of instability which it purports to alleviate.

In spite of the problem of determining exactly the basis of national interest, it is clear that virtually all states of the world subscribe by necessity to maintaining territorial integrity and economic prosperity as central preoccupations of the government of the day in their international dealings. Moreover, historically states have frequently used the balance of power approach to maintaining order and stability within the international system. What is open to dispute is whether these aims are best achieved through the pursuit of short-term strategies based on limited provisions for cooperation or whether states gain more through adopting long term strategies that emphasise cooperative institution building. Britain’s Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, articulated the former posture in the mid-nineteenth century when he said that England had ‘no permanent friends or permanent enemies; only permanent interests’.

**Size of the state**

The size of a state's territory as well as it’s population greatly influences its foreign policy. Generally the leaders and people of countries with small territory and population do not expect their country to carry great weight in international affairs. On the other hand the leaders and people of large countries are ready to assume special responsibilities. However, sometimes even small states which have rich resources also leave a deep impact on world politics. For example, Britain, a small country, played leading role in world politics in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Oil-rich countries of the Middle East, though small
in size are playing a significant role in international politics. On the other hand large states like Canada and Australia have not been able to pursue effective foreign policy. Commonwealth of Independent states (CIS) which came into existence after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, though quite large in size, is not able to play an effective role in contemporary international relations.

**Geography.**
The geography of a country, including its fertility, climate, location in relation to their land masses, and water-ways etc. also influence the country's foreign policy. It is a major factor in determining self-sufficiency of a country. Generally land-locked countries, nations in the tropics and those bordering a superpower are less self-sufficient in comparison to the countries which have access to warm-water ports or are located in the temperate zones and far removed from superpowers. For example in the nineteenth century USA adopted isolationist policy chiefly on account of its geographical location. Though the importance of geographic factors is acknowledged almost at all hands, its importance has considerably declined due to technological and scientific developments. For example, due to improvement in the means of transport and communication the world has greatly shrunk and the perception of large bodies of water as natural barriers to military attack has greatly diminished. But still geographical location of a country has a deep impact on the determination of its foreign policy. India adopted policy of non-alignment because of geographical location.

**Culture and History**

The cultural and historical traditions of a country also deeply influence the foreign policy. Generally people possessing a unified common culture and historical experience can pursue an effective foreign policy because of the support of all sections of society who share the same values and memories. On the other hand, a country which is culturally and historically fragmented cannot pursue an equally effective foreign policy. According to Prof. Roseau "the influence of cultural factors is not limited to the impact of societal unity upon the formulation and implementation of foreign policy'. Equally important are the processes through which the contents of Shared norms and practices of society, as distinguished from the degree of unity that supports them shape the plans that are made and the activities that are undertaken with respect to the external world.

**Economic Development.**

The stage of economic development which a country has attained also has its impact on its foreign policy. Generally the industrially advanced countries feel more deeply involved in relations with other countries because they have to import different kinds of raw materials and commodities from other countries. They are also on the lookout of latest knowledge and technical know-how. Therefore they maintain intimate trade relations with their trading partners. All this leads to intimate links between the groups and people of one country with their counterparts in the other country. Again, an industrial country is expected to have a higher gross national product (GNP) and can devote greater funds for external purpose, economic aid programme, military ventures and extensive diplomatic commitments. On the other hand, industrially backward countries are not able to actively involve themselves in external affairs. The lack of scientists, engineers and other specialists in the country prevents them from taking advantage of the technological break-through
abroad. United States of America has been able to pursue more vigorous foreign policy and secure its national objectives, mainly on account of its high degree of economic development. It has made liberal use of foreign aid as an instrument for the promotion of its foreign policy goals. It is a matter of common knowledge that in our times the industrially developed countries (popularly known as G-7) are playing an effective role in international politics as compared to other developed or under-developed countries. This is but natural in view of fact that economically developed countries possess greater military capability than the less developed countries, and can exert greater influence on international relations. The decline of Russia's economic power has considerably undermined her political role in the international arena.

Technology.

Advancement in technology, which affects the military and economic capabilities of a state, also exercises profound influence on the foreign policy. However, this factor influences the foreign policy only in an indirect manner, by influencing other sources of foreign policy. It has been observed that countries which possess advance technology are able to provide technical know-how to less developed and developing nations and thus exert necessary influence on their foreign policies. Roseau has rightly observed 'Technological changes can alter the military and economic capabilities of a society and thus its status and role in the international system'. The dominant role which countries like France, China, Germany and Japan have been able to play is largely due to excellent technological developments in these countries.

National Capacity:

The national capacity of a state also exercises profound influence on the foreign policy of a state. National capacity of a state depends on its military preparedness, its technological advancement and economic development. It is well known that United States which continued to pursue policy of isolation till the beginning of the present century got deeply involved in the international arena in the present century mainly due to tremendous increase in her national capacity due to rapid economic development. Similarly, the foreign policy of Britain underwent great transformation in the post World War II period, mainly due to decline in her national capacity.

Social Structure:

The social structure of a society also exercises profound influence on its foreign policy. A society which is sharply divided on the basis of wealth, religion, regional imbalances, etc. cannot pursue effective foreign policy on account of division and lack of co-operation among various groups. On the other hand a homogeneous society possessing strong sense of national unity can pursue a more effective foreign policy. It is well known that Britain stood as one person under the leadership of Churchill during the Second World War and the people gladly suffered all kinds of hardships to preserve their unity because of social solidarity.

Public Mood:
Public mood is another important determinant of a country's foreign policy. Though public mood usually follows rather than guides the foreign policy making process, it can exercise lot of influence on the determination of a foreign policy if the basic realignment in the prevailing great power structure takes place and the state becomes more involved or more isolated from the world affairs. It may be noted that generally in an authoritarian system the public mood does not influence the foreign policy, but in a democratic system based on political accountability considerable weight has to be accorded to the changing public mood and sentiments.

Political Organisations:

The political organization found in a country also greatly influences the foreign policy. Generally under authoritarian system quick foreign policy decisions are possible because the decision making power rests with an individual assisted by his clique. But as the leaders under this system are isolated from the operational environments and the subordinate policy makers provide the information which is perceived by the superiors, there is every possibility of a discrepancy between the psychological and operational aspects of the foreign policy. Further, under this system undesirable opposition can be suppressed through censorship and promulgation of regulations. On the other hand in a country possessing a democratic structure the citizens can freely express their opinion on the domestic as well as foreign policy which naturally leave its impact on the foreign policy of the country. Under democratic system there is very little discrepancy between what the officials want to believe about the state of world politics and the actual position because the subordinate policy makers make available critical and detached information. Within the democratic system itself the difference in a political structure has its impact on foreign policy. For example, under a parliamentary system of government based on co-operation between the Legislature and the Executive, the cordial relations between the two wings have an impact on country's foreign policy. On the other hand under presidential system based on the principle of separation of powers, the relation between the two wings are likely to be more strained, which affect the ambiguity or continuity of foreign policy. Similarly, different foreign policy is likely to emerge under bi-party system and multi-party systems. Generally under bi-party system the government is likely to have a clear-cut majority and conduct itself in a more decisive manner regarding the conduct of foreign relations. In contrast of this, under multi-party system conflicting view points and interests may have to be reconciled. This may lead either to the avoidance or postponement of the decision.

Role of Press:

The press also plays a vital role in the foreign policy formulation process. The press contributes to this process by supplying factual information on the basis of which the people take decision. The press also plays an important role in publicizing the foreign policy of the country. The role of the press, however, depends on the political system prevailing in the country, the rate of literacy as well as the attitude of government. Democratic governments nurture press freedom. In autocracies, press becomes a puppet in the hands of rulers and hence minimum foreign policy impact.

Political Accountability.
The nature of political accountability prevailing in a system also greatly influences the foreign policy of the country. Generally in an open political system, the demands of citizen and groups get articulated and transmitted to foreign policy formulators. The framers of foreign policy cannot ignore these demands. In fact quite often the policy formulators anticipate these demands while formulating the foreign policy. On the other hand under a closed system the public reactions are neither available nor given much importance.

Leadership:

The leadership also plays a vital role in the shaping of a country's foreign policy. According to Rosenau: "A leader's beliefs about the nature of international arena and the goals that ought to be pursued therein, his or her peculiar intellectual strength and weakness for analyzing information and making decisions, his or her past background and the extent of its relevance to the requirements of the role, his or her emotional needs and most of other personality traits—these are but a few of the idiosyncratic factors that can influence the planning and execution of foreign policy." No doubt, the qualities of leadership have a deep impact on the country's foreign policy but their role is greatly constrained by the governmental and social structure. Further the role of leadership is not identical in all countries. In less developed countries their role is greater as compared to industrialized societies. In industrialized societies the individuals enjoy very limited discretion in high governmental and non-governmental positions.

STAGES IN FOREIGN POLICY DECISION MAKING:

The making of foreign policy involves a number of stages:

a. Assessment of the international and domestic political environment - Foreign policy is made and implemented within an international and domestic political context, which must be understood by a state in order to determine the best foreign policy option.

b. Goal setting - A state has multiple foreign policy goals. A state must determine which goal is affected by the international and domestic political environment at any given time. In addition, foreign policy goals may conflict, which will require the state to prioritise.

c. Determination of policy options - A state must then determine what policy options are available to meet the goal or goals set in light of the political environment. This will involve an assessment of the state's capacity to implement policy options and an assessment of the consequences of each policy option.

d. Formal decision making action - A formal foreign policy decision will be taken at some level within a government. Foreign policy decisions are usually made by the executive branch of government. Common governmental actors or institutions which make foreign policy decisions include: the head of state (such as a president) or head of government (such as a prime minister), cabinet, or minister.

e. Implementation of chosen policy option - Once a foreign policy option has been chosen, and a formal decision has been made, then the policy must be implemented.
Foreign policy is most commonly implemented by specialist foreign policy arms of the state bureaucracy, such as a Ministry of Foreign Affairs or State Department. Other departments may also have a role in implementing foreign policy, such as departments for: trade, defence, and aid.

INSTRUMENTS OF FOREIGN POLICY

A best crafted foreign policy, will be supported by certain instruments which are suitable for a given time of action. These instruments are sometimes theoretical designs or hypothetical assumptions that might have long term or sometimes short term gains. Traditionally, states have had options to diplomacy, economic, subversion and military instruments to achieve their respective aims. More recently, these ‘hard power’ instruments have been supplemented by recognition of the importance of incorporating ‘soft power’ into a state’s repertoire.

The promotion of values through governmental and nongovernmental actors is one of the ‘soft power’ tools which can help states shape a target country’s foreign policy aims. Each of these has strengths and weaknesses in relation to a given foreign policy problem and it is a state’s ability to capitalise on these diverse sets of instruments that determines whether it has a successful foreign policy or not.

Diplomacy is the prime currency of the international system and occupies the bulk of activity between states. It consists of formal and informal discussions aimed at resolving matters of mutual concern. These talks, negotiations or mediation can take place at a bilateral level (between two states) or multilateral level (involving a number of states). Usually, officially recognised diplomats trained in the intricacies of international protocol conduct such discussions.

Alliances with like-minded states, or at least states that share a common perception of threat, and trade relations with preferred states are common topics in the diplomatic arena. More often than not, however, the work of diplomats is preoccupied with the mundane day-to-day tasks of maintaining positive relations between states, attending to the concerns of its citizens abroad and protocol-related issues. In those instances when one state’s behaviour causes persistent concern or alarm, diplomatic actions – ranging from formal notes of protest to the application of diplomatic sanctions such as the withdrawal of official recognition of an offending government – can be utilised to express a state’s resentment.

Contemporary diplomacy owes its formal practices and codes to the conventions developed in Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Secretive agreements tying states to the defence of one another formed the backbone of European diplomacy up to the First World War. In the twentieth century, the rise of democracies, the media and international institutions such as the League of Nations and its successor, the United Nations, has brought about a shift towards a more public form of diplomacy. International summitry, when states’ leaders come together to discuss high-profile foreign policy issues, has played an increasing role from the mid-twentieth century onwards as well. Economic instruments are used by states when standard diplomatic practices are seen to be insufficient.
in achieving their aims. They include: economic sanctions, such as imposing trade restrictions against a target state; and military sanctions, such as imposing restrictions on trade or manufacture of arms to a target state. With few exceptions, sanctions are only really effective if implemented by a collectivity of states and rigorously enforced by all of them. For this reason, it is often said that the importance of sanctions lies more in its symbolic value as a sign of displeasure with a particular state than its actual effect upon that state.

Subversion is an instrument favoured by leaders for its purported ability to offer a state a tactical advantage over other states. The gathering of intelligence and its analysis by specialists trained in assessing designs and capabilities of other states can provide insight into alternative courses of action to be pursued by an opponent and a willingness to pursue these actions. Less frequently – though certainly popularly associated with espionage – is the promulgation of covert operations aimed at destabilising an opponent in one way or another. Grey and black propaganda (the former partially based on truth, the latter an outright fabrication) against the target state or its leader, providing covert financial or military support to opposition movements, and even political assassinations, all form part of the arsenal utilised in this form of espionage.

