



**THE TAMIL NADU  
Dr. AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY**

(State University Established by Act No. 43 of 1997)

M.G.R. Salai, Perungudi, Chennai - 600 113.



**POLITICAL SCIENCE - III**  
**FOR**  
**B.A.LL.B. (HONS)**  
**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**  
**STUDY MATERIAL**

Edited by

**Mr. P. Kannan**

Assistant Professor

The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University

&

**Dr. K. Senthilvel**

Guest Lecturer

School of Excellence in Law

**THE TAMIL NADU Dr. AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY**  
**CHENNAI**

## PREFACE

We are all part of international relations because of our identities, religion and cultural backgrounds, places where we live and choices that we make. Even if we are not interested in international relations, international relations are interested in us. Modern international relations give us deep cultural understanding that is a foundation for interaction with cultures with different values and beliefs. And we, as well as countries, need to communicate to survive. All nations depend on the trade and exchanges with others can be beneficial in many ways.

Naturally, foreign relations are based on this international communication. No or poor communication between countries has proven to lead to terrible consequences in the past. For example, World War I was partially caused by bad relations between Germany, England and France at that time. Better international communication could have prevented one of the most destructive wars that human kind has faced so far. At the same time, today's world is rapidly changing. As a new countries becoming more powerful and significant on the international stage, the developing world continues to grow. Center of gravity has shifted in international affairs, moving towards Pacific which itself defines new roles for almost all major actors. The global scene is more fluid than ever before in human history. All these changes are starting to have profound impact on foreign relations in the decades to come. That's what makes international relations so inspiring and intriguing, not to mention important nowadays.

The field of international relations is becoming more and more relevant in society today. Effective communication between countries is a key for making beneficial relationships and ensuring a safer world as a result. In short, international relations are all about power and weakness, war and peace, conflicts and cooperation and put simply, understanding of these behavior patterns is the only way to change it.

This made easy book of International Relations for the students exclusively pursuing B.A.LL.B at School of Excellence in Law in our university. Every care has been taken to avoid the difficult terms and expression. It has, therefore, been written in lucid, clear and thoughtful manner for the comprehension of all students. It is hoped that the book will meet the needs of the students of the subject and the aim with which it has been presented.

I wish you all the best for your successful career.

**P. Kannan**

Assistant Professor

The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

UNITS	TITLE	PAGE No.
UNIT-I	INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	1
UNIT-II	NATIONAL POWER	15
UNIT-III	BALANCE OF POWER	33
UNIT-IV	THE ROLE OF WAR IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS	42
UNIT-V	GLOBALIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	65

# UNIT – I

## INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The term International Relations (IR) may be used both for a 'condition' and a 'discipline'. Quincy Wright, for example, makes such a distinction. The official relations between sovereign countries are described as international relations, though according to him, "..... the word interstate would have been more accurate because in political science the state came to be the terms applied to such societies. Viewed thus, international relations as 'condition' refers to the facts of international life, that is to say, the actual conduct of relations among nations through diplomacy based on foreign policy. It also includes actual areas of cooperation, conflict and war. According to Wright, IR should tell the "truth about the subject" i.e., how such relations are conducted and as a discipline IR should treat them in a systematic and scientific manner.

In other words, IR should focus on the study of all relations-political, diplomatic trade, ,academic among sovereign states which constitute the subject matter on international relations. The scope of IR should include study of "varied types of groups-nations, states, governments, peoples, regions, alliances, confederations, international organisations, even industrial organisations, cultural organisations, religious organisation" etc. which are involved in the conduct of these relations.

While Quincy Wright distinguished between international relations as a 'condition' and a 'discipline', there are other scholars like Palmer and Perkins who doubted its status as a discipline. They argued that History and Political Science are the disciplines from which international relations has emerged. Writing about 40 years ago. Palmer and Perkins had opined : "Although international relations has emerged from its earlier status as a poor relation of political science, and history, it is still far from being a well-organised discipline. "

One of the earlier scholars of international relations, Professor Alfred Zimmern had written before the Second World War that : "International Relations . . . . is clearly not a subject in the ordinary sense of the word. It does not provide a single coherent body of teaching material . . . . It is not a single subject but a bundle of subjects . . . . of law, economics, political science, geography, and so on . . . . " International Relations, according to Palmer and Perkins, was too subjective in character and content. In its early stages even E.H. Carr had described it as "markedly and frankly utopian." But the failure of the League of Nations and its collective security system led Carr to remark that it had become possible to embark on serious and critical analytical thought about international problems." This has been vigorously pursued by a number of scholars after the Second World War. Today, it will not be proper to describe International Relations as 'Utopian or deny' it the status of an independent subject of study. National interest is an important concern of every state. Planners and makers of foreign policy - cannot ignore correct perception of their country's national interests. which must be protected at all costs. Hartman defines International Relations as a field of study which focuses upon the "processes by which states adjust their national interest to those of other states." Since national interests of different states are often in conflict, Morgenthau concludes that international politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power. Therefore, power is the means through which nations promote their national interest.

### **International Relations and International Politics**

The first Chair in International Relations was established at the University of Wales (U.K) in 1919. The first two occupants of the chair were eminent historians, Professors Alfred Zimmern and C.K. Webster. At that time, International Relations as a subject was little more than diplomatic history. During the next seven decades this subject has changed in nature and content. Today the analytical study of politics has replaced descriptive diplomatic history. The term International politics is now used for the new discipline that has been emerging since the second world war. It is more scientific, yet narrow, as compared to International Relations.

The two terms are even now sometimes used as synonyms. But, they have two distinct areas, or content, of study. Hans Morgenthau believes that “the core of international relations is international politics”, but a clear distinction between the two is to be made. International Relations, according to him, is much wider in scope than International Politics. Whereas politics among nations is, as Morgenthau says, struggle for power, international relations includes political, economic and cultural relations. Harold and Margaret Sprout opine that international relations include all human behaviour on one side of a national boundary affecting the human behaviour on the other side of the boundary. International politics, on the other hand, deals with conflicts and cooperation among nations essentially at political level. As Padelford and Lincoln define it, international politics is the interaction of state policies within the changing pattern of power relationship. Palmer and Perkins express similar views when they say that international politics is essentially concerned with the state system.

Since international relations includes all types of relationships between sovereign states, it is wider, and international politics is narrower in scope. As students of IR, we shall indeed examine political conflicts and cooperation among states. But, we shall also study other aspect of relations among nations as well including economic inter-action and role of the non-state actor.

### **CHANGING NATURE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

The context and nature of IR have undergone major changes after the Second World War. Traditionally, world politics was centered around Europe and relations among nations were largely conducted by officials of foreign offices in secrecy. The common man was hardly ever involved, and treaties were often kept secret. Today public opinion has begun to play an important role in the decision-making process in foreign offices, thus, changing completely the nature of international relations. Ambassadors, once briefed by their governments, were largely free to conduct relations according to the ground realities of the countries of their posting. Today, not only have nuclear weapons changed the nature of war and replaced erstwhile the balance of power by the balance of terror, but also the nature of diplomacy changed as well. We live in the jet age where the heads of state and government and their foreign ministers travel across the globe and personally establish contacts and conduct international relations. Before the First World War a traveler from India to Britain spent about 20 days in the sea voyage. Today, it takes less than 9 hours for a jet aircraft to fly from Delhi to London, telephones, fax machines, teleprinters and other electronic devices have brought all government leaders hi direct contact. Hotline communications between Washington and Moscow, for example, keeps the top world leaders in constant touch. This has reduced the freedom of ambassadors who receive daily instructions from their governments.

Decolonization has resulted in the emergence of a large number of sovereign states. The former colonies of the European Powers, including India, have become important actors on the stage of international relation. They were once silent spectators. Today, they participate in the conduct of world politics. The disintegration of the Soviet Union has created 15 members of the United Nations, instead of the previous three. Some of the very small countries like Nauru may have no power but they also have, an equal voice in the General Assembly. Four very small countries viz. Liechtenstein, San Marino, Monaco and Andorra were admitted to the U.N. during 1990-93. The total number of U.N. members has gone up from 51 in 1945 to 185 in 1997. Thus, international relations are now conducted by such a large number of new nation- states. Besides, many non-state actors such as multinational corporations and transnational bodies like terrorist groups have been influencing international relations in a big way. With the collapse of the Soviet Union as a Super Power, the United States has emerged as the supreme monolithic power and can now dominate the international scene almost without any challenge. The Non-Alignment Movement ((NAM) still exists but with the dismemberment of one of its founders (i.e. : Yugoslavia) and the disappearance of rival power blocs, the role of the ‘Third World’ has changed along with that of NAM.

## IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS?

International Relations (IR), is closely related with several disciplines. These include History, Political Science, Law, Economics, and Geography. What is the utility of the study of IR as a separate subject? You know that no country in the World can live in isolation. Even when means of transportation and communication were primitive or much less developed than today, sovereign states did interact with each other. They cooperated at times, and had frequent conflicts which often led to wars. Relations among those states were generally studied by Historians and Political Scientists. Diplomatic History was usually studied for understanding relations among sovereign states.

During the second half of the twentieth century, revolution in the means of travel and communication has not only changed the nature of international relations, but made its study essential for every enlightened person.

We are today living in an interdependent state - system. It is essential for all of us to have a clear idea of what is happening in the world. Political events are important, but even economic developments, trade, commerce and activities of actors like multinational corporations are no less significant. We live in an age of growing international cooperation. Therefore, not only do the activities of the United Nations and its numerous agencies affect all the nations and their peoples, but regional organisations like the European Union, South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC), Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the 'Organisation of African Unity (OAU) also play important roles in our lives. International terrorism has been a concern for the humankind and economic institutions like the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) affect international relations. The study of International Relations has therefore become highly useful and enlightening for students and others alike.

## SCOPE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Beginning with the study of law and diplomatic history, the scope of international relations has steadily expanded. With growing complexity of contacts between nations, the study of international organizations and institutions attracted the attention of scholars. The outbreak of the Second World War gave a strong stimulus to area studies and strategic aspect of foreign policy. This led to efforts to understand better the dynamics of national liberation struggles and anti-colonial movements. The foundation of the United Nations during the war encouraged thinking about post-war restructuring of the relations among nations. The study of cooperation became important even as the study of conflict remained central. The immediate aftermath was marked by a constructive outlook. This is reflected in titles of books like *Swords and Ploughshares* written by this Claude. New topics like ideology and disarmament assumed unprecedented importance in the era of cold war. So did the system of alliances and regionalism. Contemporary international relations embrace the whole gamut of diplomatic history, international politics, international organisation, international law and area studies. Writing about the contents of international relations, a few decades back, Palmer Perkins had said that the then international relations was a study of "the world community in transition." This conclusion is largely true even today. The transition has not reached a terminal point. While the underlying factors of international relations have not changed, the international environment has changed and is still changing. The state system is undergoing modifications; a technological revolution has taken place in a very big way; new states of Asia and Africa are playing increasingly important roles. India, in particular, is in a position to assert and take a rigid stand, as in 1996 on the question of signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). There is also a "revolution of rising expectations." Thus, as Palmer and Perkins wrote, "old and new elements must be interwoven" in the contemporary international relations. "The focus is still the nation - state system and inter-state relations; but the actions and interactions of many organisations and groups have also to be considered."

The scope of international relations at the end of the twentieth century has become very vast indeed. The world has virtually become a “global village”, as interdependence of states has increased manifold. Economic relations between states, the role of international institutions like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organisation today influences economic activity all over the world. The United Nations and its various agencies are engaged in numerous socio-economic and political activities. International terrorism is a cause of serious concern for the human existence. Multinational Corporations (MNCs), who are giant companies operating the world over, are important non-state actors of international relations. Thus, the scope of international relations has become vast, and, besides international politics, it embraces various other inter - State activities as well.

## **HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

The history of international relations can be traced back to thousands of years ago; Barry Buzan and Richard Little, for example, consider the interaction of ancient Sumerian city-states, starting in 3,500 BC, as the first fully-fledged international system.

The history of international relations based on sovereign states is often traced back to the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, a stepping stone in the development of the modern state system. Prior to this the European medieval organization of political authority was based on a vaguely hierarchical religious order. Contrary to popular belief, Westphalia still embodied layered systems of sovereignty, especially within the Holy Roman Empire. More than the Peace of Westphalia, the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713 is thought to reflect an emerging norm that sovereigns had no internal equals within a defined territory and no external superiors as the ultimate authority within the territory's sovereign borders.

The centuries of roughly 1500 to 1789 saw the rise of the independent, sovereign states, the institutionalization of diplomacy and armies. The French Revolution added to this the new idea that not princes or an oligarchy, but the citizenry of a state, defined as the nation, should be defined as sovereign. Such a state in which the nation is sovereign would thence be termed a nation-state (as opposed to a monarchy or a religious state). The term republic increasingly became its synonym. An alternative model of the nation-state was developed in reaction to the French republican concept by the Germans and others, who instead of giving the citizenry sovereignty, kept the princes and nobility, but defined nation-statehood in ethnic-linguistic terms, establishing the rarely if ever fulfilled ideal that all people speaking one language should belong to one state only. The same claim to sovereignty was made for both forms of nation-state. (It is worth noting that in Europe today, few states conform to either definition of nation-state: many continue to have royal sovereigns, and hardly any are ethnically homogeneous.)

The particular European system supposing the sovereign equality of states was exported to the Americas, Africa, and Asia via colonialism and the “standards of civilization”. The contemporary international system was finally established through decolonization during the Cold War. However, this is somewhat oversimplified. While the nation-state system is considered “modern”, many states have not incorporated the system and are termed “pre-modern”.

Further, a handful of states have moved beyond insistence on full sovereignty, and can be considered “post-modern”. The ability of contemporary IR discourse to explain the relations of these different types of states is disputed. “Levels of analysis” is a way of looking at the international system, which includes the individual level, the domestic state as a unit, the international level of transnational and intergovernmental affairs, and the global level.

What is explicitly recognized as international relations theory was not developed until after World War I, and is dealt with in more detail below. IR theory, however, has a long tradition of drawing on the work of other social sciences. The use of capitalizations of the “I” and “R” in international relations aims to distinguish

the academic discipline of international relations from the phenomena of international relations. Many cite Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* (6th century BC), Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War* (5th century BC), Chanakya's *Arthashastra* (4th century BC), as the inspiration for realist theory, with Hobbes' *Leviathan* and Machiavelli's *The Prince* providing further elaboration.

Similarly, liberalism draws upon the work of Kant and Rousseau, with the work of the former often being cited as the first elaboration of democratic peace theory.[6] Though contemporary human rights is considerably different from the type of rights envisioned under natural law, Francisco de Vitoria, Hugo Grotius and John Locke offered the first accounts of universal entitlement to certain rights on the basis of common humanity. In the 20th century, in addition to contemporary theories of liberal internationalism, Marxism has been a foundation of international relations.

### Study of international relations

International relations as a distinct field of study began in Britain. IR emerged as a formal academic discipline in 1919 with the founding of the first IR professorship: the Woodrow Wilson Chair at Aberystwyth, University of Wales (now Aberystwyth University),[7] endowed by David Davies. Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service is the oldest international relations faculty in the United States, founded in 1919. In the early 1920s, the London School of Economics' department of international relations was founded at the behest of Nobel Peace Prize winner Philip Noel-Baker: this was the first institute to offer a wide range of degrees in the field. This was rapidly followed by establishment of IR at universities in the US and in Geneva, Switzerland. The creation of the posts of Montague Burton Professor of International Relations at LSE and at Oxford gave further impetus to the academic study of international relations. Furthermore, the International History department at LSE developed a focus on the history of IR in the early modern, colonial and Cold War periods.

The first university entirely dedicated to the study of IR was the Graduate Institute of International Studies (now the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies), which was founded in 1927 to form diplomats associated to the League of Nations. The Committee on International Relations at the University of Chicago was the first to offer a graduate degree, in 1928. In 1965, Glendon College and the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs were the first institutions in Canada to offer an undergraduate and a graduate program in international studies and affairs, respectively. In 2012, Ramon Llull University initiated the first International Relations degree in Barcelona, fully in English.

## THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

### Normative theory

In the academic discipline of international relations, Smith, Baylis & Owens (2008) make the case that the normative position or normative theory is to make the world a better place, and that this theoretical worldview aims to do so by being aware of implicit assumptions and explicit assumptions that constitute a non-normative position and align or position the normative towards the loci of other key socio-political theories such as political liberalism, Marxism, political constructivism, political realism, political idealism and political globalization

### Epistemology and IR theory

IR theories can be roughly divided into one of two epistemological camps: "positivist" and "post-positivist". Positivist theories aim to replicate the methods of the natural sciences by analysing the impact of material forces. They typically focus on features of international relations such as state interactions, size of military forces, balance of powers etc. Post-positivist epistemology rejects the idea that the social world can be studied in an objective and value-free way. It rejects the central ideas of neo-realism/liberalism, such as



rational choice theory, on the grounds that the scientific method cannot be applied to the social world and that a “science” of IR is impossible.

A key difference between the two positions is that while positivist theories, such as neo-realism, offer causal explanations (such as why and how power is exercised), post-positivist theories focus instead on constitutive questions, for instance what is meant by “power”; what makes it up, how it is experienced and how it is reproduced. Often, post-positivist theories explicitly promote a normative approach to IR, by considering ethics. This is something which has often been ignored under “traditional” IR as positivist theories make a distinction between “facts” and normative judgments, or “values”.

During the late 1980s and the 1990s, debate between positivists and post-positivists became the dominant debate and has been described as constituting the Third “Great Debate” (Lapid 1989).

## **POSITIVIST THEORIES**

### **REALISM**

Realism focuses on state security and power above all else. Early realists such as E. H. Carr and Hans Morgenthau argued that states are self-interested, power-seeking rational actors, who seek to maximize their security and chances of survival. Cooperation between states is a way to maximize each individual state’s security (as opposed to more idealistic reasons). Similarly, any act of war must be based on self-interest, rather than on idealism. Many realists saw World War II as the vindication of their theory.

Realists argue that the need for survival requires state leaders to distance themselves from traditional morality. Realism taught American leaders to focus on interests rather than on ideology, to seek peace through strength, and to recognise that great powers can coexist even if they have antithetical values and beliefs.