Values promotion is an explicitly ‘soft power’ approach to foreign policy that is operationalised through a variety of means. Government agencies that promote the society’s cultural values through, for example, educational exchanges and scholarships to élites or prospective élites, are ways of shaping the aims and choices pursued by foreign policy actors in another country. States can also fund non-governmental actors with an explicit values promotion agenda, such as human rights groups, trade union support or electoral assistance. The strength of this approach is that domestic actors within a particular target country embrace the underlying values of another country and then this becomes the basis for foreign policy choice that, perhaps unconsciously, conforms to the interests of the promoter state.

IDEOLOGY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FOREIGN POLICY:

An ideology is a system of ideas which attempts to explain reality. Ideologies are developed because reality is often too complex to be understood. They also, almost always, reflect a bias and serve the interests of a particular group. Some ideologies are well grounded in reality, while others are completely divorced from reality and can only be explained in terms of the emotional and psychological motivations of its adherents. Ideologies tend either to over-simplify reality or to completely distort it. As a system of conjured up conviction, ideology can play an important role in framing foreign policy of a nation.

M.H Hunt in his book ‘Ideology and US Foreign Policy’ defined ideology as “an interrelated set of convictions or assumptions that reduces the complexities of a particular slice of reality to easily comprehensible terms and suggests appropriate ways of dealing with that reality”. It is an ideological mapping of possible directions of a countries’ foreign policy. For example, communist ideology of former Soviet Union was an important factor in deciding balance of cold war regime against liberal ideology of the US led alliances. The
content and effectiveness of a particular ideology depends on its generic and categorical or practical and indexical (i.e., time-and-place specific) attributes. For example, Indian foreign policy is known for its Non Alignment ideology. But when it reach at the practical phase, very often; criticised for being biased towards socialist bloc. So factor of time-and-place specific attribute of ideology is very important in deciding nature of foreign policy.

Thus ideology is a connected set of ideas about how the world does and should work. Foreign policy instruments are precisely institutionalized connections between expectations about the kinds of problems likely to arise and the ways in which those problems should be dealt with. Policy instruments, in effect, are crystallized ideologies. In short ideology assumes, in international relations, organisational stature. It reflects power relations. New alliances, military exercise between powerful counties, bilateral or multilateral contracts, assistance for R&D development etc are some of the realistic examples where ideology plays an important role in foreign policy makeover. Conservatism is an ideology which values the status quo and accepts change only reluctantly and at a very slow pace. Liberalism is an ideology which advocates equality of opportunity for all nations within the framework of a system of laws. Recent studies in foreign policy, pointed out a new phase of ideology as ‘donor ideology’ in foreign policy relations. The role of ideology in the allocation of aid has been approached from several angles. For instance, ideology has been identified as an explanatory factor in the determination of aid during the Cold War. Qualitative analyses of U.S. foreign aid generally stress the support to “anti-communist” regimes as a driving force of U.S. aid allocation.

WAR AS AN INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

War is an important instrument of national policy. Military instruments remain the ultimate expression of a state’s willingness to pursue its foreign policy. For the renowned strategist Karl von Clausewitz, the use of the military was ‘politics pursued by other means’.

States employ their military principally in times of crisis to defend their interests, be they territorial, resources or citizens, or in support of foreign policy aims such as acquiring new territory, gaining access to strategic resources or upholding international principle. The military, in the hands of an expert, can be a much more diversified foreign policy instrument than is immediately apparent. For instance, it can mark the state’s commitment to a security alliance through the presence of permanent military bases or the sending of a naval fleet to a region in dispute. Equally, public displays of technological prowess such as the launching of ballistic missiles or the testing of nuclear weapons can be important signals to potential adversaries and friends alike. With modern military technology outside of the reach of most states, global force projection is increasingly limited to merely a handful of states, with the United States as the foremost military power today.

Until the end of the Cold War, the military was seen to be the most obvious measure of a state’s power, but subsequently many International Relations scholars have argued that economic strengths or even cultural reach are equally significant indicators. This gave impetus to proponents of ‘soft power’ instruments, who argued that their approach was more suited to the changing international environment. More generally, the advent of total
warfare in the twentieth century introduced to the world conflict on such a destructive scale that both the efficacy and the morality of the use of force as an instrument of foreign policy has been called into question.

Peacekeeping forces, usually under the auspices of an international organisation like the United Nations, are a more recent innovation of the classic military tool and some states include a specially trained battalion on hand for such missions.

Module-VI

MAJOR TRENDS IN THE FOREIGN POLICIES OF INDIA, U.S.A., RUSSIA, CHINA AND JAPAN

INTRODUCTION

The primary task of the foreign policy maker is to articulate the country’s external interest and order. Haremann defines foreign policy as a “systematic statement of deliberately selected national interests”. This definition shows that the main goal of foreign
policy is the promotion of national interests of the concerned countries. In the formulation of a country’s foreign policy both the objective and the subjective factors play an important role. The objective factors which influence a country’s foreign policy include environmental factors like historical influence, geographical location, natural resources, industrial development, population etc. The subjective factors on the other hand related to those specific developments or particular situations which influence the foreign policy of a country.

**INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY**

The foreign policy of India like that of any other country is an extension of its domestic policy and reflects the dominant domestic concerns. ‘Our foreign policy’ wrote Jawaharlal Nehru, “will ultimately be governed by our internal policy”. The foreign policy of a country is primarily based on its own individual interests and what it considers good for the world. India’s foreign policy is based on democratic principles of equality, liberty and fraternity. The underlying aim of having a foreign policy is to ensure peaceful relations with neighboring countries and the rest of the world and to preserve freedom to have autonomy in making decisions on international issues.

Though a clear beginning of the foundation of an independent foreign policy was writ large in the minds of the nationalist leaders, it could not take a concrete shape till independence was achieved. It was in 1920s that Nehru spelt out the principle of the foreign policy of a future independent India. He realized the importance of the need to have direct contact with other nations and cooperate with them in enhancing world peace, and freedom. He also understood the importance of maintaining and identifying India as a free nation and not to become a slave of any other nation. He also spoke about combating such maladies affecting a large part of humanity as disease, poverty and ignorance. To Nehru, global peace was the goal of India’s foreign policy.

**BASIC OBJECTIVES OF INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY**

1. **Promotion of world peace and security.**

   India’s foreign policy aims at the promotion of international peace and security. Article 51 of the constitution directs the Indian states to promote international peace and security. India stands for world peace and disarmament. It condemned blind armament race among nations and denounced military and security alliances which leads to international instability and war. To the promotion of international peace, India gave high priority.

2. **Anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism:**

   Another outstanding principle of India’s foreign policy has been her strong opposition to colonialism and imperialism. This policy was largely the outcome of her long sufferance as a colony under the British. Naturally after independence India showed full sympathy for all those people who were still under colonial rule. It took up the cause of such people at the United Nations and played an important role in the promotion of decolonization. The anti-colonial and anti-imperialist stand of India was not limited to mere judgment. On the other hand India tried to practice it and extended support to Indonesia, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco etc.

3. **Anti-racism:**

   India has always emphasized the principle of brotherhood of man and opposed all types of discrimination based on race and culture. It was the first country to highlight the problem of racial discrimination at the international forums. India severely condemned the policy of racial segregation being pursued by the government of South Africa. India had
severely denounced apartheid policy practiced by white regime of South Africa against black people of South Africa and Namibia.

**Peaceful settlement of international disputes:**

Peaceful and pacific settlement of international disputes represents another important objective of India’s foreign policy. India cultivated very intimate relations with China, Nepal, Yugoslavia, Egypt etc and played a leading role in the evolution of five principles (Pancha sheel) emphasizing mutual respect for each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty, non aggression, non intervention in each other’s domestic affairs, mutual benefit and equality, and peaceful coexistence.

**Non –Alignment:**

When India became independent in 1947, the world was divided into two power blocs on ideological basis namely the capitalist block headed by USA and the communist bloc headed by the former USSR. As India was keen to play an effective role in the international arena, it thought proper to keep distance from these blocks. It may be observed that the policy of non-alignment was dictated by the consideration of national interest. Because of its liberal tradition India could not align itself with Soviet Union which believed in ideology of violence and revolution. On the other hand her geographical location demanded that she should not join the Western alliance. The traditional attitude of tolerance also impelled India to remain Non-Aligned.

**Special Bias for Asia:**

Even though the foreign policy of India stands for maintaining friendly relation with all the countries of the world, it shows a social bias for the countries of Asia in its foreign policy. It developed very close relations with countries of Asia, and tried to promote unity among them by organizing number of conferences. At these conferences Nehru emphasized that Asia could play an effective role in promoting the world peace and play a dominant role in the shaping of the international relations.

**Intimate relations with Common Wealth:**

Intimacy of relations with common wealth has been another important feature of India’s foreign policy. India sought the membership of common wealth even after adopting a Republican constitution, because it thought that the membership of common wealth shall be beneficial in the economic and other spheres. India played a leading role at the various common wealth meets. No doubt occasionally certain irritants appeared in relations with Britain and there was a demand for withdrawal from the common wealth, but the Government decided to withstand the pressure for withdrawal and continued its membership.

**Faith in the United Nations:**

India as a proponent of peace has shown great faith in the United Nations. It has not only encouraged the settlement of disputes through methods but also extended full support to the United Nations actions. It has been contributing military as well as other personnel’s for implementing the decisions of the United Nations. It is well known that India played a commendable role during the Korean war and Indo-China crisis.

**Solidarity with the third world:**

---
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Being an Asian country, India has always tied herself with the third world and championed the cause of third world and particularly of Afro-Asian unity. The concept of unity and peace in Asia was extended to cover Africa also. The Bandung conference was held and an important step was taken to secure Afro-Asian on solidarity on the basis of panchaseel. The strength and popularity of Afro-Asian solidarity movement enabled the emergence of the concept of third world. India has always worked to secure for the third world its due place in the international system.

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS IN INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY

The year 1962 marks a watershed in the development of India’s foreign policy. India had a war with China in 1962 and the war convinced the leadership that purely moralistic foreign policy shall not be in the interest of the country and necessary medications should be made in the policy to make it more effective instrument of national interest. This change was discernable during the prime minister ship of Nehru himself when he openly declared that India was no more non aligned so far as China was concerned. Lal Bahadurshastri, who succeeded Nehru as prime minister tried to cultivate friendly and intimate relations with neighboring countries like Nepal, Burma and Srilanka. He succeeded in procuring military and economic assistance from both the power and greatly strengthened India’s position.

Another outstanding feature of the Indian foreign policy during Shastri era was that the emphasis shifted to collective decision making. The public involvement in the formulation of foreign policy also increased. However, the basic principles of foreign policy remain unchanged. After the reign of Shashtri, Indira Gandhi became the prime minister. She took keen interest in the conduct of foreign policy. During her period also the process of developing close relations with super powers continued and India got huge financial assistance from USA. She also maintained good relationships with Soviet Union which resulted in Indo-Soviet treaty of friendship and cooperation in 1971. This period witnessed a great tilt toward soviet union and somewhat cooling of relations with the United States.

With the formation of Janatha Government in 1977 it was expected that a drastic change in India’s foreign policy would take place. It has hoped that there would be a certain amount of cooling off relations with Soviet Union and more intimate relations with USA. But Vajpayee announced that the new government wanted to pursue a policy of genuine nonalignment. The Janatha Government therefore tried to develop very intimate relations with both the super powers. New government continued friendly relations with the Soviet Union. The Jenatha Government also tried to improve relations with USA. A new chapter was opened in Indo-US relations with the visit of President Jimmy Carter. Most of the suspicions which had marred the relations between the two counties were removed and a spirit of mutually beneficial cooperation was revived. The Janatha Government took a number of steps to improve its relation with neighboring countries like Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal, China etc. In addition to this, the Janatha party continued the policy of improving relations with the countries of south East Asia and West Asia and extended full support to the anti racial policies and liberation movements in Africa.

With the fall of the Janatha Government and the formation of congress Government under the leader ship of Indira Gandhi, a shift was taken place in Indian foreign policy. There was a closer relations with the countries of western Europe in order to reduce India’s dependence on Soviet union for sophisticated arms and technologies. The next Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi also indicated India’s determination to work for narrowing international economic disparities, develop closer relations with immediate neighbor; pursue policy of non-interference, peaceful., coexistence and non alignment. He
promised to pursue the concept of common regional development of South Asia; improvement and strengthening of relations with China, Soviet Union and US.

During the time of Narasimha Rao government the world had undergone complete change due to breaking of ideological barriers, the end of cold war and adjustment in power equations due to disintegration of soviet union. Rao government tried to give a new orientation to the foreign relations in the light of harsh economic realities. Greater emphasis was laid on economic diplomacy. Rao openly declared that his government would use foreign policy as a dynamic instrument for promotion of national interest in the changed global context. Another notable change in Indian foreign policy under Rao took place with regard to Israel. India established diplomatic relations with Israel.

The united Front Government, which came into power in June 1996, continued the earlier foreign policy. However, it laid great emphasis on improvement of relations with the neighboring countries. It put forth Gujaral Doctrine under which unilateral concessions were made to the neighboring countries with regard to travel and trade, without expecting reciprocity. Effort was also made to promote free trade among the SAARC countries and to convert it into an economic union at the earliest. Moreover new government tried to make it clear to the various powers to keep out of South Asia.

The BJP led coalition government which came into power in 1998 while adhering to the basic principles of India’s foreign policy, gave a new orientation to the foreign policy which is more realistic than moralistic. With regard to neighboring countries it favored more intimate relations but did not approve of unilateral concessions as done by Gujaral government. During this period India successfully conducted three underground nuclear tests in the Pokran range on May 11 1998. New Delhi and Washington were in agreement on many key issues. Relations between India and United states have surged in the last few years. Dr. Manmohan sing’s government inaugurated a new phase of partnership with the signing of Nuclear Agreement between India and United States. The Narendra Modi Government of India also tries to project India as a super power. The emerging prospects of the country is well accepted in the global forums. The Modi government is also taking stern stands against cross border and international terrorism.

It is evident from the preceding account that India’s foreign policy has been based on stable principles and its directions have remained trimly steady. Further, it has stood the test of the time and helped India to play a dynamic role in the international affairs.

FOREIGN POLICY OF CHINA

The People’s Republic of China is a major power in global system due to its size, population and potency as centre of aspiration for revolutionary change and nation building. At present People’s Republic of China (PRC) has become one of the ‘Big Five’ of the permanent members of the Security Council of the UN. Observers of the world scene never stop wondering at the zigzags of China’s foreign policy. But, though Peking’s’ methods and tactics have changed; the essential policies and objectives remain the same.

Before the emergence of the People’s Republic of China, the country did not have a systematic foreign policy because China did not actively participate in the international politics. Whatever foreign policy the country had was decided by the powerful local war lords. However these Chinese were always conscious of the fact that they had been a great power and would once again play a dominant role in the world politics in general and East Asia in particular. With the assumption of power by the communists an effort was made to provide a systematic foreign policy to the country. The foreign policy of communist China has been influenced by various factors including Marxist Leninist Theories. China’s foreign
policy represents a mixture of traditionalism Nationalism and Marxism. Its leaders claim that their foreign policy is based on scientific socialism. China’s foreign policy aims at modernizing her economy, industry, technology and defense and increasing her international security, status and influence.

China has the longest continuous history in the world. For thousands of years, China had been a very advanced country in the field of sciences literature, painting and state crafts. They have been a great people by a unique blend of culture, common sense and self-discipline. The Chinese society is highly orderly. Law commands general obedience. In fact obedience to legal authority is in the blood of the Chinese people. For the first few years the communists were mainly concerned with their domestic problems and the foreign policy was greatly influenced by the domestic factors.

Major features of Chinese foreign policy

Foreign policy of communist China was oriented to the basic tenets of Marxism Leninism. Essentially, the foreign policy of Mao’s China has been a mixture of imperialism, Chinese nationalism, revolutionary strategy of Mao-Tse-Tung and Marxism-Leninism. Chinese claimed that their domestic and foreign policy was based on scientific socialism. It was an instrument for the world-wide struggle of communism against capitalism.

1, Communism:

China’s foreign policy is influenced by the Marxist-Leninist Theories. Chinese Policy upheld the Marxist tenets of dialectical materialism and class war. Soon after the emergence of People’s Republic of China the leaders were contracted with the problems of deciding whether they wanted to join one of the two blocs, in which the world had become divided at that time, or to remain neutral. The Chinese leaders were certainly against neutralizer or non alignment which they described as a ‘Camouflage’.

Opposition to imperialism:

The Marxist theory of imperialism is based on the presumption that all political phenomena arise from economic system. Imperialism is a policy of capitalism. China denounced imperialism.

Marxism: The foreign policy of China has been influenced by Marxist-Leninist theories Mao-Tse-Tng reinterpreted Marxism and Leninism to suit the Chinese Socio political conditions. It became a Chinese edition of Marxism-Leninism. The Chinese leaders during the Mao’s period claimed that their foreign policy was based in scientific socialism.

Nationalism: China’s nationalism found expression through Sun-Yat –Sen. He had to flee from China 1895, but had directed revolutionary movement from aboard, China certainly preferred nationalism to ideology when it came to its national interest.

Major developments in China’s foreign policy

Peoples’ Republic of China’s foreign policy was made at the session of the people’s political consultative conference held in September 1949. Here it was declared that the principle of the foreign policy of communists was the protection of the independence, freedom, integrity of territory and sovereignty of the country upholding lasting international peace and friendly cooperation between the people of all countries and opposition to the imperialist policy at aggression and war. Bu the most elaborate exposition of the Chinese foreign policy was made by LiuThao-chi in July 1961. He said: “since the founding of the people’s Republic of china, the basic policy of our international relations has been to
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develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation with the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries; to for peaceful coexistence with countries of different social system imperialist policies of aggression and war; to support the revolutionary struggles of all oppressed peoples and nations against imperialism and colonialism. This is the general line of our foreign policy’ A perusal of the various policy pronouncements of Chinese foreign policy shows that it laid emphasis on developing closer relations with Soviet to the imperialist Union and other socialist countries and strong opposition to the imperialist powers of the west.

However subsequently its relations with Soviet Union cooled down and China began to assert its leadership in Asia. After the Korean War, China made close relationship with non communist countries of Asia and adopted the policy of reconciliation with the west and developed intimate relations with the western countries. Thus China aligned itself first with Moscow against Washington in 1950’s and then with Washington against Soviet Union since 1972 in an attempt to counter balance the threat to Chinese interest. However in the eighties China once gain started improving its relations with Soviet Union and entered into number of agreements for greater cooperation in the field of trade, culture and other matters.

Changes of foreign policy of China occurred after the assumption of power by Deng Xian ping in 1978. Deng adopted policy of total modernization. He tried to organize the Chinese economic and military on modern lines with the help of United States and western powers. He attached more importance to ‘market’ than ‘Marxism’ Chinese foreign policy under Deng was characterized by pragmatism and flexibility and the revolutionary rhetoric of Marxism was missing from it. Most outstanding achievement of China under Deng was improvement of relations with USA as well as Soviet Union. In the domestic field it promoted political stability and economic development.

The former Soviet Union and China were the two great giants of the communist world. Their relations have been of a friendship and hostility, cooperation and competition since the installation of People’s Republic of China. In 1952 PRC concluded with Soviet Union Treaty of friendship and Alliance and mutual Aid, under which the two countries agreed to cooperate and help each other in case of aggression. They also agreed to cooperate in the economic and cultural spheres.

These intimate relations between China and Soviet Union could not last long and a schism developed towards the close of the fifties. This conflict was mainly a clash for leadership at the communist movement which was given the color at a direct struggle over the correct interpretation of Marxism and Leninism. Sino-Soviet differences further sharpened due to the Soviet stand during Sino-Indian conflict of 1962. Soviet Union’s signing of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty with USA and UK in 1963; etc. The cultural revolution of 1966-1969 in China also greatly contributed to the widening of gulf and in 1969 open clashes took place between the guards on the Sino sSoviet border.

In 1970’s China drew closer to the United States and adopted hostile attitude towards Soviet Union. On the other hand Soviet Union support for the entry of Vietnamese troops into neighboring Kampuchea greatly irritated the Chinese. As a result, in 1979 when Soviet Union sent troops Afghanistan, China bitterly criticized the Soviet Union. In the mean while China’s relations with USA also got strained on the question of supply of American arms to Taiwan. As a result the Sino Soviet leaders started thinking of improving their relations. In March 1980 Brezhnev expressed his willingness to normalize relations between the two countries. In the same year China also announced the adoption of an independent foreign policy, which stood for equidistant course between the US and USSR.
Since 1982 there has been better understanding between China and Soviet Union. After 1986 China adopted more constructive attitude and tried to improve political ties with Soviet Union and other countries of Soviet bloc. In 1996 the Chinese prime ministers visited Russia and expressed solidarity with Russia in opposing unipolar world, and indicated its desire to cooperate with Russia in the creation of multipolar world. In 1999 Russian President Boris Yeltsin paid a two day visit to China and succeeded in securing Chinese support of Moscow actions in combating terrorism and extremism in Chechnya. On its part Yeltsin backed China stance on Taiwan. But the most notable achievement was that the two countries resolved their centuries old border dispute by signing accords on the demarcation of their western and eastern parts of their shared boarders.

Relations with India

India’s relation with China dates back to 2000 years. India was keen to cultivate friendly relations with China. India was the first among the few non-Communist countries, which accorded recognition to the new regime in China. India also consistently supported the Chinese claim to the seat in the Security council. In 1950 China’s relations with India were embittered because of her armed action in Tibet. India did not approve of this action and suggested that efforts should be made to settle the matter through peaceful negotiations. On the issue of the Korean Crisis, Sino-India relation was governed by India’s desire to mediate between China and West.

The third phase of Sino-Indian relations began early in 1957 and continued up to about the middle of 1958. During this short period, there were difference between India and China on the question of Suez and Hungary and on Yugoslavia’s concept of “Independent roads to Socialism”

The fourth phase begins in July 1958 and continued up to the outbreak of Tibetan revolt in March 1959. The fifth stage of Sino-Indian relations began in March 1959, when demonstrations were staged in Thasa and proclamation declaring the independence of Tibet was issued by the Tibetan cabinet. The seventeen point agreement between Tibet and China was also declared null and void. The people’s liberation army suppressed the revolt and Dalai Lama reached India with his entourage and was granted political asylum.

The next phase in Sino-Indian relations was the phase of acceleration of the process of deterioration in Sino-Indian relation. In 1962 the People’s Republic of China launched a full fledged attack on India. This marked a break in the cordial relations between the two countries. During the next fourteen years the diplomatic relations between the two countries remained breached.”The Chinese continued their policy of isolating India in the region by developing closer relations with other countries of the region, particularly Pakistan.

After the death of Mao-Tse-Tung in 1976, the new dispensation in China and Morarji Desais government in India decided to carry forward the process of normalization. A serious bid to resolve the 26 years old border dispute was made in December 1988 when Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi paid a visit to Beijing. As a result of this meeting the two countries agreed to develop their relations actively in various fields and to work hard to create a favorable climate for a fair and reasonable settlement of boundary questions. There have been number of visits and reciprocal visits from India and China by top government functionaries. Starting with prime Ministers Dr. Manmohan Sing’s visit to China in 2008, India China relations made all round progress over the past years. In December 2008, China and India successfully conducted a joint army training exercise on combating terrorism in India.
In 2009, President Pratibha Patil visited China at the invitation of President Hujintao. It was a big event that provided new opportunities to advance bilateral relations.

**RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY**

The Soviet Union, as the centre of communist bloc formidable global power, dominated the world political scene for almost half a country. The communist party of Soviet Union played the most crucial role in the formulation of Soviet foreign policy. Its foreign relations therefore were centrally controlled. The Soviet foreign policy like that of any other state is molded by a variety of factors such as national security, historical background, international political environment, domestic situation, economic interest, national character and national leadership. While all these factors have played their role there is peculiar blending of the ideology of Marxism – Leninism with national interest so that all other factors have been relegated to a secondary position.

**Features of Soviet Foreign Policy**

The foreign policy of Russia came to be determined by its social and economic interest as perceived by its social and economic interest as perceived by its leaders. The Soviet foreign policy in the early phase had its intellectual and ideological roots in Leninism. In fact there is fusion of communism and nationalism in its foreign policy.

It became the mission of foreign policy makers to denounce the network of imperialism and colonialism and support the struggle for national liberation. It also became essential for them to make efforts for the export of communist revolution. For this purpose, Lenin formed the third international (Comintern) in 1919. The Soviet foreign policy had the element of the doctrine of peaceful co-existence and at the same time worked for the subversion of other political system.

It is believed that workers of the world have to unite for breaking the chains of slavery existing all over the world. Russian leaders held that USSR is the father land of international proletariat. They considered the proletariat as the principal bulwark for the achievement of international emancipation.

After the Second World War Soviet Union emerged as one of the strongest powers and assumed the leadership of the communist countries. She successful extended her influence to Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria North Korea etc by establishing communist government in these countries. In fact the whole of Eastern Europe with the exception of Finland and Greece came under Soviet Influence. The communist government in the various countries pursued policies subservient to the soviet policy and soon came to be known as soviet satellites.

The remarkable speed with which Soviet Union extended her influence over Eastern Europe and East Germany greatly alarmed the western countries and they decided to make necessary measure to check the further spread of communist influence. Russia set up the communist information bureau (COMINFORM) to coordinate the work of the communist parties of various countries. This organization was to take necessary steps to popularize communist ideology through periodicals etc. More over Russia concluded a mutual Assistance Treaty with China and Soviet Union tried to consolidate her position in Eastern Europe through Morocco plan for economic reconstruction and industrialization of the region, with a view to promote greater economic cooperation among the communist countries.

The close relation among the communist countries encourages the western powers to increase their economic and military collaboration. In 1949 NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) consisting of USA, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium Italy and
Portugal was created. The Russians tried to counter the western moves by forming the Warsaw pact for friendship. Cooperation and mutual assistance with Albania, Hungary, East Germany Poland and Czechoslovakia was established.

A change in Soviet Foreign policy took place after death of Stalin in 1953. The new leadership laid emphasis on greater friendship and peace. The period also witnessed efforts by Soviet Union to improve relations with USA. In 1957 the General Assembly adopted a declaration of peaceful co-existence of states at the instance of Soviet Union. In 1957 Soviet Union made several proposals for reduction of international tension.