Thucydides, the author of Peloponnesian War is considered to be the founding father of the realist school of political philosophy. Amongst others, philosophers like Machiavelli, Hobbes and Rousseau are considered to have contributed to the Realist philosophy. However, while their work may support realist doctrine, it is not likely that they would have classified themselves as realists in this sense. Political realism believes that politics, like society, is governed by objective laws with roots in human nature. To improve society, it is first necessary to understand the laws by which society lives. The operation of these laws being impervious to our preferences, persons will challenge them only at the risk of failure. Realism, believing as it does in the objectivity of the laws of politics, must also believe in the possibility of developing a rational theory that reflects, however imperfectly and one-sidedly, these objective laws. It believes also, then, in the possibility of distinguishing in politics between truth and opinion—between what is true objectively and rationally, supported by evidence and illuminated by reason, and what is only a subjective judgment, divorced from the facts as they are and informed by prejudice and wishful thinking.

Placing realism under positivism is far from unproblematic however. E. H. Carr’s “What is History” was a deliberate critique of positivism, and Hans Morgenthau’s aim in “Scientific Man vs Power Politics” was to demolish any conception that international politics/power politics can be studied scientifically.

### **LIBERALISM**

According to liberalism, individuals are basically good and capable of meaningful cooperation to promote positive change. Liberalism views states, nongovernmental organizations, and intergovernmental organizations as key actors in the international system. States have many interests and are not necessarily unitary and autonomous, although they are sovereign. Liberal theory stresses interdependence among states, multinational corporations, and international institutions. Theorists such as Hedley Bull have postulated

an international society in which various actors communicate and recognize common rules, institutions, and interests. Liberals also view the international system as anarchic since there is no single overarching international authority and each individual state is left to act in its own self-interest. Liberalism is historically rooted in the liberal philosophical traditions associated with Adam Smith and Immanuel Kant that posit that human nature is basically good and that individual self-interest can be harnessed by society to promote aggregate social welfare. Individuals form groups and later, states; states are generally cooperative and tend to follow international norms.

Liberal international relations theory arose after World War I in response to the inability of states to control and limit war in their international relations. Early adherents include Woodrow Wilson and Norman Angell, who argued that states mutually gained from cooperation and that war was so destructive as to be essentially futile.

Liberalism was not recognized as a coherent theory as such until it was collectively and derisively termed idealism by E. H. Carr. A new version of "idealism" that focused on human rights as the basis of the legitimacy of international law was advanced by Hans K ochler.

## **NEOLIBERALISM**

Neoliberalism seeks to update liberalism by accepting the neorealist presumption that states are the key actors in international relations, but still maintains that non-state actors (NSAs) and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) matter. Proponents argue that states will cooperate irrespective of relative gains, and are thus concerned with absolute gains. This also means that nations are, in essence, free to make their own choices as to how they will go about conducting policy without any international organizations blocking a nation's right to sovereignty.

Neoliberalism also contains an economic theory that is based on the use of open and free markets with little, if any, government intervention to prevent monopolies and other conglomerates from forming. The growing interdependence throughout and after the Cold War through international institutions led to neoliberalism being defined as institutionalism, this new part of the theory being fronted by Robert Keohane and also Joseph Nye.

## **REGIME THEORY**

Regime theory is derived from the liberal tradition that argues that international institutions or regimes affect the behavior of states (or other international actors). It assumes that cooperation is possible in the anarchic system of states, indeed, regimes are by definition, instances of international cooperation.

While realism predicts that conflict should be the norm in international relations, regime theorists say that there is cooperation despite anarchy. Often they cite cooperation in trade, human rights and collective security among other issues. These instances of cooperation are regimes. The most commonly cited definition of regimes comes from Stephen Krasner, who defines regimes as "principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actor expectations converge in a given issue-area".

Not all approaches to regime theory, however, are liberal or neoliberal; some realist scholars like Joseph Grieco have developed hybrid theories which take a realist based approach to this fundamentally liberal theory. (Realists do not say cooperation never happens, just that it is not the norm; it is a difference of degree).

## POST-POSITIVIST/REFLECTIVIST THEORIES

### INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY THEORY (THE ENGLISH SCHOOL)

International society theory, also called the English School, focuses on the shared norms and values of states and how they regulate international relations. Examples of such norms include diplomacy, order, and international law. Unlike neo-realism, it is not necessarily positivist. Theorists have focused particularly on humanitarian intervention, and are subdivided between solidarists, who tend to advocate it more, and pluralists, who place greater value in order and sovereignty. Nicholas Wheeler is a prominent solidarist, while Hedley Bull and Robert H. Jackson are perhaps the best known pluralists.

### SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVISM

Social constructivism encompasses a broad range of theories that aim to address questions of ontology, such as the structure-and-agency debate, as well as questions of epistemology, such as the “material/ideational” debate that concerns the relative role of material forces versus ideas. Constructivism is not a theory of IR in the manner of neo-realism, but is instead a social theory which is used to better explain the actions taken by states and other major actors as well as the identities that guide these states and actors.

Constructivism in IR can be divided into what Ted Hopf (1998) calls “conventional” and “critical” constructivism. Common to all varieties of constructivism is an interest in the role that ideational forces play. The most famous constructivist scholar, Alexander Wendt, noted in a 1992 article in *International Organization*—and later in his 1999 book *Social Theory of International Politics*—that “anarchy is what states make of it”. By this he means that the anarchical structure that neo-realists claim governs state interaction is in fact a phenomenon that is socially constructed and reproduced by states.

For example, if the system is dominated by states that see anarchy as a life or death situation (what Wendt terms a “Hobbesian” anarchy) then the system will be characterised by warfare. If on the other hand anarchy is seen as restricted (a “Lockean” anarchy) then a more peaceful system will exist. Anarchy in this view is constituted by state interaction, rather than accepted as a natural and immutable feature of international life as viewed by neo-realist IR scholars.

### MARXISM

Marxist and Neo-Marxist theories of IR reject the realist/liberal view of state conflict or cooperation; instead focusing on the economic and material aspects. It makes the assumption that the economy trumps other concerns; allowing for the elevation of class as the focus of study. Marxists view the international system as an integrated capitalist system in pursuit of capital accumulation. Thus, colonialism brought in sources for raw materials and captive markets for exports, while decolonialization brought new opportunities in the form of dependence.

A prominent derivative of Marxian thought is critical international relations theory which is the application of “critical theory” to international relations. Early critical theorists were associated with the Frankfurt School which followed Marx’s concern with the conditions that allow for social change and the establishment of rational institutions. Their emphasis on the “critical” component of theory was derived significantly from their attempt to overcome the limits of positivism. Modern-day proponents such as Andrew Linklater, Robert W. Cox and Ken Booth focus on the need for human emancipation from the nation-state. Hence, it is “critical” of mainstream IR theories that tend to be both positivist and state-centric.

Further linked in with Marxist theories is dependency theory and the core-periphery model, which argue that developed countries, in their pursuit of power, appropriate developing states through international banking, security and trade agreements and unions on a formal level, and do so through the interaction of

political and financial advisors, missionaries, relief aid workers, and MNCs on the informal level, in order to integrate them into the capitalist system, strategically appropriating undervalued natural resources and labor hours and fostering economic and political dependence.

Marxist theories receive little attention in the United States, where no significant socialist party has flourished. It is more common in parts of Europe and is one of the more important theoretic contributions of Latin American academia to the study of global networks.

## **APPROACHES**

There are many approaches to the study of international relations. The traditional or classical approach treated History as the laboratory from which meaningful conclusions could be drawn. Two of the main schools of the traditional approach are Realism and Idealism. Whereas the Realism School considers the struggle for power as the central point of all international relations, the Idealism School believes in the inherent goodness of man. Realists like Morgenthau do not attach much importance to means, or morality. For them national interest is the aim that must be served with the help of power. The idealists, on the other hand, feel that the ideal of world peace is attainable with the help of reason, education and science. In recent years, Neo- Realism has appeared as another approach to the study of international relations.

## **TRADITIONAL APPROACHES : REALISM, IDEALISM AND NEO-REALISM**

The two most important variants of the traditional approach of international relations are Realism and Idealism. Taking inspiration from Kautilya and Machiavelli, the leading twentieth century realists George Kennan and Hans Morgenthau argued that the struggle for power is the central point of all international relations. Individuals believe that others are always trying to attack and destroy them, and therefore, they must be continuously ready to kill others in order to protect themselves. This basic; human instinct guides the States as well. Thus, the realists argue that rivalry and strife among the nations in some form or the other are always present. Just as self- interest guides the individual's behaviour, similarly national interest also guides the foreign policy of nation-states. Continued conflict is the reality of international relations and realists attribute this to the struggle for power. Thus, national interest, as defined in terms of power, is the only reality of international relations. The realists do not attach much significance to means, for them national interest is the end, and it must be promoted at all costs. Hans . Morgenthau's influential book "Politics among Nations" (1972) carried the torch of realism far and wide. For the realists, distribution of powers among states is all that is there to explain in IR. Given a particular distribution of power, the realists claim that, it is possible to explain both the characteristics of the system and the - behaviour of the individual states.

The idealists firmly believe that the essential goodness of human nature will eventually prevail and that a new world order would emerge which would be marked by the absence of war, inequality and tyranny. This new world order would be brought about by the use of reason, education and science. Idealism presents a picture of future international relations free from power politics, violence and immorality. Idealism argues that an international organization commanding respect of nation-states would pave the way for a world free of conflicts and war. Thus, the crucial point on which the realists and idealists sharply differ is the problem of power. St. Simon, Aldous Huxley, Mahatma Gandhi and Woodrow Wilson are among the prominent idealists. Morality is vital for them as they aim at international peace and cooperation.

An analysis of Realism and Idealism will show that both have their validity provided they give up their extremism. The approach that takes a middle position between "idealistic utopianism" and "cynical realism" is called Eclecticism. It has been described as a sort of synthesis of the 'pessimism of realism' and 'optimism of idealism'. Eclecticism tries to use the best in both realism and idealism. The former has been described by Quincy Wright as a representative of short-run national policies whereas idealism represents long-term policies of internationalism. Realists have been called 'Children of darkness' and idealists the 'children

of light'. Neibuhr regards the children of darkness as evil and wicked and the children of light as virtuous. But, on the basis of another criterion, he says, the realists are wise as they understand the power of self-will, and the idealists are foolish because they underestimate the risk of anarchy in the international community. Both have something to learn from this.

Neo-Realism, also known as 'Structural Realism' is one of the current approaches to the study of international relations. Waltz, Grieco, Keohane and Joseph Nye are among the prominent neo-realists. Neo-Realists believe that might is right in a system which is essentially Hobbesian (full of strife) in nature. The great powers are engaged in permanent rivalry. The structure has, more or less, remained one of anarchy though the prominent actors have been changing. The term 'structure' has been referred to "how the actors in a system stand in relation to each other." The present structure being anarchical (challenges to state domination are rampant), one finds powerful states are most interested in trying to prevent others from improving relative capabilities. Keohane and Nye add that with the increasing role of non-state actors, the structure has become even more complex and unpredictable. In short, neorealism believes that the nation-states still remain the most important actors in world politics: behaviour of the states can be explained rationally; states seek power and calculate their interests in terms of power. (All these they share with the scholars of realism). However, the neorealists add, the international system is characterized by anarchy and emerging 'multi-centric' activities emanating from sources other than state. This complexity is further compounded by international terrorism, religious war-fares, increasing incidence of civil wars and emerging competitive multinational corporations.

In the post-cold war years, international arena has assumed a new form. Nation-states are being threatened by divisive and secessionist movements. Many of the conflicts have assumed deadly proportions. According to John Stremlau "prevention has become a buzz word among diplomats seeking to stem anarchy in Africa, the Balkans, the new states of the former Soviet Union, and elsewhere." In 1992, for example, out of 30 conflicts across the world as many as 29 were military actions taking place inside states. One can refer to such examples to show that more military actions are being taken recourse to inside states rather than outside and among them. The ethnic conflict in erstwhile Yugoslavia (conflict between Serbs and Croats, and between Serbs and Bosnians), insurgency within Afghanistan, the conflict in Iraq regarding Kurds, chaotic conditions inside Somalia, the conflict in Sri Lanka, Mohajir Quami Movement (MQM) related conflict in Palustan and terrorist activities in northern Indian States of Jammu & Kashmir and Punjab, are some of the ongoing military or paramilitary actions within nation-states. In the post-cold war conflicts, 90 per cent of casualties have been of civilians, not of the soldiers. Thus, neo-realism stresses the struggle for power not only between states but also intra-state struggles in an 'anarchic' world.

It will not be out of place here to mention that at a socio-political level, domestic determination of foreign policy options was not an important consideration with the realists who preferred states to remain confined to diplomatic, military and strategic sources of power. (See the box below). The post-cold war realists believe that peace was made possible in the world during the cold war period (1945-89) owing to stable bipolarity, balance of terror and a belief that nuclear war could be suicidal. With the end of the cold war, the realists hope for lasting peace to result out of the rules of conduct (for international relations) to be enforced by the United States which has virtual monopoly of powers. Realism today recognises the role of the United Nations, International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organisation yet they are still considered to be subordinate to the wishes of the powerful states. The realists do not want proliferation of nuclear weapons so that monopoly of the American power is maintained in that sector. Thus, realists (and neo-realists) still believe in promotion of national interest as expressed through State power. Despite international organisations, regress and non-state actors, power continues to dominate international relations, the realists still maintain. It may be of interest to students to note that Realism and Neorealist approaches are mostly confined to, studies in USA and Europe. Both stress on state power systems and inter-state relations. An important difference between the two is, however, one of degree and focus.

Neorealism (which appeals more widely in USA and Europe) in IR differs from Realism by virtue of its lesser concern with the diplomatic, military and strategic sources which maintain or disturb the balance of power and more pre-occupation with the political and economic concerns which need to be addressed for a sustainable international system. Most of the neo-realists therefore have been students of international political economy. IR studies began focussing on the developing countries after neo-realistic approach came to vogue. They are more concerned with issues of dependence and development as against the state-centered approaches espousing the cause of "hegemonic stability" (that is to say, uneven distribution of power with one or a few states holding superior power to ensure stability in the world). As behaviouralists like Prof. James Rosenau often complained, concerned Third World students of IR often tend to be attracted to "dependency theory" (see below). This perspective posits that the Third World has been historically exploited by rich nations of the developed West.

## **MODERN/BEHAVIOURAL APPROACHES OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS**

Behavioural approaches to study of IR are often claimed by their western adherents to be scientific because they are based on quantitative calculations. They made us more aware of the complex nature of conflicts and provided many valuable insights into decision making. The ultimate objective of the behaviouralist scholars is to develop a general theory of international relations. The traditional approach was rooted largely in Political Science and drew heavily from Law, History and Philosophy. With the help of the behavioural approach, a discipline of international relations is at last beginning to emerge which is devoted to behavioural studies in IR. There are several theories which may be lumped together under scientific/behavioural approach. Some like Systems Theory are more comprehensive than others like Bargaining and Game Theories. We will in this section briefly deal with only two of these behavioural scientific theories viz., the System Theory and the Game Theory.

### **SYSTEM THEORY**

A system is defined as a set of elements interacting with each other. Another important feature of the system is that it has a boundary which separates it from the environment, the latter however, influences the system in its operations. Generally speaking, a system may be either natural (e.g. solar system), or mechanical (a car, a clock or a computer), or social (e.g. family). The social system itself may be related either to "society, or economy, or politics, or international systems."

The general concept of an international system, and of international systems, formed the basis of work for many 'major scholars, Karl W. Deutsch and Raymond Aron being among the most prominent. As Aron observed, there has never been an international system including the whole of the planet. But in the post-war period, "for the first time, humanity is living. (in) one and the same history, and there has emerged some kind of global system". It is greatly heterogeneous but not to an extent that scholars may fail to hold them together in a discipline. As a matter of fact, Stanley Hoffman's working definition of the discipline was sufficient. "An international system", according to Hoffman "is a pattern of relations between the basic units of world politics which is characterized by the scope of the objectives pursued by these units and of the tasks performed among them, as well as by the means used in order to achieve those goals and perform those tasks". (System and Process in International Politics, 1957).

Among others, Prof. Morton Kaplan is considered the most influential in the systems theorizing of IR. He presented a number of real and hypothetical models of global political organisation. His six well known models were (i) balance of power system, (ii) loose bipolar system, (iii) tight bipolar system, (iv) universal actor system, (v) hierarchical system, and (vi) Unit Veto system. The first two are historical realities; the remaining four are hypothetical models. Although Kaplan did not say that his six systems were likely to emerge in that order, yet it was expected that the Super Power being very powerful, non-aligned countries

were likely to lose their status and become parts of one or the other power blocs, leading to a tight bipolar world. With the collapse of the former Soviet Union in 1991, the erstwhile bipolarity phenomenon ended. While the United States emerged more powerful than other countries, many countries like Germany and Japan also merged as major economic powers. Thus, depending upon how one analyses the emerging global order, it may be characterized as a unipolar or a multipolar world. The present situation does not however fall strictly within any one of the six-models of Morton Kaplan which are described briefly below :

1. **The Balance of Power System:** This system prevailed in Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this system some powerful states seek to maintain equilibrium of power individually or in alliance. Usually there is a 'balancer' - a state which assists anyone who is likely to become weaker than others so that balance is not disturbed.
2. **The Loose Bipolar System:** This was the situation during the days of cold war politics. Despite bipolar division of the global power scene, some countries refused to align with either block. They hang loose in an otherwise stratified global order. Examples: Non-aligned countries (NAM).
3. **The Tight Bipolar System :** Think of a situation where the international actors like NAM countries are forced to align with either block, the result is - one of the tight bipolar system.
4. **The Universal Actor System :** In this system, an international organisation or actor commanding universal allegiance becomes the centre of power. Whether big or small, all states will accept the superiority of a universal actor like the United Nations. Thus, without giving up their sovereignty, nation-states will strengthen the United Nations and generally abide by its decisions. This may eventually pave the way for a world government.
5. **The Hierarchical International System :** In this system one country will become so powerful that all other states will be virtually dictated to by that one Supreme Power. This situation may be described as a 'Unipolar World Model'. The U.N. may still exist, but there will be no true non-aligned country and even the U.N. will not have enough power.
6. **The Unit Veto System :** Morton Kaplan's Unit Veto System in international context resembles the 'state of nature' as defined by Thomas Hobbes. Each state will be the enemy of every other state, because almost all the countries will possess nuclear weapons. Thus, all the international actors will be capable of using nuclear weapons against their enemies.

These six models were later supplemented by Kaplan himself by some other models. Meanwhile, other scholars have also suggested some other models. Thus, Coultombis and Wolfe endorse Kaplan's six models, but add three more. These three are a) multibloc (or interregional) model, b) the national-fragmentation (or multipolar) model, and c) the post-nuclear war model.

The multi-bloc model portrays a world divided into five to seven mutually exclusive spheres of influence. Each of these spheres would be controlled by one major power, thus giving rise to a multipolar world.