In 1962 Soviet Union’s relation with USA were greatly strained due to Cuban crisis and there was every possibility that two giants may clash. However due to efforts of the UN Secretary General the crisis was averted. Another important tension was with China leaders which produced a great Schism in communist camp. Many Scholars opined that Soviet foreign policy under Khrushchev do not fundamentally differ from the policy pursued by Stalin and only the method of its conduct changed. With the overthrow of Khrushchev in 1964 the era of collective leadership was set in Soviet Union which resulted in some modification in the foreign policy. The new leadership (Kosygin and Brezhnev) tried to improve relations with the communist countries by undertaking personal visit to China and North Vietnam. The Cultural Revolution in China further stood in the way of improvement of relations between Soviet Union and peoples Republic of China.

The new Soviet leaders tried to improve relations with United States and succeeded in concluding agreements for cooperation in the fields of exploration of outer space, problems at environment relations between the two countries also showed n improvement. The leaders of two countries even showed their keenness to end armament race and concluded SALT I in 1972 and SALT II in 1979. The leaders of the two countries paid courtesy visits to the capitals of each other and thus displayed unprecedented amity toward each other. This process of improvement of relations with USA suffered a setback following soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979. During the next few years the relations between the two superpowers continued to deteriorate and a sort of new cold war set in.

When Mr. Putin look over from his predecessor Boris Yeltsin, Russia’s foreign policy and its economy were in bad shape. The NATO was advancing to Russia’s door step and Moscow was fast losing influence in its own former Soviet backward.

The present foreign policy doctrine of Russia may be described as ‘multilateral bipolarity’. Russia has skillfully used its geopolitical and economic position to enhance its strategic value for the West in such key areas as fight against terrorism, international security energy and non-proliferation. The September 11, attack on world Trade Centre in United states provided Russia a perfect chance to put its new foreign policy to works. So she has boldly accepted the United States bases in Central Asia, and gave critical support to the US led military campaign in Taliban ruled Afghanistan. Russia’s new stand weakened the Islamic Threat to Russia through its South and also helped Russia to notifying the world that the conflict in Chechnya was a part of war on international terrorism. Russia is also actively cultivating political cooperation in the Moscow. Delhi Beijing triangle which could become a major pillar of stability in Asia.

MAJOR TRENDS IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

America occupies a central place in post-war world politics. The post-war period has often been described as ‘American Era of International Relations’. The foreign policy of USA in the post world war II, period has undergone complete transformation and replaced the tradition pattern of US foreign policy by new assumptions and principles. and
promotion of the economic interests of the people constitute the foundation of American foreign policy. Towards achieving these goals they believe in peace, order and stability in the international society.

Let us look on the basic principles of the United States foreign policy after World War II

**Territorial integrity and security of US:** The United States, before the outbreak of world war pursued a policy of isolationism in order to guard her territorial integrity. The development of military technology resulted in remarkable change in sea power, air power etc. In the new context security considerations came to occupy a prominent role in the foreign policy formulation.

**International peace and security:** United States believes in international peace and security. It supported the setting up of United Nations and entered into an agreement with other allied powers on the terms of peace treaty in 1947.

**Support to the United Nations:** United States occupies permanent position in Security Council US is one of the major power supporting UN for peacemaking efforts. It provide financial supports to UN. Since the end of World War II American have spent more than 100 billion dollars on foreign aid programme.

**Containment of Communism:** The United States foreign policy in the post war era has been directed towards the containment of communism. The first step towards the containment of communism began with the enunciation of Truman doctrine, followed by Marshall Plan, Eisenhower doctrine regional defence arrangements like NATO, SEATO, CENTO, and other important anticommunist measures.

The disintegration of USSR caused the collapse of the bipolar world order and the emergence of United States as the only super power. While the common wealth of independent status comprising of eleven former Soviet Republics have become a reality the ethnic struggle and the dissatisfaction among the armed forces still continue. Russia is now dependent on American for reorganizing its economy. Russia was beset with numerous problems both economic and political during the period of Boris Yeltisin.

**Relations with China**

The relations of Red China with USA got strained from the very beginning because the Americans openly supported Chiang Kai-Shek against the communists. Even after the communists captured power, America continued to extend support to the Kuomintang government. An improvement in China’s relations with USA started after the Cultural Revolution of 1966-69. China and the United States appeared in common forums and a number of trade and cultural agreements were concluded. In the wake of improvement of relations with China, USA agreed to extend support to the Chinese demand for a permanent seat in the Security Council. It may be observed that the improvement in relations between the two countries was made possible largely by the growing tension between Soviet Union and China and partly by the spirit of détente which gained popularity doing those years. However relations between China and USA began to deteriorate due to US stand on Taiwan. But the realization by US leadership that cooperative relations with China were vital to US world wide security interests prompted them to make all possible efforts to improve relations with China. As a result in 1983 the two countries concluded a five year agreement by which China accepted the growth rate of textile exports of USA of 2-3 percent per year which is somewhat higher than the rates ablated to other East Asian
exporters. In the subsequent years the relations between the two countries continued to be cordial and their cooperation in political economic cultural and military fields continued to grow.

In March 1992 China proceeded to ratify NPT and this paved the way for the improvement of relations between the two countries. In 1997 Chinese president Jliag zemin paid a visit to USA and held talks with President Clinton. This was the first summit meet between the leaders of two countries since Beijing’s 1989 crushing of an unarmed prodemocracy protesters. As a result of this meeting China agreed to promulgate new export controls over nuclear material equipment and technology. In 1998 China and United States signed a key military agreement which provided for a consulting mechanism to strengthen maritime military safety. Thus China’s relations with United States showed considered improvement in recent years.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF JAPAN

Japan, known as the place of rising sun, is a country of several islands grouped together. At one end it touches the Russian territory on the west and the American borders on the East. This geographical situation of Japan has given her a strategic significance due to the fact Japan has played an effective role in the Asian affairs. Japanese influence on modern Asia was also profound in more constructive ways.

Throughout the post–World War II period, Japan concentrated on economic growth. It accommodated itself flexibly to the regional and global policies of the United States while avoiding major initiatives of its own; adhered to pacifist principles embodied in the 1947 constitution and generally took a passive, low-profile role in world affairs. This policy was highly successful and allowed Japan to prosper and grow as an economic power, but it was feasible only while the country enjoyed the security and economic stability provided by its ally, the United States.

In the 1970s, there was growing domestic pressure on the government to exercise more foreign policy initiatives independent of the United States. The so-called Nixon "shock," involving the surprise visit to China by Richard Nixon and the sudden reconciliation in Sino-American relations, also argued for a more independent Japanese foreign policy. The nation's phenomenal economic growth had made it a ranking world economic power by the early 1970s and had generated a sense of pride and self-esteem. On the other hand, Japan's burgeoning economic growth and expansion into overseas markets had given rise to foreign charges of "economic aggression" and demands that it adopt more balanced trade policies. Changes in the power relationships in the Asia-Pacific quadrilateral—made up of Japan, the People's Republic of China, the United States, and the Soviet Union—also called for reexamination of policies.

The move toward a more autonomous foreign policy was accelerated in the 1970s by the United States decision to withdraw troops from Indochina. Japanese public opinion had earlier favored some distance between Japan and the United States involvement in war in Vietnam. The collapse of the war effort in Vietnam was seen as the end of United States military and economic dominance in Asia and brought to the fore a marked shift in Japan's attitudes about the United States. Thus, political leaders began to argue that in the interests of economic self-preservation, more attention should be paid to the financial and development needs of other countries, especially those that provided Japan with vital
energy and raw material supplies. Japanese leaders played a strong supporting role in curbing economic and other interaction with the Soviet Union and its allies in order to help check the expansion of Soviet power in sensitive areas among the developing world countries. Japanese thinking on foreign policy was also influenced by the rise of a new postwar generation to leadership and policy-making positions. Under Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, a more hawkish stance on foreign policy was introduced. Japan built up a close political-military relationship with the United States.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the growing preoccupation of its former republics and the East European nations with internal political and economic problems increased the importance of economic competition, rather than military power, to Japan. Its economic power gave Japan a steadily growing role in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other international financial institutions. Investment and trade flows give Japan by far the dominant economic role in Asia, and Japanese aid and investment were widely sought after in other parts of the world. It appears to be only a matter of time before such economic power would be translated into greater political power. The crucial issue for the United States and many other world governments centers on how Japan will employ this growing economic power.

MODULE VII.
UNITED NATIONS

a. UNITED NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE
b. U.N. AND DEVELOPMENT
c. PEACE KEEPING OPERATIONS OF THE U.N.
d. PEACE AND SECURITY ISSUES BEFORE U.N

INTRODUCTION:
The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War to maintain international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights. Due to its unique international character, and the powers vested in its founding Charter, the Organization can take action on a wide range of issues, and provide a forum for its Member States to express their views. The work of the United Nations reaches every corner of the globe. Although best known for peacekeeping, peace building, conflict prevention and humanitarian assistance, there are many other ways the United Nations and its System (specialized agencies, funds and programmes) make the world a better place. The Organization works on a broad range of fundamental issues, from sustainable development, environment and refugees protection, disaster relief, counter terrorism, disarmament and non-proliferation, to promoting democracy, human rights, gender equality and the advancement of women, governance, economic and social development and international health, clearing landmines, expanding food production, and more, in order to achieve its goals and coordinate efforts for a safer world for this and future generation

**The UN has four main purposes**

1. To keep peace throughout the world;
2. To develop friendly relations among nations;
3. To help nations work together to improve the lives of poor people, to conquer hunger, disease and illiteracy, and to encourage respect for each other’s rights and freedoms;
4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations to achieve these goals.

**The preamble of UN charter says that The UN is determined;**

1. to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
2. to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and
3. to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and
4. to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

And for this end:

- to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and
- to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and
- to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and
to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples.

**THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND PEACE BUILDING MECHANISM**

Article 24 (1) of the UN charter gives the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Article 39 of the United Nations Charter states that, the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression. The range of situations which the Security Council determined as giving rise to threats to the peace includes country-specific situations such as inter- or intra-State conflicts or internal conflicts with a regional or sub-regional dimension.

Furthermore, the Security Council has identified potential or generic threats as threats to international peace and security, such as terrorist acts, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the proliferation and illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons. The context in which the Security Council determined a situation as giving rise to breaches of the peace is narrower. The Security Council has determined a breach of the peace only in situations involving the use of armed force. Only in a very few cases in its history has the Security Council ever determined the existence of an act of aggression by one State against another.

Article 41 of the Charter says that the Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. The Repertoire also covers how Article 41 has been applied and interpreted by the Security Council as well as the sanctions committees and other bodies that have been created to monitor mandatory measures.

Article 42 of the Charter enables the Council to use force to maintain or restore international peace and security if it considers non-military measures to be or to have proven inadequate. Articles 43 -47 of the Charter provide for arrangements intended to govern the relationship between the Security Council and the Member States contributing troops for the purpose of maintenance of international peace and security. Article 43 deals with the obligation for United Nations members to undertake to make armed forces available to the Security Council, render assistance and accord relief as necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security exists only in accordance with one or more special agreements. Nevertheless, such agreements were never concluded and no State is obligated to make troops available to the Council in a particular situation. Consequently, the United Nations has to enter into negotiations every time a situation calls for the establishment of an operation. According the Article 47, there is a Military Staff Committee, composed of the chiefs of staff of the five permanent members of the Council, was given responsibility for the strategic coordination of forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. However, the Military Staff Committee has been of only limited significance in practice.
UNITED NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE

The United Nations is an international organization whose aims are facilitating cooperation in international law, international security, economic development, social progress, human rights, and achievement of world peace. The UN was founded to stop wars between countries, and to provide a platform for dialogue. It contains multiple subsidiary organizations to carry out its missions. There are currently 193 member states. From its offices around the world, the UN and its specialized agencies decide on substantive and administrative issues in regular meetings held throughout the year. The organization has six principal organs: the General Assembly (the main deliberative assembly); the Security Council (for deciding certain resolutions for peace and security); the Economic and Social Council (for assisting in promoting international economic and social cooperation and development); the Secretariat (for providing studies, information, and facilities needed by the UN); the International Court of Justice (the primary judicial organ); and the United Nations Trusteeship Council (which is currently inactive). Other prominent UN System agencies include the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Food Programme (WFP) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). One of the primary purposes of the United Nations is the maintenance of international peace and security. Since its creation, the UN has often been called upon to prevent disputes from escalating into war, to persuade opposing parties to use the conference table rather than force of arms, or to help restore peace when armed conflict does break out.

The Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General all play major, complementary roles in fostering peace and security. United Nations activities cover the principal areas of conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, enforcement and peace building.

Preserving world peace is a central purpose of the United Nations. Under the Charter, Member States agree to settle disputes by peaceful means and refrain from threatening or using force against other States. Over the years, the UN has played a major role in helping defuse international crises and in resolving protracted conflicts. It has undertaken complex operations involving peacemaking, peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance. It has worked to prevent conflicts from breaking out. And in post–conflict situations, it has increasingly undertaken coordinated action to address the root causes of war and lay the foundation for durable peace.

UN efforts have produced dramatic results. The UN helped defuse the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 and the Middle East crisis in 1973. In 1988, a UN–sponsored peace settlement ended the Iran–Iraq war, and in the following year UN–sponsored negotiations led to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. In the 1990s, the UN was instrumental in restoring sovereignty to Kuwait, and played a major role in ending civil wars in Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Mozambique, restoring the democratically elected government in Haiti, and resolving or containing conflict in various other countries.

DISARMAMENT
Halting the spread of arms and reducing and eventually eliminating all weapons of mass destruction are major goals of the United Nations. The UN has been an ongoing forum for disarmament negotiations, making recommendations and initiating studies. It supports multilateral negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament and in other international bodies. These negotiations have produced such agreements as the Nuclear Non–Proliferation Treaty (1968), the Comprehensive Nuclear–Test–Ban Treaty (1996) and the treaties establishing nuclear–free zones.

Other treaties prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons (1992) and bacteriological weapons (1972), ban nuclear weapons from the seabed and ocean floor (1971) and outer space (1967); and ban or restrict other types of weapons. In 1997, more than 100 nations signed the Ottawa Convention outlawing landmines. The UN encourages all nations to adhere to this and other treaties banning destructive weapons of war. The UN is also supporting efforts to control small arms and light weapons. As decided by the General Assembly, an international conference in 2001 will focus on the illicit trade in small arms.

The Vienna–based International Atomic Energy Agency, through a system of safeguards agreements, ensures that nuclear materials and equipment intended for peaceful uses are not diverted to military purposes. And in The Hague, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons collects information on chemical facilities worldwide and conducts routine inspections to ensure adherence to the chemical weapons convention.

PEACEMAKING

UN peacemaking brings hostile parties to agreement through diplomatic means. The Security Council, in efforts to maintain international peace and security, may recommend ways to avoid conflict or restore or secure peace — through negotiation, for example, or recourse to the International Court of Justice.

The Secretary–General plays an important role in peacemaking. The Secretary–General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which appears to threaten international peace and security; may use "good offices" to carry out mediation; or exercise "quiet diplomacy" behind the scenes, either personally or through special envoys. The Secretary–General also undertakes "preventive diplomacy" aimed at resolving disputes before they escalate. The Secretary–General may also send a fact–finding mission, support regional peacemaking efforts or set up a local UN political office to help build trust between the parties in conflict.

PEACE–BUILDING

The UN is increasingly undertaking activities which focus on the underlying causes of violence. Development assistance is a key element of peace–building. In cooperation with UN agencies, and with the participation of donor countries, host governments and NGOs, the United Nations works to support good governance.
UN IN AFRICA

UN peace efforts have taken many forms over the years, including the long campaign against apartheid in South Africa, active support for Namibian independence, some 20 peacekeeping operations and a number of electoral support missions. The UN has helped repatriate refugees to Mozambique, provided humanitarian assistance in Somalia and Sudan and undertaken diplomatic efforts to restore peace in the Great Lakes region. It has helped prevent new unrest in the Central African Republic, and it is helping to prepare for a referendum on the future of Western Sahara. At the request of the Security Council, the Secretary-General recently provided a comprehensive analysis of conflicts in Africa along with recommendations on how to promote durable peace. The Security Council established new peacekeeping operations, in Sierra Leone, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Ethiopia.

UN IN ASIA

The UN continues working to strengthen Cambodian civil society, human rights and democracy following the massive 1992–1993 UN peacekeeping mission in that country. In Afghanistan, the UN Special Mission has worked since 1993 to facilitate national reconciliation and reconstruction needed as a result of the country's protracted civil war. In spite of intense diplomatic efforts by the Secretary-General and his special envoys, fighting has continued at great humanitarian cost, severely hindering attempts by the UN system to provide assistance to the Afghan people.

In East Timor, UN–brokered talks between Indonesia and Portugal culminated in the May 1999 agreement which paved the way for a popular consultation on the status of the territory. Under the agreement, a UN mission supervised voter registration and the August ballot, at which 78 per cent of East Timorese voted for independence from Indonesia over autonomy within that country. When the results were announced, militias opposing independence unleashed a campaign of violence, forcing some 200,000 East Timorese to flee their homes.

The Security Council in September 1999 authorized the dispatch of an international security force, which helped to restore order. The UN Transitional Administration has replaced the international force and is overseeing East Timor's transition towards independence.

UN IN EUROPE

The UN worked strenuously towards resolving the conflict in the former Yugoslavia while providing relief assistance to some 4 million people. In 1991, the UN imposed an arms embargo, while the Secretary-General and his envoy conducted diplomatic efforts to end the fighting. From 1992 to 1995, UN peacekeepers sought to bring peace and security to Croatia, helped protect civilians in Bosnia and Herzegovina and helped ensure that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was not drawn into the war.

Following the 1995 Dayton–Paris peace agreements, four UN missions helped secure the peace. The largest of them, the UN Transitional Administration in Eastern Slavonia, oversaw the reintegration of this territory into Croatia.

In Kosovo (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia), the UN established in 1999 an interim international administration following the end of NATO air bombings and the withdrawal
of Yugoslav forces. The Security Council vested in the UN administration unprecedented authority over the territory and people of Kosovo, including all legislative, executive and judiciary powers. Under the umbrella of the UN, the European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the United Nations are working with the people of Kosovo to create a functioning, democratic society with substantial autonomy.

UN IN THE AMERICAS

UN peacemaking and peacekeeping have been instrumental in resolving protracted conflicts in Central America. In 1989, in Nicaragua, the peace effort led to the voluntary demobilization of the resistance movement, whose members turned in their weapons to the UN. In 1990, a UN mission observed Nicaragua’s elections — the first UN–observed elections in an independent country.

In El Salvador, peace talks mediated by the Secretary–General ended 12 years of fighting, and a UN peacekeeping mission verified implementation of all agreements. In Guatemala, UN–assisted negotiations ended a 35–year civil war. UN Verification Mission in Guatemala works to see that the comprehensive peace agreements are fully implemented. In Haiti, following international action to restore the democratically elected government, the UN has continued its work to consolidate democratic institutions.

UN IN MIDDLE EAST

UN concern over the Arab–Israeli conflict spans five decades and five full–fledged wars. The UN has defined principles for a just and lasting peace, including in two benchmark Security Council resolutions — 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) — which remain the basis for an overall settlement.

The UN has supported other initiatives aimed at solving underlying political problems and has despatched various peacekeeping operations to the region. The UN's first military observer group was set up in 1948 and maintains its presence in the area to this day. The UN's first peacekeeping force was also set up there, during the Suez crisis of 1956. Two peacekeeping forces are currently in the region. One, established in 1974, maintains an area of separation on the Golan Heights between Israeli and Syrian troops. The other, established in 1978, contributes to stability in southern Lebanon; in 2000, it verified the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the area. Elsewhere in the region, a UN observer mission monitors the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait following restoration of Kuwait's sovereignty in 1991.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT

United Nations development efforts profoundly affect the lives and well-being of millions of people throughout the world. They are based on the conviction that lasting international peace and security are possible only if the economic prosperity and the well-being of people everywhere is assured. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the UN's global development network, advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life. The concept of development has been started from human development rather than infrastructure development. Mahbub ul Haq (1934-1998), founder of the Human Development Report. Observes: "The basic purpose of development is to enlarge people's choices. In principle, these choices can be infinite and can change over time. People often value achievements that do not show up at all, or not immediately, in income or growth
figures: greater access to knowledge, better nutrition and health services, more secure livelihoods, security against crime and physical violence, satisfying leisure hours, political and cultural freedoms and sense of participation in community activities. The objective of development is to create an enabling environment for people to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives."

Amartya Sen, says, "Human development, as an approach, is concerned with what I take to be the basic development idea: namely, advancing the richness of human life, rather than the richness of the economy in which human beings live, which is only a part of it.". The human development approach is as relevant as ever to making sense of our changing world and finding ways to improve people’s well-being. Human development is an evolving idea, not a fixed, static set of precepts.

UNDP works primarily through its offices in more than 177 countries and territories. UNDP is at the centre of the UN’s efforts to reduce global poverty. At the global level, UNDP chairs the United Nations Development Group (UNDG), which includes the UN’s key players in international development. UNDP is also helping to reinforce joint action on development in such forums as the Economic and Social Council, and the General Assembly of the United Nations. At the country level, UNDP plays two important roles, one as a partner for development work and the other as manager of the Resident Coordinator system.

MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS

In 2000, 189 Nations made a promise to free people from extreme poverty and multiple deprivations. This pledge turned into the eight Millennium Development Goals. All UN members are committed to help achieve the goals by 2015. They are;

1. To eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.
2. To achieve Universal Primary education.
3. To promote gender equality and empower women.
4. To reduce child mortality.
5. To improve maternal health.
6. To combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases
7. To ensure environmental sustainability
8. To develop a global partnership for development.

EXTREME POVERTY AND HUNGER:

More than 162 million young children are still suffering from chronic under nutrition. About one in five persons in developing regions lives on less than $1.25 per day. Vulnerable employment accounted for 56 per cent of all employment in developing regions, compared to 10 per cent in developed regions. About 173 million fewer people worldwide suffered from chronic hunger in 2011–2013 than in 1990–1992. One in four children under age five in the world has inadequate height for his or her age. Every day in 2013, 32,000 people had to abandon their homes to seek protection due to conflict.

In order to address this issue of poverty and hunger UN has developed 1012 projects. Carrier development projects in Guatemala; Construction of micro dams and increase of
food production in Eretria; Protection and improvement of standard of living among ethnic minorities in Vietnam; the MGNREGA in India; Micro finance programme in Mongolia; Jamaican Debt exchange project etc are examples which cope up with the project either aided or in support of UN millennium development goals to irradiate poverty and malnutrition across the world.

ACHIEVEMENT OF UNIVERSAL PRIMARY EDUCATION:

High dropout rates remain a major impediment to universal primary education. An estimated 50 per cent of out-of-school children of primary school age live in conflict-affected areas. Half of the 58 million out-of-school children of primary school age live in conflict-affected areas. More than one in four children in developing regions entering primary school is likely to drop out. 781 million adults and 126 million youth worldwide lack basic literacy skills, and more than 60 per cent of them are women.

The UN Aral Sea Programme helps address the economic, health and food needs of more than 130,000 people affected by the environmental crisis. The projects rebuild kindergartens in Uzbek province. US $3.12 million project in Tunisia. The joint programme “Engaging Tunisian Youth to Achieve the MDGs” is a collaboration between five UN agencies (ILO, FAO, IOM, UNIDO, UNDP) and the Tunisian government to reduce joblessness and migration among youth in Tunisia, where one third of all young people are unemployed- are some of the examples.

GENDER EQUALITY AND EMPOWER WOMEN.

In Southern Asia, only 74 girls were enrolled in primary school for every 100 boys in 1990. By 2012, the enrolment ratios were the same for girls as for boys. In sub-Saharan Africa, Oceania and Western Asia, girls still face barriers to entering both primary and secondary school. Women in Northern Africa hold less than one in five paid jobs in the non-agricultural sector. In 46 countries, women now hold more than 30 per cent of seats in national parliament in at least one chamber. The 5.3 billion dollar project in Afghanistan for clean drinking water which helped 3 million people to have access to clean water; the project to reduce unemployment in Bosina and Herzegovina; The US$ 2 million project aims at raising awareness and improving access to justice for victims of domestic and sexual violence in Nicaragua; bio-diversity projects in China are some of the examples and initiatives to ensure gender equality and empowerment of women across the globe.

REDUCTION OF CHILD MORTALITY:

The child mortality rate has almost halved since 1990; six million fewer children died in 2012 than in 1990.During the period from 2005 to 2012, the annual rate of reduction in under-five mortality was more than three times faster than between 1990 and 1995.Globally, four out of every five deaths of children under age five continue to occur in sub-Saharan Africa and Southern Asia. Immunization against measles helped prevent nearly 14 million deaths between 2000 and 2012.

IMPROVEMENT OF MATERNAL HEALTH:
Poverty and lack of education perpetuate high adolescent birth rates. Inadequate funding for family planning is a major failure in fulfilling commitments to improving women’s reproductive health. Almost 300,000 women died globally in 2013 from causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. The proportion of deliveries in developing regions attended by skilled health personnel rose from 56 to 68 per cent between 1990 and 2012. In 2012, 40 million births in developing regions were not attended by skilled health personnel, and over 32 million of those births occurred in rural areas. 52 per cent of pregnant women had four or more antenatal care visits during pregnancy in 2012, an increase from 37 per cent in 1990. UNDP’s core mandate of helping countries tackle poverty, promote gender equality, and achieve sustainable human development is highly relevant to lifting health status.

COMBAT HIV/AIDS, MALARIA, AND OTHER DISEASES:

Access to antiretroviral therapy (ART) for HIV-infected people has been increasing dramatically. ART has saved 6.6 million lives since 1995. Expanding its coverage can save many more. In addition, knowledge about HIV among youth needs to be improved to stop the spread of the disease. Almost 600 children died every day of AIDS-related causes in 2012. Antiretroviral medicines were delivered to 9.5 million people in developing regions in 2012. Malaria interventions saved the lives of three million young children between 2000 and 2012. Between 1995 and 2012, tuberculosis treatment saved 22 million lives.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY:

Global emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) continued their upward trend and those in 2011 were almost 50 per cent above their 1990 level. Millions of hectares of forest are lost every year, many species are being driven closer to extinction and renewable water resources are becoming scarcer. Global emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) have increased by almost 50 per cent since 1990. Protected ecosystems covered 14 per cent of terrestrial and coastal marine areas worldwide by 2012. Over 2.3 billion more people have gained access to an improved source of drinking water since 1990, but 748 million people still draw their water from an unimproved source. Between 1990 and 2012, almost 2 billion people obtained access to improved sanitation. However, 1 billion people still resort to open defecation. One-third of urban residents in developing regions still live in slums. The UNDP projects in India protect 21 conservation areas covering 32,000 hectares across the 3 project states, help protect 32 globally significant medicinal plants. The micro-credit projects in Burundi financed 43 projects for biodiversity conservation; noted examples.