The National Fragmentation Model will be the outcome of political and territorial disintegration. Ethnic, tribal or racial separatist movements may cause many of the large states to disintegrate into small fragmented units. Examples : the former Soviet Union, former Yugoslavia and former Czechoslovakia which have split into several : sovereign states.

The Post-Nuclear War Model : is the world after a catastrophic nuclear war. If such a war takes place, its aftermath would be ghastly. In such a situation, only the most tyrannical regimes would be able to maintain orderly distribution of food, shelter and medicine. A new order will have to be found out to overcome such chaotic conditions.

## GAME THEORY

Game theory attempts to provide models for studying world politics, especially in highly competitive situations when outcomes of the actions are difficult to anticipate. This has led scholars to create the game theory for a more scientific study of the calculation of probabilities in an uncertain situation. Game theory was created almost in one shot with the publication of *Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour* (Princeton, 1944) by the mathematician John von Neumann and the economist Oskar Morgenstern. Karl Deutsch and Martin Shubik are among influential theorists who followed them. Though the economists were the first to adapt it to their purpose in recent years it has been applied to many other fields with suitable Modifications.

In its simplest version, the game theory is the model of a zero sum game which describes the situation of conflict/competition in which one party's total loss is exactly equal to the other adversary's total gain. This explains the name - the sum total of gain and loss is zero. For the study of IR, game theory model however is a multiparty non-zero-sum game. This is because as J.K. Zawodny reminds us, "we must recognize that some types of international conflicts today can be resolved only by situations in which neither side loses and in which sometimes both sides may win."

As you must have already understood, isolated, completely independent states, are not affected by what other states do. They however are affected and interact through mutual dependence for some benefits. States play games to have maximum gains out of such a situation of inter-dependence.

The two most important kinds of game that have been suggested are the "Chicken Game" and the game of "Prisoner's Dilemma". In the chicken game situation two car drivers are going in the middle of the road towards each other from the opposite sides. Unless one of them stops on the side and gives way to the other, there is a possibility of serious accident which may even result in the death of one or both the drivers Any one who gives, way to the other will suffer a loss of reputation but accident will be avoided. Nations often face such a situation. Generally, none wants to suffer loss of reputation. The underlying idea of chicken game is that inspite of not being able to know the intention of its opponent, a country's foreign policy - makers can adopt such a course as would ensure its own interest only if it does not mind the other country also benefiting from that course of action. A country standing on its prestige may suffer heavy losses.

The situation in prisoners dilemma is different. A nation, like a prisoner, often faces dilemma without having the slightest idea of its opponent's intentions. In this model two persons, charged with murder, are kept in two cells and they can neither see nor talk to each other. The prison-in-charge tells both of them separately that if one of them confesses to murder, and the other does not, the one who confesses will not only be set free but rewarded, and the other prisoner will be hanged. If none of them confesses, both will be freed but without reward. But if both of them confess, they both would be given serious punishment. The game suggests that everyone wants reward or advantage, but may land in serious situation as it does not know the mind of the other.

## INTEGRATION THEORY

The theory is associated with the names of Charles Kegley and Wittkopf. In an essay published in 1993, they rejected the realist view of human nature. They argue that human beings have diverse make-ups, and that human action is based on voluntary choice influenced by environment. The liberals reject the view that international relations are anarchic. They argue that the international system today is based on transnational interactions which create areas of interdependence. Societies and governance are being knit together by growing cultural homogeneity and economic and social interdependence. Various international agencies and regimes like the World Trade Organisation promote integration: The Liberals emphasize the growing role of non-State actors like NGOs, regional organisations etc, in promoting regional and global interdependence.



The liberals do not accept the view that the world has become unipolar. They feel that in the post-cold war years the world is moving in the direction of multi-polarity. At the same time there is increasing inter-state cooperation to reduce mistrust and tension in order to promote peace. Global interdependence has led to a growing concern among all governments about nuclear proliferation, global recession, ozone depletion, climatic changes and AIDS. These common concerns indicate: interdependence and need for the scholars to examine these problems in the context of integration. The liberals, therefore, insist on the study of these and other organisations. They believe that expanding the U.N. System promotes interdependence. To sum up : the liberal concern for interdependence is related to multipolarity in the post-cold war period. increasing role of U N. and other non- governmental and regional organisations, and consequent integration under the influence of western industrialized countries.

## **NATION STATE SYSTEM**

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. After the II. World War many states in Asia and Africa came into being which do not possess 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.

## **FEATURES OF THE STATE SYSTEM**

Certain features of the state system are essential conditions, without which the state system cannot exist.

These features have been described by Palmer and Perkins as corollaries. They are the concepts of nationalism, sovereignty and power.

Nationalism is that psychological or spiritual quality which unites the people of a state and gives them the will to champion what they regard as their national interest.

Sovereignty is the concept of unlimited powers. A group of people who are territorially organized are called sovereign when they possess both internal and external freedom to do what they wish to do.

National power is the might of a state which enables the state to get things done as it would like them to be done. Power is a complex of many tangible and intangible elements.

## UNIT - II

### NATIONAL POWER

Feminism is a broad term given to works of those scholars who have sought to bring gender concerns into the academic study of international politics.

In terms of international relations (IR) theory it is important to understand that feminism is derived from the school of thought known as reflectionism. One of the most influential works in feminist IR is Cynthia Enloe's *Bananas, Beaches and Bases*. This text sought to chart the many different roles that women play in international politics - as plantation sector workers, diplomatic wives, sex workers on military bases etc. The important point of this work was to emphasize how, when looking at international politics from the perspective of women, one is forced to reconsider his or her personal assumptions regarding what international politics is 'all about'.

However, it would be a mistake to think that feminist IR was solely a matter of identifying how many groups of women are positioned in the international political system. From its inception, feminist IR has always shown a strong concern with thinking about men and, in particular, masculinities. Indeed, many IR feminists argue that the discipline is inherently masculine in nature. For example, in her article "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals" *Signs* (1988), Carol Cohn claimed that a highly masculinised culture within the defense establishment contributed to the divorcing of war from human emotion.

A feminist IR involves looking at how international politics affects and is affected by both men and women and also at how the core concepts that are employed within the discipline of IR (e.g. war, security, etc.) are themselves gendered. Feminist IR has not only concerned itself with the traditional focus of IR on states, wars, diplomacy and security, but feminist IR scholars have also emphasized the importance of looking at how gender shapes the current global political economy. In this sense, there is no clear cut division between feminists working in IR and those working in the area of International Political Economy (IPE).

Feminist IR emerged largely from the late 1980s onwards. The end of the Cold War and the re-evaluation of traditional IR theory during the 1990s opened up a space for gendering International Relations. Because feminist IR is linked broadly to the critical project in IR, by and large most feminist scholarship has sought to problematise the politics of knowledge construction within the discipline - often by adopting methodologies of deconstructivism associated with postmodernism/poststructuralism. However, the growing influence of feminist and women-centric approaches within the international policy communities (for example at the World Bank and the United Nations) is more reflective of the liberal feminist emphasis on equality of opportunity for women.

In regards to feminism in International Relations, some of the founding feminist IR scholars refer to using a "feminist consciousness" when looking at gender issues in politics. In Cynthia Enloe's article "Gender is not enough: the need for a feminist consciousness", Enloe explains how International Relations needs to include masculinity in the discussion on war, while also giving attention to the issues surrounding women and girls. In order to do so, Enloe urges International Relations scholars to look at issues with a 'feminist consciousness', which will ultimately include a perspective sensitive to masculinities and femininities. In this way, the feminist consciousness, together with a gendered lens, allows for IR academics to discuss International Politics with a deeper appreciation and understanding of issues pertaining to gender around the world.

Enloe argues how the IR discipline continues to lack serious analysis of the experiences, actions and ideas of girls and women in the international arena, and how this ultimately excludes them from the discussion in IR. For instance, Enloe explains Carol Cohn's experience using a feminist consciousness while participating in the drafting of a document that outlines the actions taken in negotiating ceasefires, peace agreements and new constitutions. During this event, those involved came up with the word "combatant" to describe those in need during these usually high-strung negotiations. The use of 'combatant' in this context is particularly problematic as Carol points out, because it implies one type of militarized people, generally men carrying guns, and excludes the women and girls deployed as porters, cooks and forced 'wives' of male combatants. This term effectively renders the needs of these women invisible, and excludes them from the particularly critical IR conversation regarding who needs what in war and peace. This discussion is crucial for the analysis of how various masculinities are at play in International Politics, and how those masculinities affect women and girls during wartime and peace and initially eliminates them from the discussion.

Conversely, feminist IR scholar Charlotte Hooper effectively applies a feminist consciousness when considering how "IR disciplines men as much as men shape IR". So, instead of focusing on what and whom IR excludes from the conversation, Hooper focuses on how masculine identities are perpetuated and ultimately are the products of the practice of IR.[2] In this way, it is ineffective to use a gendered lens and feminist consciousness to analyze the exclusion of a discussion in gender in IR. Hooper suggests that a deeper examination of the ontological and epistemological ways in which IR has been inherently a masculine discipline is needed. The innate masculinity of IR is because men compose the vast majority of modern IR scholars, and their masculine identities have been socially constructed over time through various political progressions. For instance, Hooper gives examples of the historical and political developments of masculinities that are still prevalent in IR and society at large; the Greek citizen/warrior model, the Judeo Christian model and the Protestant bourgeois rationalist model. These track the masculine identities throughout history, where manliness is measured in militarism and citizenship, ownership and authority of the fathers, and finally, competitive individualism and reason. These masculinities in turn asks one to not only use the feminist consciousness to analyze the exclusions of femininities from IR, but additionally, Hooper illuminates how one can locate the inherent inclusions of masculinities in the field of IR with a feminist consciousness.