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR DEVELOPMENT:

80 per cent of imports from developing countries entered developed countries duty-free and tariffs remained at an all-time low. The debt burden of developing countries remained stable at about 3 per cent of export revenue. Official development assistance stood at $134.8 billion in 2013, the highest level ever recorded. 80 per cent of imports from developing countries enter developed countries duty-free. The debt burden on developing countries remains stable at about 3 per cent of export revenue. The number of people needing humanitarian aid around the world has risen from 51 million to 62 million – an
increase of more than 20 per cent – during the first half of 2012. More than 18 million people in nine countries in the Sahel region are facing a severe food and nutrition crisis, worsened by conflict in northern Mali. More than a million children under five are at risk of dying from severe acute malnutrition and over 200,000 people have fled into neighbouring countries. All these factors points to the necessity of global partnership for development.

PEACE KEEPING OPERATIONS OF THE U.N.

The founders of the UN made no explicit provisions for peacekeeping in the 111-article-long Charter. Chapter VI covered the voluntary settlement of disputes, and Chapter VII dealt with enforcement action. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld quipped that peacekeeping forces might be placed in their own chapter, numbered "six and a half." Lacking specific legal provisions, peacekeeping has emerged largely through precedent. The principles and customs of peacekeeping have been moulded by the various missions. Therefore, any discussion of UN peacekeeping must start by highlighting some of the major points in its evolution, from the Cold War to the present. Anthony McDermott states that there has never been a 'golden age' of peacekeeping operations. Peacekeeping has proven to be one of the most effective tools available to the UN to assist host countries navigate the difficult path from conflict to peace. Peacekeeping has unique strengths, including legitimacy, burden sharing, and an ability to deploy and sustain troops and police from around the globe, integrating them with civilian peacekeepers to advance multidimensional mandates. UN Peacekeepers provide security and the political and peace building support to help countries make the difficult, early transition from conflict to peace.

UN Peacekeeping is guided by three basic principles:

1. Consent of the parties;
2. Impartiality;
3. Non-use of force except in self-defence and defence of the mandate.

There are 16 peace keeping operation missions at present deployed among four continents. These peacekeeping operations are called upon not only to maintain peace and security, but also to facilitate the political process, protect civilians, assist in the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of former combatants; support the organization of elections, protect and promote human rights and assist in restoring the rule of law. The UN initiatives in peace keeping got global recognition in 1998 when the organization was awarded Nobel Peace Prize.

United Nations Peacekeeping began in 1948 when the Security Council authorized the deployment of UN military observers to the Middle East. Since then, 69 peace keeping operations have been deployed by the UN, 56 of them since 1988. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of military personnel, as well as tens of thousands of UN police and other civilians from more than 120 countries have participated in UN peacekeeping operations.

EARLY PERIODS OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS:
Peacekeeping was primarily limited to maintaining ceasefires and stabilizing situations on the ground, providing crucial support for political efforts to resolve conflict by peaceful means. Those missions consisted of unarmed military observers and lightly armed troops with primarily monitoring, reporting and confidence-building roles. The first two peacekeeping operations deployed by the UN were the UN Truce Supervision Organisation (UNTSO) and the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP). Both of these missions, exemplified the observation and monitoring type of operation and had authorized strengths in the low hundreds. The UN military observers were unarmed. Other important peacekeeping operations were:

b. The UN operation in Congo in 1960
c. Mission of the representative of the Secretary-general in the Dominican Republic during May 1965 to October 1966.
d. UN Security Force in West New Guinea from 3rd October 1962 to 30th April 1963
e. UN Yemen Observation Mission (UNYOM from July 1963 to September 1964)
f. The UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP from 1964 to present)
g. The UN Emergency Force II (UNEF II was established in October 1973 to supervise the ceasefire between Egyptian and Israeli forces)
h. The United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) was established on 31 May 1974 in Israel - Syria sector, by Security Council resolution 350 (1974) and
i. UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) UNIFIL was created by the Security Council in March 1978 to confirm Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon, restore international peace and security and assist the Lebanese Government in restoring its effective authority in the area

UN PEACEKEEPING IN POST COLD WAR:

The UN shifted and expanded its field operations from “traditional” missions involving generally observational tasks performed by military personnel to complex “multidimensional” enterprises. These multidimensional missions were designed to ensure the implementation of comprehensive peace agreements and assist in laying the foundations for sustainable peace.

The nature of conflicts also changed over the years. UN Peacekeeping, originally developed as a means of dealing with inter-State conflict, was increasingly being applied to intra-State conflicts and civil wars. UN Peacekeepers were now increasingly asked to undertake a wide variety of complex tasks, from helping to build sustainable institutions of governance, to human rights monitoring, to security sector reform, to the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants.

Although the military remained the backbone of most peacekeeping operations, there were now many faces to peacekeeping including: administrators, economists, police officers, legal experts, de-miners, electoral observers, human rights monitors, civil affairs and governance specialists, humanitarian workers, communications and public information experts.
After the Cold War ended, there was a rapid increase in the number of peacekeeping operations. With a new consensus and a common sense of purpose, the Security Council authorized a total of 20 new operations between 1989 and 1994, raising the number of peacekeepers from 11,000 to 75,000.

Most of these missions were deployed to:
- help implement complex peace agreements;
- stabilize the security situation;
- re-organize military and police;
- Elect new governments and build democratic institutions.

The mid 1990s saw a recession in the field of peacekeeping operations. The three high-profile peacekeeping operations (the former Yugoslavia - UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR), Rwanda - UN Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) and Somalia - UN Operation in Somalia II (UNOSOM II)) came under criticism as peacekeepers faced situations where warring parties failed to adhere to peace agreements, or where the peacekeepers themselves were not provided adequate resources or political support. As civilian casualties rose and hostilities continued, the reputation of UN Peacekeeping suffered. The setbacks of the early and mid-1990s led the Security Council to limit the number of new peacekeeping missions and begin a process of self-reflection to prevent such failures from happening again.

In the second half of the 1990s, the Council authorized new UN operations in:
- Angola - UN Angola Verification Mission III (UNAVEM III) and UN Observer Mission in Angola (MONUA);
- Bosnia and Herzegovina - UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH);
- Croatia - UN Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia (UNCRO), UN Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES) and UN Civilian Police Support Group (UNPSG);
- the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia - UN Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP);
- Guatemala - UN Verification Mission in Guatemala (MINUGUA);
- Haiti - UN Support Mission in Haiti (UNSMIH) UN Transition Mission in Haiti (UNTMIH) and UN Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH).

**PEACE AND SECURITY ISSUES AND CHALLENGES BEFORE U.N.**

Article 33 describes the basic techniques of peacemaking as negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement and resorting to regional agencies and organisations. Peace-building activities can include monitoring elections, promoting human rights, providing reintegration and rehabilitation programmes, and creating conditions for resumed development. During the Cold War, peacekeeping had a relatively minor role that was largely confined to the Middle East and regional conflicts associated
with de-colonisation. Peacekeeping forces thus helped to contain those crises in which neither superpower had a major interest, forestalling their involvement and subsequent escalation. In 1956, the General Assembly created the first United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF I) for the Suez Crisis. The responsibility and authority for creating mandates has since fallen to the Security Council. UNEF I was charged with separating the sides, supervising the withdrawal of British, French and Israeli units, and patrolling the Sinai peninsula and the Gaza Strip. Another important operation was the UN Operation in Congo from 1960 to 1964. Both of these experiences have shown that peacekeeping was not a simple procedure to activate and carry out. The operations of the early 1990s were overly ambitious, given the considerable financial and political constraints placed on the UN by member states. To a large degree, the UN overextended its management capabilities, its resources and its political backing. These new endeavours were mostly incorporated into existing administrative and management structures, often lacking success. In fact, the problems of third generation operations in Somalia and Bosnia, and the "disastrous" mission in Rwanda "prompted a period of retrenchment."

The Security Council—particularly the United States—was reluctant to authorise, implement o finance new peacekeeping operations. Rather than setting up more missions, the UN turned to improving its infrastructure and its operational efficiency. The total deployment of UN military and civilian personnel fell from its 1993 peak of more than 80,000 to approximately 14,000 in 1998. Along with this retrenchment also came a general consensus that much needed to be done to approach conflict management more inclusively with other fields. Many saw a need to better co-ordinate humanitarian concerns, human rights, social development and traditional military approaches.

Some of the challenges to effective peacekeeping are considered largely conceptual. In the past, peacekeepers were merely expected to separate hostile forces and observe cease-fires or truces. For the operation to be successful, it was essential that the parties to the conflict offered their collaboration and support. However, in recent conflicts, involving ethnic-based disputes, internal political struggle or the collapse of state institutions, the UN has been acting without the clear consent of the parties to the conflict. The result is that the environment for peacekeeping is no longer benign. Peacekeepers increasingly work in a climate of continuing armed conflict, sometimes in places where there are poorly defined borders or cease-fire lines and no guarantees of respect for their safety or role. Petru Dimitriu argues that this new and complex environment, together with the ambitious objectives of the United Nations and ever-growing pressure on scarce resources, has made it more imperative than ever to think clearly about when and how the UN should become involved in peacekeeping operations.

The UN was largely excluded from the initial stages of war. There is Security Council Resolution 1244 in June 1999, which provided measures for rebuilding Kosovo, proved that the UN is still relevant and needed. But, if the UN wants to use that relevance to live up to its Charter and "save next generations from the horrors of war," it needs to amend its peacekeeping agenda. It needs the funding, the strength and the capacity to mount and support a new generation of peacekeeping operations. The nature of war has changed and peacekeeping must keep pace.

MODULE VIII
CONFLICTS AND CHALLENGES

A. INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

B. HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

C. RISE OF ETHNIC VIOLENCE

D. GLOBALIZATION, MNCS AND TNCS

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Terrorism may be described as an act of violence, committed to create fear, with an underlying political motive. This fear is an intended effect and not merely a byproduct of terrorism. International Terrorism has international or trans-national consequences in which terrorists strike targets outside and beyond their country of origin. International terrorist groups have an organization/network in a number of countries. The revolution in information and technology also enables instant transmission of ideas and information at a global level, among the terrorist outfits. Terrorism today, therefore, has been transformed into a trans-national, high-tech, lethal and global phenomenon.

For decades terrorists have carried out attacks against non-combatant targets causing massive destruction by means of vicious assaults. While the objectives and modus operandi have changed, there is no reason to believe that terrorism will completely cease to exist in the near future. In fact, because terrorism is a tactic used by a wide variety of organizations it can be argued that terrorism cannot be defeated at all. While individual groups that use terrorist means to further their political objectives can be curbed, the vicious cycle has thus far not been broken.

CAUSES OF TERRORISM

It is generally agreed that a lack of democracy, civil liberties and the rule of law are preconditions for many forms of domestic terrorism. Generally, the most democratic and the most totalitarian societies have the lowest levels of oppositional violence. Failed or weak states on the other hand, lack the capacity to exercise territorial control. This often leaves a power vacuum that can be exploited by terrorist organizations to maintain safe havens and training facilities or serve as bases for launching terrorist campaigns. Long standing liberal democracies with established traditions of free speech and tolerance have been the targets of both domestic and foreign terrorism.

Rapid modernization and urbanization in the form of high economic growth has also been found to correlate strongly with the emergence of ideological terrorism. This maybe particularly important in countries where sudden wealth (e.g. from oil) has precipitated a change from tribal to high-tech societies in one generation or less. When traditional norms and social patterns crumble or are made to seem irrelevant, new radical ideologies that are sometimes based on religion or perhaps nostalgia for a glorious past, may become attractive to certain segments of society. Extremist ideologies of a secular or religious nature are at least an intermediate cause of terrorism, although people usually adopt such extremist
ideologies as a consequence of more fundamental political or personal reasons. When these worldviews are adopted and applied in order to interpret situations and guide action, they tend to take on a dynamics of their own, and may serve to dehumanize the enemy and justify atrocities.

Historical antecedents of political violence, civil wars, revolutions, dictatorships or occupation may lower the threshold for acceptance of political violence and terrorism, and impede the development of non-violent norms among all segments of society. The victim role as well as longstanding historical injustices and grievances may be constructed to serve as justifications for terrorism. When young children are socialized into cultural value systems that celebrate martyrdom, revenge and hatred of other ethnic or national groups, this is likely to increase their readiness to support or commit violent atrocities when they grow up. Hegemony and inequality of power is another reason for terrorism. When local or international powers possess an overwhelming power compared to oppositional groups, and the latter see no other realistic ways to forward their cause by normal political or military means, “asymmetrical warfare” can represent a tempting option. Terrorism offers the possibility of achieving high political impact with limited means. Illegitimate or corrupt governments frequently give rise to opposition that may turn to terrorist means if other avenues are not seen as realistic options for replacing these regimes with a more credible and legitimate government.