### Feminist Anti-Militarism

Feminists within IR often look to how conceptions of masculinity have shaped foreign policy, state identity, and security and armament during and outside of warfare. One tradition that exists within the field for this purpose is that of feminist anti-militarism. This is a stance within Feminist International Relations that opposes weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear weaponry, and holds gender accountable in part for the propagation of militarism. Gender becomes embedded in relations of power as that which is seen to be stronger is assigned a masculinized identity, while concepts such as emotion are seen as indicators of weakness and become associated with femininity. In this way, the military strength and capability of a state becomes associated with its degree of masculinity, which feminist anti-militarists see as problematic. As disarmament could be perceived as emasculatory, states are less likely to disarm; consequently, militarism becomes normalized, downplayed, and more likely to incite warfare.[ These are some of the concepts that Carol Cohn and Sara Ruddick explored in their article "Feminist Ethical Perspective on Weapons of Mass Destruction," (2003) which laid out the meaning behind what they referred to as "anti-war feminism". They explain that it opposes the use of weapons of mass destruction whether for military, political, or deterring purposes, yet that it differs from pacifism in that it does not outright reject all forms of warfare. Such opposition stems partly from the questionability of how effective warfare/militarism is, and whether the costs, (albeit monetary, environmental, and especially human) that are inevitably incurred yet not always accounted, for are worth it.

Manifestations of feminist anti-militarism can be identified in various contexts and methods. In line with Cohn and Riddick's (2003) aforementioned article, part of what feminist anti-militarism critiques is the framework in which weapons of mass destruction are "discussed". Such discourse assumedly would have large influence in the outcome, as investigated by Cohn in one of her earlier articles, "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals." Her participation in security discussions allowed her to observe the way in which the "technostrategic" language used by American defense intellectuals was highly gendered, and assigned greater value and strength to that which was assigned masculine or highly sexualized terminology. While Cohn does not explicitly identify the use of a feminist anti-militarist view in this article, the ideas and subjects at hand run parallel. Relatedly, Claire Duncanson and Catherine Eschle do state their use of a feminist anti-militarist perspective in their article "Gender and the Nuclear Weapons State: A Feminist Critique of the UK Government's White Paper on Trident". The authors borrow Cohn's rendition of the relationship between gender and nuclear weapons to examine the way in which discourses are shaped by underlying dichotomous views of masculinity and femininity. This perspective is then applied to the renewal of Trident nuclear weapons, a plan which Duncanson and Eschl argue is enabled by the UK government's use of masculinized language that seems to be constructed into the state's identity. The UK Trident Program was the cause of another expression of feminist anti-militarism, beginning a few decades earlier in the form of the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp. The 1979 decision by NATO to base ground cruise missiles at Greenham Common initiated a response from women largely associated with various feminist and anti-nuclear groups. Their opposition to such militarism was demonstrated in the persistence of peace camps, demonstrations and other forms of resistance for the following two decades (nat. archive website). Such efforts brought to life the feminist anti-militarist perception of the relationship between gender and militarism as exhibited through nuclear weaponry.

### Gender Theory and Feminisms

Gender theory highlights the limitations of linguistic categories, asserts the significance of intersectionality, values concrete cultural context over universalisms and essentialisms (for example, the notion of universal patriarchy), rigorously problematizes sex and gender binaries, recounts and accounts for the history of sex and gender relations, and deals directly with other theoretical strains such as structuralism, post-structuralism, socialism, and psychoanalysis. For example, in her book *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Judith Butler explores the possibility of troubling gender first by examining conventional understandings of gender that support masculine hegemony and heterosexist power, and subsequently wondering about the extent to which one can undermine such constitutive categories (that is, male/female, man/woman) through continually mobilizing, subverting, and proliferating the very foundational illusions of identity which seek to keep gender in its place. Gender theory can inform critical lenses and perspectives such as Cynthia Enloe's "feminist consciousness," as well as other feminist perspectives such as liberal feminism difference feminism, and poststructuralist feminism. In terms of feminist international relations, gender theory engages directly with the notion of mainstreaming gender in both institutional politics and discursive politics.

Liberal feminism deals specifically with policy-making, and requires that women as well as perspectives on both women's and men's lived realities are fairly included and represented in that policy-making. With regard to liberal feminism, gender theory contemplates, for example, what is meant by the term "women," whose perspectives on "women's" and "men's" lived realities are considered valuable in facilitating fair representation in policy-making, and what aspects of life are considered components of "lived reality".

Difference feminism focusses on empowering women in particular through specific designs, implementations, and evaluations of policies that account for the material and cultural differences between men and women and their significance. With regard to difference feminism, gender theory questions, again, what is meant by the term "women;" what factors might lead to "women" requiring specific designs,

implementations, and evaluations of policies; what is considered to constitute “difference” in the material and cultural experience of “men” and “women;” and what aspects of that “difference” suppose its especial significance.

Poststructuralist feminism prioritizes difference and diversity to the extent that it recognizes all identities as absolutely contingent social constructions. With regard to poststructuralist feminism, gender theory points out that due to this ontological and epistemological discursiveness, poststructuralist feminism can, in some cases, risk understanding the subjects in policy-making as distinct social subjectivities primarily and/or exclusively in terms of gender difference, rather than in terms of the multiplicities of difference that comprise subjectivities in poststructuralist feminist thought.

Institutional politics describes the political, material, bureaucratic, and organizational relationships and conventions that govern administrative institutions. Gender theory seeks to examine the ways in which these normalized relationships and conventions shape the policy-making processes of and within these institutions.

Discursive politics refers to the ways in which institutionalized norms, policy procedures, organizational identities, and material structures shape the language and meaning of gender equality and/or difference therein. Gender theory, with regard to discursive politics, for instance, would examine the identities, the constitutive categories, created and/or perpetuated by the language and meaning of gender equality and/or difference in such international institutions.

#### **Barriers to femininities and female bodies**

A feminist approach to international relations also provides analyses for not only theoretical understandings of gender relations, but also the consequences that perpetuate the subordination of femininities and female-bodies. ‘Women’ (female bodies + performed femininities) endure a higher level of criticism for their actions, personalities, and behaviors within the public and private spheres, particularly while running for political office, whether this at the local or national levels. This is due to a perception of politically ambitious women as either being too feminine or too masculine, to be capable of the job that certain offices demand. This is typically linked to the ideal that women will take care of ‘women’s issues’, such as education and abortion, while men will take care of ‘men’s issues’ such as the military, national security, and the economy. It is critical that researchers seek to explain further the barriers that women endure in their attempts to attain political office on any level. To begin with, there must be a consideration of women’s socioeconomic status, and thus a difficulty in funding a campaign. While women are more educated in the western world than ever before, the average women’s socioeconomic powers still do not match the average man’s. This results in a further consequence for women, as employment is positively related to one’s ability to attain political information, and to build internal political efficacy. Thus, not only does socioeconomic status lead to a lesser ability to finance a political campaign for women, but it also leads to lower levels of political efficacy, impacting women’s participation in politics from the very beginning.

Further barriers exist into women’s entrance into politics, which include, but are not limited to, attachment to the private sphere and the scrutiny of the media. Media coverage of campaigns can be particularly detrimental to a woman’s ability to attain political office. The media focuses far more on physical appearance and lifestyle, rather than the prominent political questions of the campaign, for female candidates. Further, women receive less overall media coverage, the media questions women’s abilities and potential for future power, as well as focusing on what are deemed as ‘women’s issues’. These kinds of coverage discourage voters from voting or contributing to the campaigns of female candidates, and moreover, discourage women from entering into a campaign. Thus, the media has demonstrated its ability to deem candidates either capable or ill suited for political office, simply through the dialogue in which they use, that perpetuates systems of disqualification for women. These dialogues place men in positions of high politics, and reinforce

symbolic understandings of 'women's issues' versus 'men's issues', and who best represents offices of high-politics due to naturalized understandings of individual's bodies and gendered identities. Through a feminist lens of international relations however, we may understand the systemic nature of these perceptions of the relationships between bodies and identities in order to discount popular dialogue, and find places for women within high-politics.

### Critique

Certain parts of the academic realm of IR theory did not offer the feminist perspective serious attention because of differences with its ways of addressing problems within the discipline. Some circles within social sciences are increasingly employing a hypothetico-deductivist way of looking at social phenomena. In that context, feminist perspective is criticized for providing a more politically engaged way of looking at issues than a problem-solving way. Keohane has suggested that feminists formulate verifiable problems, collect data, and proceed only scientifically when attempting to solve issues. Unsurprisingly, Keohane's suggestion received a cold reaction from feminists; one particular rebuttal was entitled "You Still Don't Understand: Why Troubled Engagements Continue between Feminists and (Critical) IPE."

## NATIONAL POWER

National Power of a nation is dependent upon several factors which are together called the components or elements or determinants of national power. Frankel calls these as capabilities or capability factors. Several other scholars prefer to use the name 'Determinants of National Power.' However, more and more scholars now prefer to use the name Factors/Elements of National Power because no single factor or element is a determinant of National Power.

### ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL POWER:

There are a number of elements of National Power. Several political scientists have attempted to classify these. Whereas Morgenthau has classified these into two parts— permanent and temporary elements, Organski has preferred to classify these into the natural and social determinants—the former including geography, resources and population and the latter economic development, political structures and national morale.

Palmer and Perkins, Charles O. Lerche, Abdul Said, Theodore A, Couloumbis and James H. Wolfe have classified these elements into two parts; Tangible and Intangible Elements—the former category includes those elements which can be assessed in quantitative terms and latter such elements as are ideational and psychological and cannot be quantified.

Geography, raw material, natural resources, population and technology are the tangible elements, whereas ideology, morale, leadership, personality, organisational efficiency and quality of diplomacy are the intangible elements.

In a simple way we can discuss the following seven elements of National Power:

### 1. GEOGRAPHY

Amongst the elements of National Power, geography is the most stable, tangible, permanent and natural element. Its importance as a factor of national power can be judged from the fact that Geo-political scientists, like Moodie, Spykman, Haushofer, Mackinder and others, regard Geography as the determinant of international politics.

While describing -the importance of geography in international relations Napoleon, observed. "The foreign policy of a country is determined by its geography." Geography is, however neither an independent determinant of national power nor of foreign policy. It is just an element of National Power.

Nature and Role of Geography as an Element of National Power:

**(i) Maps:**

Maps are always geographical in nature. These are sometimes used by nations to justify a particular course of policy or action as well as to reject the views of other nations.

"Observers of international relations always need an atlas showing population, raw materials, communication routes and other data and the ability to interpret maps." —Padelford and Lincoln

The Sino-Indian dispute has been a dispute of maps regarding McMahon Line. Maps are used as instruments for justifying a particular demand or action of a nation. These are used to influence decisions in ones favour.

**(ii) Size:**

Size is another geographical element of national power. The large size of a country can accommodate a large population, offer better natural resources and raw materials, and can be more helpful in the defence of the country. A large size can help the country to defend by retreat in the event of an attack. It is definitely more, rather very difficult for a state to defeat a big country. It was also the large size of the erstwhile Soviet Union that helped it to defeat the forces of Hitler.

Large area also makes it possible for a country to establish vital industrial complexes far away from the borders and thereby, to organdie effective defence. Thus size is a component of national power. A united Germany as a big state is bound to be a new powerful state in the world politics of 21st century.

However, size can be both a helping as well as a hindering factor. A large size with inadequate natural resources, inaccessible mountains and forests, unhealthy climate and topography can be a hindrance in the way of national power. It can also pose a defence problem.

The Himalayas in the North and a long sea-coast in the South have made the defence of India a complex and difficult problem. Moreover, the existence of some other factors can help even the small sized states to develop a large amount of national power. The location of England and the rapid industrial development that it could achieve after the Industrial Revolution helped it to establish and maintain a big empire and be a virtual ruler of the seas till 1945.

Japan, even with its small size, scored a victory over Russia in 1905. The USA has a relatively smaller territory than Russia yet it has more power than the latter. Israel offers another striking example of a small sized country that has a disproportionately large amount of power.

On the other hand, some large sized countries such as, Brazil, Canada, Zaire, Australia and Sudan, and now Russia are not as powerful as their sizes might indicate. In spite of these exceptions, it cannot be denied that a large territory generally creates the possibility of a great power, or, conversely, small states are normally not expected to be great powers.

**(iii) Location:**

Location of a nation can be as helping as well as a hindering factor for its national power. It determines whether a nation can be a sea-power or not. England could become a big naval power and thereby an imperial power because of its location. The location of Japan has helped it to be a major ship- building nation. Location of Germany in the heart of Europe has been a sources of strength for it.

The location of the USA helped it to adopt (1823-1945) and follow the policy of isolationism. Further, its location, being relative to land as well as seas, has helped it to be a both land and sea power. The location of Switzerland has been instrumental in securing for it the status of a permanently neutralized state.

Middle East and Continental Europe have been the potential zones of power rivalry because of their geographic and strategic locations. Location of Canada has hindered its emergence as a great power. Hence, a favourable geographical location among other things can help a nation to be powerful and an unfavorable location can limit the national power.

#### **(iv) Climate:**

No one can deny the importance of climate in the context of National Power. Climate determines the food production, economy and even the culture of a nation. It can be a source of big limitation or help for the human capabilities. The cold climate of Arctic zone and Antarctic and the excessive heat of the Tropical zone, and Sahara have kept the development of life backward in these areas.

Extreme heat or cold are unfavorable conditions for national power. The prosperity of India stands inseparably conditioned by Monsoons. A failure of Monsoons weakens India and likewise timely and good Monsoon rains help India to be self-sufficient and even surplus in food production.

It is a well-known fact that the great centres of power have so far emerged only in the moderate temperate zone, between 20 and 60 degrees north. A helpful climate can be a source of power and an unkind climate can be a source of weakness.

#### **(v) Topography:**

The nature of terrain, together with other geographical elements, is an important factor of national power. Terrain can influence the power of a state and its potential for offence, defence and growth. A nation with plane and artificial boundaries can be an easy victim of expansionism on the part of a powerful nation.

Natural boundaries with strategic advantages are always a source of strength for a nation. It is terrain which determines decisions concerning physical security of the state. The English Channel has remained a source of defence and some security for England. The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have provided strength to the security of the United States.

Since mid-1950s defence of the Himalayas has been a source of limitation on India's power. The lack of a good number of natural harbours along the sea coast has hindered the development of economic and trade relations of India with other countries. All these examples highlight the role of topography in determining the national power of a state.

#### **(vi) Boundaries:**

Boundary is also a geographic factor of national power. Settled and natural boundaries are always a source of friendly and cooperative relations among the nations of a region. Undefined and disputed boundaries are potent sources of conflict which weakens national power e.g. the boundary disputes between India and China, Israel and Arab states can be quoted as examples. Natural boundaries are helpful to national power and conversely artificial boundaries are a source of weakness and conflict.

Everyone accepts that Geography is an important element of National Power. However, its role can be both helpful and hindering. Ideal geographical conditions can be a source of strength and negative and hindering geographical factors can be a source of weakness for the national power.



Further, role of geography as an element of national power is linked with several other elements, like population, level of scientific and industrial development means of transport and communication, and the like. In fact, scientific inventions and technological innovations have made it possible for man to adjust with and overcome geographical problems and hindrances. Geography is an element but not an independent determinant of national power. The Geo-political scientists over-rate its importance.

## **2. NATURAL RESOURCES:**

No nation can hope to be a powerful nation if its territory is not adequately graced by natural resources. Natural resources are indeed "gifts of nature of established utility." The industrial and military capabilities of a nation as well as its economic well-being are dependent upon the existence of natural resources.

A self-sufficiency in certain key resources can be a big source of power of a nation. The USA has been in a position to be a super power in the world mainly due to its near self-sufficiency in respect of several key natural resources. No nation can be powerful without becoming a developed industrialized nation and the chances of becoming an industrialized nation are basically linked with the possession of natural resources, particularly industrial raw materials and minerals. Natural resources, in the form of minerals, fertile soil, flora and fauna, through planned exploitation and use always make a nation powerful.

In analyzing the role of National Resources as a factor of National Power Morgenthau discuss it in two parts:

1. Raw Materials and
2. Food.

### **1. Raw Materials:**

Raw materials can be further sub-divided into three categories:

- (i) Minerals— Coal, Petrol, Iron, Copper, Zinc, Tin, Manganese, Uranium etc.,
- (ii) Natural Products— Rubber, Jute, Bamboo, Medicinal Plants, Wood Pulp, Wood, Plants, Colours, Varnishes, Forest Products etc., and
- (iii) Animal Products—Milk, Eggs, Meat, Wool, Hides, Feathers, Silk etc.

It is impossible to develop power in modern times without industrialisation and it is very difficult, if not impossible, for a nation to get industrialized without adequate possession of key raw materials. Raw materials influence national power, national policies and international trade of the nation.

The United States has been nearly self-sufficient in respect of key minerals and this fact has largely contributed to its industrial and military strength. The interdependence among nations stands largely constituted by the necessities of trade relations in respect of minerals and raw materials for their industrial needs.

A nation cannot hope to be a big military, industrial and economic power without the possession of adequate quantities of raw- materials. The importance of oil as the key source of energy is a well known fact of present day international relations. Oil diplomacy in world politics of our times solely depends upon the fact that the OPEC countries monopolies world crude production and have vast oil reserves.

Oil has tremendous importance, both for industrial production and military strength and mobility. Clemenceau's observation; "One drop of oil is worth one drop of blood of our soldiers", is true even today. The importance of uranium as a source of atomic power is well known. Adequate means of energy security

contribute to the national power of a nation. As such, raw materials constitute an important element of national power.

However, merely the existence of raw materials cannot be automatically a source of power. The ability to exploit and utilize the raw- materials is a factor almost as important as the existence of raw-materials. This ability is directly linked with the level of scientific, technological and industrial advancement.

## **2. Food:**

Food indeed is an important element of national power. Food determines policies. The existence of large stocks of food grains and surplus food production can be a source of vital strength of a nation. A nation deficient in food production can rarely become a major power.

“Nations self-sufficient in food are better placed than nations which import food.” —Morgenthau

The food shortage in India was a highly limiting factor of the Indian foreign policy during 1950s and 60s. Food shortage leads to power shortage. Acute food problem is a big source of weakness for all the developing countries. It is keeping them dependent upon developed states who have surplus food productions. The Green Revolution of 1970s enabled India not only to sustain its economy but also to preserve and develop its national power.