Powerful external actors upholding illegitimate governments may be seen as an insurmountable obstacle to needed regime change. Such external support to illegitimate governments is frequently seen as foreign domination through puppet regimes serving the political and economic interests of foreign sponsors. Repression by foreign occupation or by colonial powers has given rise to a great many national liberation movements that have sought recourse in terrorist tactics and other political means. Despite their use of terrorist methods, some liberation movements enjoy considerable support and legitimacy among their own constituencies, and sometimes also from segments of international public opinion. The experience of discrimination on the basis of ethnic or religious origin is the chief root cause of ethno-nationalist terrorism. When sizeable minorities are systematically deprived of their rights to equal social and economic opportunities, obstructed from expressing their cultural identities, or excluded from political influence, this can give rise to secessionist movements that may turn to terrorism or other forms of violent struggle. Ethnic nationalisms are more likely to give rise to terrorism than are moderate and inclusive civic nationalisms. Failure or unwillingness by the state to integrate dissident groups or emerging social classes may lead to their alienation from the political system. Some groups are excluded because they hold views or represent political traditions considered irreconcilable with the basic values of the state. Large groups of highly educated young people with few prospects of meaningful careers within a blocked system will tend to feel alienated and frustrated. Excluded groups are likely to search for alternative channels through which to express and promote political influence and change. To some, terrorism can seem the most effective and tempting option.

The experience of social injustice is a main motivating cause behind social revolutionary terrorism. Relative deprivation or great differences in income distribution in a
society have in some studies been found to correlate rather strongly with the emergence of social revolutionary political violence and ideological terrorism, but less with ethno-nationalist terrorism. The presence of charismatic ideological leaders able to transform widespread grievances and frustrations into a political agenda for violent struggle is a decisive factor behind the emergence of a terrorist movement or group. The existence of grievances alone is only a precondition: someone is needed who can translate that into a program for violent action.

The first condition that can be considered a direct cause of terrorism is the existence of concrete grievances among an identifiable subgroup of a larger population, such as an ethnic minority discriminated against by the majority. The second condition that can create motivations for terrorism is the lack of opportunity for political participation. The last category of situational factors involves the concept of a precipitated event that immediately precedes outbreaks of terrorism. While general consensus points to the fact that precipitants are usually unpredictable, a common pattern has emerged that highlights particular government actions as catalysts for terrorism. Terrorist retaliations can thus occur as a result of unusual and unexpected use of force by the government, a so-called “action-reaction syndrome”. In general, provocative events that call for revenge or action, may trigger terrorist action by spoilers on both sides. Contested elections, police brutality and even peace talks are all examples of triggering causes.

On the larger international scene, the factors that impact on terrorism are many. Globalization has made geographic borders transparent to the flow of ideas, people and also turmoil. Technology has extended the reach and capabilities of the terrorists at the global level. There are political, cultural and psychological undercurrents which have played behind terrorism.

1. Political Causes: The motivation may be to affect a political reform, or overthrow a regime perceived as illegitimate or lacking public trust and support. Terrorism may be used as to demonstrate the weakness and vulnerability of the regime, to reveal its inability to provide security, to provoke government repression to help recruit followers, and ultimately to force leaders from power.

2. Cultural Causes: This motivation is most common in situations where an ethnic or religious group fears extermination, or loss of their common identity, language or culture. It may also be combined with political motives, where the rulers discriminate against the ethnic group in terms of jobs, economic opportunity or access to the political process.

3. Psychological causes: Some terrorists are unbalanced, violent individuals suffering some form of psychosis. Others may be egomaniacs driven to achieve recognition through violence, and who attract a following of other dysfunctional individuals. This characterization may be accurate in cases where terrorist appear to have no logical goal, or motivation, or a purpose that makes little sense to normal people.

FOUR WAVES OF TERRORISM
David C. Rapoport has popularized the notion of the wave theory of terrorism. He argues that there are four distinctive waves of modern terrorism, where each wave has its own ideological identity. The origin of the first wave, which is generally also seen as the origin of modern terrorism, is set around 1880 in Russia. The wave was anarchistic in character and was the first global terrorist experience. One of the main characteristics of the first wave were political assassinations. The most important group was Narodnaja Volja, or “People’s Will”. The group expected that targeting specific political representatives would ignite a popular uprising. This led the group to choose its targets very carefully, ultimately killing Tsar Alexander II. The wave that started in Russia soon swept Europe and eventually reached the United States. Anarchists killed, amongst others, the President of France Marie François Sadi Carnot, the President of United States William McKinley, the Prime Minister of Spain Antonio Cánovas del Castillo and many others. The wave of anarchist violence that swept the world led President Roosevelt to “ask in December 1901 for international treaties among all civilized powers to make anarchism a crime against the law of nations and to empower the federal government to deal with this crime”. This was a call for an international battle against anarchist terrorism, one hundred years prior to the call of President Bush for a war on religious terrorism.

The Anti-colonial wave emerged in the 1920s and had its root causes in the Treaty of Versailles signed in 1919. The European victors broke up the old defeated empires and decided that its non-European parts were not yet ready for independence. Terrorist groups appeared in, for example, Palestine and Cyprus. Following World War II terrorist activity emerged in the overseas territories of the battered European colonial superpowers. The second wave receded with the dissolving of the colonial empires in the 1950s and early 1960s.

The third wave, known as the New-Left, emerged in the 1960s out of discontent with the western political climate that was characterized by the Vietnam War and had of course the Cold War as broader context. Terrorist groups were active in Europe, Latin America and the United States and were often aided by Palestinian organizations and state sponsors. The end of the Cold War and as a result the decrease of state sponsorship of terrorism were the main reason behind the demise of the third wave.

The fourth wave has its roots in the Iranian Revolution and the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union in 1979. Although religion has always played an important role in some terrorist organizations, it was typically subordinate to other main causes. The IRA, for instance, wanted to liberate and unite the whole of Ireland, while the Irgun aimed to create a Jewish state. In the fourth wave religion became the ideological justification for perpetrating terrorist attacks. This wave is further characterized by specific trends like suicide terrorism, the decline of the number of terrorist groups and the targeting of ‘softer’ targets.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF TERRORISM
The consequences of terrorism can be very dire, with hundreds or in some cases even thousands of deaths, and great economic damage. The number of casualties, however, is not the only consequence of terrorist acts. Taking the economic impact of terrorism into account produces a fuller picture. However, it is extremely difficult to accurately determine such costs. One year after 9/11, the New York City Comptroller estimated that 146,000 jobs were lost as a result of the attacks. Furthermore, the cumulative economic costs totaled between 83 and 95 billion U.S. dollars. At the same time, the impact resulting from attacks in other parts of the world present a different picture. According to the findings of a research institute in Spain, estimated costs of terrorist attacks carried out in Madrid on March 11, 2004, amounted to 212 million euros.

Another important set of consequences of terrorism is formed by the psychological effects on the population. These effects can be very serious. For example, one report about the psychological effects of 9/11 on people in the entire United States notes that sixteen percent of the respondents had persistent psychological problems related to the terrorist attacks. They expressed trouble sleeping, accomplishing less at work, drug and alcohol use, and fear of going to public gathering places.

Another important consequence is the political and societal impact of terrorism. Although on the individual level the human toll is obviously the most disastrous consequence, on the state and systemic levels the political and societal consequences of terrorism are undoubtedly most severe. This is perhaps not surprising. After all, one of the main characteristics of terrorism is that it always has a political objective. A successful terrorist attack, thus, does not need to involve many deaths, but it must include political ramifications, at least in the long term.

The fact that countries are often eager to react militarily to terrorist attacks is another example of potential political consequences. This could be because of an actual desire to reduce the capabilities, or as a result of public pressure to “do something” following the incident. One of the best and most recent manifestations of such outcomes is the US-led invasion of Afghanistan following after the events of 9/11. A number of European countries assisted in this military operation. Political consequences of terrorism can impact decision-making beyond military action. For instance, law makers may decide to implement legislation meant to reduce the risk of terrorism that may infringe on essential liberties such as freedom of speech and press, or the right to privacy.

**Strategies to Counter Terrorism**

A long-term strategy is required to counter terrorism. It has to be comprehensively addressed on all fronts, political, economic, social and military. At the international level states should plan joint actions to counter terrorism. International organizations, including in particular regional organizations and their member States, should adopt the necessary legal framework to prevent or suppress terrorism and should reach out to, and actively support, states that need technical and operational support for counterterrorism activities. States can co-operate to develop mechanisms and procedures, such as co-ordination and cooperation with each other and with competent international agencies for intelligence and information sharing. States should develop modalities for international cooperation and
coordination within the regional and universal organizations. Such modalities should focus specifically on effective mutual assistance in law enforcement cooperation within a rule of law framework, guaranteeing fair treatment of suspected offenders’ in conformity with human rights laws and, in particular, standard minimum rules for treatment of prisoners and accused.

**HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS**

Human rights are universal values and legal guarantees that protect individuals and groups against actions and omissions primarily by State agents that interfere with fundamental freedoms, entitlements and human dignity. The full spectrum of human rights involves respect for, and protection and fulfillment of, civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights, as well as the right to development. Human rights are universal—in other words, they belong inherently to all human beings—and are interdependent and indivisible. Human rights violations are a major threat faced by the global community. Historically governments have violated human rights for many reasons. There may be ideological and structural reasons for violations of rights. At times governments may try to induce fear over subjects so as to gain maximum loyalty to their ideology. Dictators often force citizens to accept official ideologies and religions. The opponents may be sent to prisons or may be tortured. Their political and civil rights may be suppressed. This trend is not particular to dictators only. Even democratic nations tend to violate human rights. This may be in terms of military necessity or national security. Since the Second World War crimes against humanity is ever-increasing. This includes genocides and politicides. In many parts of the world ethnic cleansing has threatened the very existence of communities.

**Human Rights and the UN**

The promotion and protection of human rights has been a major activity for the United Nations since 1945. UN has developed a wide network of human rights instruments and mechanisms to ensure the protection of human rights. The General Assembly is the main deliberative body of the United Nations. The General Assembly allocates items relating to human rights issues to its Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Affairs Committee, commonly called as the "Third Committee". The Committee focus on the examination of human rights questions, including reports of the Human Rights Council. The Committee also discusses the advancement of women, the protection of children, indigenous issues, the treatment of refugees, the promotion of fundamental freedoms through the elimination of racism and racial discrimination, and the right to self-determination. The Committee addresses issues related to youth, family, ageing, persons with disabilities, crime prevention, criminal justice, and international drug control. The Economic and Social Council, makes recommendations to the General Assembly on human rights matters, and reviews reports and resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights and transmits them to the General Assembly. The Economic and Social Council established the following bodies to address human right issues

1. **Human Rights Council**,
2. **Commission on the Status of Women** and
3. **Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice**.

The Human Rights Council is the main policy-making body dealing with human rights issues. It was established in 2006. The council prepares studies, makes recommendations and drafts international human rights conventions and declarations. It also investigates allegations of human rights violations.

The Commission on the Status of Women, composed of 32 members, the commission prepares recommendations and reports to the Economic and Social Council on the promotion of women's rights in political, economic, social and educational fields. It makes recommendations to the Council on problems requiring attention in the field of women's rights.

The Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, composed of 40 members, it is the main United Nations policy-making body on criminal justice. It develops and monitors the United Nations programme on crime prevention.

**Strategies of UN**

To enhance respect for fundamental human rights and to further progress towards their realization, the UN adopted a three-pronged approach: (a) establishment of international standards, (b) protection of human rights, and (c) United Nations technical assistance.

International Human Rights standards were developed to protect people's human rights against violations by individuals, groups or nations.: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the Declaration on the Right to Development (1986) and the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (1992) are some international human right standards.

To monitor the implementation of treaty obligations treaty bodies were established. The treaty bodies examine reports of States parties. Each year they engage in dialogue with national Governments and issue concluding observations and offer suggestions and recommendations for improvement.

In 1993 General Assembly established a post of High Commissioner for Human Rights. The High Commissioner carries out the "good offices" function in the field of human rights on behalf of the Secretary-General and is therefore now the United Nations official with principal responsibility for human rights activities. He is responsible for promoting and protecting human rights for all and maintains a continuing dialogue with Member States.

**ETHNIC CONFLICTS**

Throughout history, ethnic conflicts have long been a component of international politics. Today, ethnic wars continue to be the most common form of armed conflicts around the world. In the recent past for example, there have been numerous instances of
Ethnic conflict including ethnic war in Somalia, Kurdish struggle for autonomy in Iraq, Iran and Turkey, guerilla wars in El Salvador and Nicaragua, insurrection in Chechnya, and the conflict between Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda to name a few. However, it is apparent that certain places and states are more prone to ethnic conflicts, while others experience essentially none. Ethnic conflict is defined as any episode of sustained violent conflict in which national, ethnic, and religious or other communal minorities challenge governments to seek major changes in their status. Ethnic conflicts around the world devastate the lives of millions of people, destabilize national governments and undermine the prospects of sustainable development and successful transitions to democracy in entire regions. The threats to global peace and stability that ethnic conflicts in today’s globalising world pose often prompt the international community to engage in difficult and controversial peace-making and peace-keeping operations with uncertain costs and outcomes. Generally speaking, in ethnic conflicts, the goals of at least one conflict party are defined in ethnic terms. Thus, ethnic conflicts are a form of group conflict in which at least one of the parties involved interprets the conflict, its causes, and potential remedies along an actually existing or perceived discriminating ethnic divide.

Ethnically diverse societies carry various degrees of conflict potential. Ethnic emotions, rooted in historical memories of grievances, are at the core of conflict potential. Ethnicity, as Donald Horowitz argues, “embodies an element of emotional intensity that can be readily aroused when the group’s interests are thought to be at stake.” A sudden, major structural change (such as the collapse of communism in Bosnia and decolonization in Rwanda and Sri Lanka) upsets previous political and institutional arrangements. When these institutional mechanisms are no longer in place, countries face a period of political and economic transition “in which the old no longer works while the new will not yet function and the social costs grow.” This creates a context of instability and uncertainty about the political, social, and economic future of the communities. Such a situation facilitates a manifestation of emotional antagonisms among ethnic groups. Political entrepreneurs, in their quest for power, mobilize ethnic constituencies by promoting inter-ethnic animosities using the rhetorical weapons of blame, fear, and hate. This results in an inter-ethnic competition over resources and rights, which is accompanied by a reconstruction of social categories of “inclusion” and “exclusion,” ethnification and ethnic intolerance.

GLOBALIZATION

Globalization is an umbrella term for a complex series of economic, social, technological and political changes that have been identified since the 1980s. These changes and processes are seen as increasing interdependence and interaction between people and companies in disparate locations. It is a process of interaction and integration among the people, companies, and governments of different nations, a process driven by international trade and investment and aided by information technology. This process has effects on the environment, on culture, on political systems, on economic development and prosperity, and on human physical well-being in societies around the world.
Globalization is also viewed as the demise of the nation–state that permits the full integration of national economies to an international economy and different political systems to a world committee. Positively it includes the realization of a world government where everybody is a global citizen. A typical definition of globalization can be taken from the IMF (International Monetary Fund) which defines “Globalization as the growing economic interdependence of countries worldwide through increasing volume and variety of cross border transaction in goods and services, free international capital flows, and more rapid and widespread diffusion of technology”. In the Consequences of Modernity Anthony Giddens used the following definition:“Globalization can be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.”

As a system, globalization is the total control of the world by powerful supranational economic interests through a global deregulated market. It views, market as the mechanism by which transnational corporations exert and justify their influence. Globalization is also a process, a series of actions carried out in order to achieve a particular result. At the centre of the system there still remains insufficiently integrated sectors, such as agriculture, services in general and life itself. Globalization is also a discourse. In this sense it is an ideology. Its role is to as the only one that is legitimate, respectable and possible.

Globalization is a multidimensional process with, four primary dimensions. They are:

1. **The Economic dimension:** This central dimension of globalization refers primarily to the increase in international trade and the success of the free market economy. Recent economic policies have effectively created a world market where workers, consumers, and companies have the potential to enter into economic relationships with other workers, consumers and companies anywhere in the world. This is often known as economic globalization. It refers to increasing economic interdependence of national economies across the world through a rapid increase in cross-border movement of goods, service, technology and capital. Whereas globalization is centered on the diminution of international trade regulations as well as tariffs, taxes, and other impediments that suppresses global trade, economic globalization is the process of increasing economic integration between countries, leading to the emergence of a global marketplace or a single world market. Increased role of international organizations such as WTO, IMF that deal with international transactions and increase of economic practices like outsourcing, development of global financial systems, growth in the world economy are also features of economic globalization. Private capital flows to developing countries soared during the 1990s, replacing "aid" or development assistance which fell significantly after the early1980s. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) became the most important component in this category.

2. **The Technological Dimension:** The technological dimension of globalization refers primarily to the advancements of (a) New Information and Communication Technologies which have fueled the communication and information revolution of recent years; and (b) new production technologies, which have produced efficiencies in
production. The technological dynamics of globalization includes everything from the internet and mobile phones, to improved logistics systems. Free flow of information and dissemination of knowledge and increased global communication using such technologies like, internet, communication facilities, etc. also happens through the process of globalization. Information and technology exchange is an integral aspect of globalization.

3. The Political Dimension; The political dimension refers primarily to the decline of the sovereign state, which is due in part to the rise of multinational corporations, but also due to globalization's ties with neo-liberals. Neoliberalism essentially calls for a less interventionist state in both economic and social arenas, and its adherents, have proposed and imposed: (a) deregulation and free markets, with less power for the sovereign state to set economic policies, (b) decentralization of government, shifting power from the sovereign to the more local, and (c) reduction of the role of the state by increasing the role of the private sector in most areas of economic and social life.

4. The Cultural Dimension; The increasing global interconnectedness has helped to produce a kind of homogenous mass culture. The increased migration and movement of people have led to the mixing of many different cultures and societies, helping to produce a new multiculturalism. But critics point it as westernization. In the period between 1965–90, the proportion of the labor forces migrating approximately doubled. The flow of migrants to advanced economic countries was claimed to provide a means through which global wages converge. The cultural dimension of globalization also deals with gender issues, questions of identity, and the social construction of reality, as well as the production and consumption of media.

Impact of Globalization

Globalization is the source of much debate and controversy. The supporters of globalization see it as an economic savior for the world’s poor and as helping to improve the quality of life. On the other hand, the opponents consider it to be oppressing the developing world, destroying local culture and contributing to global warming. There is a hot debate on the issue between two prominent schools of globalization– “Constraints” and “the Skeptics”. The constraints school, often referred to as “transformationalists” observe that globalization is real, it has changed the nature and scope of state, but not displaced it. Globalization is seen to be intrinsically constraining, because openness involves the fall of national barriers to trade, investment and financial flows, the multinationalisation of production and growth of global financial markets. They also point out conformity with inter-governmental agreements requiring that governments should open their markets to foreign trade and financial institutions and eliminate certain subsidies to industry. The Skeptics question the very existence of strong globalization. They often acknowledge important changes in the structure of international political economy. As August Durnamo says, “Globalization has widened the gap between the have’s and havenot’s”.

Impact on National Sovereignty: Economic interdependence poses a challenge to the external dimension of sovereignty. Responding to the challenge, governments largely followed the principles of liberal economic internationalism, endorsing the incremental reduction of their external economic sovereignty by lowering tariff barriers and capital
controls. The reductions were structured around a set of international norms and standards, including in most instances the principle of reciprocity, embedded in international regimes such as the GATT, the IMF, and the OECD that formalized state adherence and assured their compliance. The concept of external sovereignty loses much of its significance when examining the implications of globalization. Global corporate networks are posing challenges to a state's internal sovereignty, by altering the spatial relationship between private and public sectors. The organizational logic of globalization induces corporations to seek the fusion of formerly segmented national markets into a single whole that subsumes multiple political geographies. As a result, governments no longer have a monopoly of the legitimate power over their territory, undermining the operability of internal sovereignty. Markets, although initially relying for their creation on political power, do not depend on the presence of boundaries. The spatial symmetry between the ‘public’ and the ‘private’ upon which internal sovereignty depends is disappearing. Governments, continually bound by territoriality, cannot project their power over the total space within which production and consumption organize themselves. Globalization thus integrates along the economic dimension and simultaneously fragments along the political. The fact that political fragmentation threatens only the operational aspects of internal sovereignty in no way minimizes the challenge.

The responses of nation-states to the pressures of globalization fall into two broad categories. First, some governments adopt essentially interventionist strategies that reemphasize the territorial nature of state jurisdiction, in the hope of regaining control over the economic and social environment. Alternatively, governments may simply rely on existing structures and processes of international cooperation, including the use of international law, as practiced when managing external sovereignty. Those who consider globalization a threat may take measures of defensive intervention, such as the reinstatement of tariffs, non-tariff barriers, and capital controls, or they may force companies to reorganize along national lines. If economic nationalism fails to arouse broad popular support, its political counterpart -- territorial secession and partition -- may do so. Alternatively, governments may pursue an offensive strategy of predatory competition, subsidizing national champions and encouraging competitive deregulation. Such states may become ‘global competitors’, seeking to entice corporations to operate within their own territory. The impact of globalization on states is felt not only in the challenge it poses to their overall or issue specific authority but also in its consequences for the territorialization of sovereignty at all. For example the world wide explosion of environmental issues like pollution and global warming does not respect international boundaries. Many people hold citizenship in multiple states. Knowledge and innovation networks are no longer honor national boundaries but are within firms and between universities that are no longer exclusively networked on a national basis. It is increasingly difficult to establish state origin for a larger number of commodities in world trade as transnational corporations coordinate their production activities across multiple locations in different countries. A large number of public and private organizations, particularly NGOs intervene, mediate and engage in the provision of public goods across state boundaries.

Economic insecurity, polluted environments, brooding conflicts all confound the capacity even of the most powerful state. Not only do states to cope with the forces of globalization, they cannot even resolve many of their own troubles at home. Huge transnational corporations, nongovernmental organizations, intergovernmental
School of Distance Education

organizations, global media and multitudes of others, all lay claim to authority that states
once called their own. No state can by itself protect its people from conflict, climate change,
drug trade or the upheavals caused by financial crisis. They demand cooperative solutions-
states collaborating with each other and with institutions, NGOs, business and others.

. The two ideologies associated with globalization; privatization and liberalization
also pose threat to national sovereignty and integrity. Privatization is the incidence or
process of transferring ownership of a business, enterprise, agency, public service or
property from the public sector to the private sector or to private non-profit organizations.
The protagonist of privatization argues that it will bring efficiency and economy in all fields
that was absent in government institution and administration. Now the privatization
experiments can be seen in all fields like, education, health transport, administration,
services etc. On the contrary the antagonists of globalization argue that privatization in fact
reduces the role of government. The state retreats from all vital functions that it performed
earlier. It stops state-owned public sector units. The role of the state is like a facilitator and
not an active player in the economic activates. The policies of the government in giving
license to the firms, and industries were renewed and became more liberal under the policy
of liberalization. The regular state rules and restrictions will not apply to them. Many laws
were amended in order to make the FDI easier. Thus liberalization is a process of removing
government-imposed restrictions on movements between countries in order to create an,
‘open’, ‘borderless’ world economy which will eventually decrease the state power.

MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

Any company is referred to as a multinational company or corporation when that
company manages its operation or production or service delivery from more than a single
country. It can also be referred to as an international corporation. They play an important
role in globalization. As defined by International Labor Organization, a M. N. C. is one,
which has its operational headquarters based in one country with several other operating
branches in different other countries. The country where the headquarter is located is called
the home country whereas, the other countries with operational branches are called the host
countries. Apart from playing an important role in globalization and international relations,
these multinational companies even have notable influence in a country's economy as well
as the world economy. The budget of some of the M. N. C.s are so high that at times they
even exceed the G. D. P. (Gross Domestic Product) of a nation. Corporations may influence
national economies through foreign direct investment. Foreign direct investment is direct
investment into one country by a company in production located in another country either
by buying a company in the country or by expanding operations of an existing business in
the country. A corporation may choose to locate in a special economic zone, which is a
geographical region that has economic and other laws that are more free-market oriented
than a country's typical or national laws.

Multinational corporations are important factors in the processes of globalization.
National and local governments often compete against one another to attract MNC
facilities, with the expectation of increased tax revenue, employment, and economic
activity. To compete, political entities may offer MNCs incentives such as tax breaks,
pledges of governmental assistance or subsidized infrastructure, or lax environmental and
labor regulations. MNCs play an important role in developing the economies of developing
countries like investing in these countries. They provide wider employment avenues in the
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host countries. The natives in the states were also given goods at quality and competitive rates. However there are many critics against the operation of MNCs, in countries with comparatively low labor costs and weak environmental and social protection, multinationals actually bring about a 'race to the top.' While multinationals will certainly see a low tax burden or low labor costs as an element of comparative advantage, MNCs deliberately avail themselves of lax environmental regulations. As for labor costs, while MNCs clearly pay workers in developing countries far below levels in countries where labor productivity is high. Anti-corporate advocates criticize multinational corporations for entering countries that have low human rights or environmental standards. Multinationals give rise to huge merged conglomerations that reduce competition and free enterprise, raise capital in host countries but export the profits, exploit countries for their natural resources, limit workers' wages, erode traditional cultures, and challenge national sovereignty.

TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS

A Transnational Corporation (TNC) differs from a traditional MNC in that it does not identify itself with one national home. Whilst traditional MNCs are national companies with foreign subsidiaries, TNCs spread out their operations in many countries sustaining high levels of local responsiveness. An example of a TNC is Nestlé who employ senior executives from many countries and try to make decisions from a global perspective rather than from one centralised headquarters. The role of TNC’s has expanded in recent decades. Their number grew from 7000 in 1970 to over 82000 in 2009. In 2009 the number of TNC foreign affiliates touched the 8,00,000 figure. They employ more than 90 million people. It is estimated that 100 largest TNC’s alone produced a quarter of gross global products.

TNC’s seek to minimize national impediments to trade or investments and prevent politics from interrupting the smooth transactions of business. Their goals are profits sales growth security and autonomy. Neoliberals consider TNC’s as wealth creators and sources of economic growth. However critics argues that they are big engines of exploitation. They create unhealthy consumerism for the purpose of meeting sales targets. Another issue is the diminishing environmental commitments and absence of sustainable policies. TNCs are also accused of gross human right violations. It may be in terms of child labour, wage structures, safety measurements and labour standards. It is in this context in 2003 the UNESCO adopted a set of norms with regard to the responsibilities of TNCs.