The military preparedness of a nation is dependent upon adequate supplies of food. A popular valid saying has been; “Armies travel on their stomach.”

However, the food factor is also inseparably linked up with other factors particularly with population, science and technology. Food production is dependent upon agricultural technology and industrial capacity. Man-power is vitally important for food production. Production of food can be stepped up by human efforts and the application of advanced agricultural technology.

The ability to utilize sea food resources can help a nation to overcome its food problem. This ability is dependent upon science and technology. As such food is again an element of national power. However its role as a factor of National Power has to be evaluated along with other factors, population, climate, and level of scientific and technological development of a nation.

## **3. POPULATION:**

Another basic element which affects national power is population. “As long as men are needed for production and fighting, other elements being equal, the state with a large number of men and women to perform such tasks shall be more capable of becoming a major power.” Manpower continues to be a key factor which determines the industrial and military capacities of a nation and its status as a power in international relations.

In this age of science, machines have come to perform a large number of functions which were previously being performed by men. Yet machines have failed to completely replace men. Even today men behind the machines continue to be more important than the machines.

Manpower alone can exploit the natural resources and utilize these for the satisfaction of national needs. Geographical hindrances can be overcome by men. Scientific and industrial development cannot be accomplished without men.

Men are needed to fight. Voltaire’s observation: “God is always on the side of the biggest battalions” holds good even today. The mechanization of warfare has not seriously limited the importance of man as the soldier. Manpower alone can register a military victory.

Hence, population is a source of power. The major powers of our times are states with fairly large populations. Large concentration of man-power in Asia, particularly China and India, has been an important factor of the power structure in international politics. Human Power resulting from the presence of a large class of skilled workforce has been a source for the emerging power of India in the world.

Thus, it can be observed that:

1. Population is an important element of military power.
2. Man power is needed for fully exploiting the resources of the state. Industrial production depends upon man-power as well as machines.
3. Population factor determines both national needs as well as policies designed to serve these needs.
4. Population is an important human element of National Power.

However, it is not merely the large number of people that determines the power of a nation. Britain, with a very small population, was in a position to rule many countries, even heavily populated countries like India. Israel with a small population has been demonstrating a larger amount of power than Arab countries.

Disproportionately large populations with a high growth rate have been hindrances in the way of China and India. Population factor has been a source of limitation on India's national power. It has adversely affected the economic growth rate and has posed a perpetual food problem for India. Poverty of India has been largely due to its over-population.

Moreover, it is not merely the quantity of population that influences national power. The quality of population is a more valuable factor in the context of National Power. Dedicated, disciplined, hardworking, healthy, educated and skilled manpower alone can be a source of power.

A nation inhabited by unhealthy, unemployed, lazy, unskilled, illiterate and ignorant people is bound to be a weak and inactive power. Further, the large size of population is a big source of strain as it leads to a rapid dilapidation of national resources. As such the evaluation of population as a factor of national power must involve an evaluation in both quantitative and qualitative aspects.

#### **4. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INDUSTRIAL CAPACITY:**

##### **A. Economic Development:**

Economic power is a vitally important part of national power of a nation because it is the means for military power and the basis for welfare, prosperity and development of its people. A nation with developed, healthy and growing economy alone can be a great power in world politics. Effective economic organisation and planning are essential qualities of a powerful nation. Poverty is always a source of limitation of power. It is this factor which has been largely forcing most of the developing countries of the Third World to live with neo-colonialism.

The increased importance of economic instruments of foreign policy is a recognized fact of present day international relations. Only nations with developed economies can use the economic instruments—aid, loan, rewards, trade, grants and denial of rewards or punishment, for securing their desired goals in international relations. By using economic means a nation tries to exercise its national power in a productive and useful way. The level of economic well-being determines the power of a nation.

## **B. Industrial Capacity:**

The economic factor is intimately linked up with industrial capacity of a nation. In this age of science, industrialisation and technology developed industrial capacity alone can be a source of enduring and effective economic development. Only industrially advanced nations can become great powers. Today, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Japan and Germany are powerful nations because of their huge industrial capacities. They have the ability to process raw materials, and thereby are in a position to control international economy. India is now emerging as an industrial power.

Industrial capacity of a nation is thus an important factor of national power. Industrial backwardness, despite the possession of raw materials, can be a source of weakness for any nation. The USA, Russia and India have almost equal coal and iron resources, but some weakness industrial capacity in India has been responsible for her comparatively less powerful position. Since her independence, India has been trying conceitedly to develop her industrial capacity and technology for increasing her power and role in international relations.

The modern warfare has made industrial capacity a significant factor of military power of a nation. The agricultural production of a country can be increased only through industrialized farming. Increased industrial capacity increases the agricultural capacity and the power of a nation.

Thus, economic development and industrial capacity are important elements of national power. However, like other elements these two are also closely related to other elements, particularly, raw materials, technology, skilled human power, scientific talent and research, economic resources and the like. Their role as elements of power has to be analyzed in relation with other factors and not independently.

## **5. TECHNOLOGY:**

Technology is the application of knowledge of science for promoting human welfare. It is the ability to use scientific inventions for the promotion of human welfare. Progress in engineering and industrial production is directly related to the nature and level of technology. It has been the advanced technological ability that has largely contributed to the prosperity and power of the developed countries.

In fact the level of technological advancement determines the power-status of a nation. A nation backed by highly developed and advanced technology alone can be recognized as a developed nation. The USA and other developed countries are technologically advanced nations and this fact has been a major source of their power. Now nuclear technology has emerged as an important source of power and influence in international relations.

Initially, monopoly over atomic secret was sought to be used by the USA for maintaining her power superiority in relation with the erstwhile USSR. The success in acquiring the nuclear technology in early 1950s, however, made it possible for the erstwhile USSR to successfully compete with the US power in international relations.

The overkill capacity achieved by the nuclear powers, resulting from the huge stockpiling of nuclear weapons of mass destruction, has been a source of limitation for other nations. The nuclear technology, missile technology, space technology and information technology have given a big boost to the power of some of the states. It has decidedly been a source of power for India.

The capacity of a nation to develop is greatly related to the capacity for technological advancement. Industrial development, development of means of transport and communication, military preparedness and all-round economic and social development can be really possible only when a nation has access to advanced technology.

The ability to achieve this through self-efforts is a bigger source of strength than the capacity to import know-how. The inability to register self-development makes a nation dependent upon technologically advanced nations and hence it limits its national power.

The technological development secured by the Indian scientists in various spheres has been a source of power for India. However, the continued dependence upon advanced nations for the import of highly advanced technology in respect of certain vital spheres has been acting as a source of limitation on India's national power. Many developing or lowly developed countries have not been in a position to fully use their natural resources because of the low levels of their technological development.

The role of technology as a factor of national power can be judged from the fact that today technological aid or assistance, weapon-technology, nuclear technology, information technology, communication technology, dual use technology, and space technology are elements of international relations and all these have been influencing the foreign policies of both the developed and under-developed countries.

However, here again it must be pointed out that the importance of this factor stands linked up with several other factors, like scientific and industrial capacity, raw materials, government policies and educational facilities.

## **6. MILITARY PREPAREDNESS:**

Military power is a vitally important part of national power of a state. The importance of military factor as an element of national power can be judged from the fact that many persons regard these synonymous. Military power is not national power, nevertheless it is an important part of national power which contributes to its strength and effectiveness.

Military preparedness is a background factor for the success of a foreign policy and it is a tangible factor capable of supporting the foreign policy and promoting national interest." It influences the level of success of foreign policy. The super powers and other major powers of our times have been big military powers. By virtue of being a major military power, India, besides other factors, is considered to be a major power having a potential to be a super power in the next 20 years or so.

While evaluating military preparedness as a factor of national power, we have to take into account three factors:

- (i) War technology or technological innovations,
- (ii) Military leadership, and
- (iii) Quantity and Quality of soldiers.

### **(a) War Technology:**

War technology refers to the nature and type of weapon system that is available with the army of the state. Modern warfare is a sophisticated technological warfare. The quantity and technical quality of weapons and military equipment is a major factor that determines the level of military power of a nation. Advanced military technology is always a source of strength and strategic advantage.

### **(b) Quality of Military Leadership:**

War technology is an important factor but it can be fruitful only when backed by efficient planning and systematic and effective use. This brings into focus the role of military leadership. Military planning is a valuable factor of military action in a war. Skilled, trained, experienced, dedicated, energetic and disciplined military leadership alone can make the best use of available weapons, equipment and manpower. A war victory can be possible only under effective and efficient military leadership.

### **(c) Quantity and Quality of Soldiers:**

In a war weapons and equipment play a key role but their role and effectiveness is dependent upon the quantity and quality of soldiers. Military equipment and weapon-system is important, but not as much as the soldiers who actually use these weapons and equipment. The number, skill, training, discipline, dedication and morale of the soldiers are essential factors which can make possible an effective and successful use of military weapons and machines.

Pakistan had a superior weapon system, tanks and aircrafts in both the 1965 and 1971 wars with India. However, it failed to use this to its advantage because of inadequately trained and less skilled men behind these machines. Indian soldiers could provide a decisive and befitting answer to Pakistani aggressions because of their superior qualities. Kargil Victory was also the outcome of the qualities of discipline, training and dedication of Indians Officers and Jawans.

We have to take into account these three factors for judging the level of military preparedness as an element of national power. However, military preparedness is directly dependent upon such factors as technology, industrial capacity, economic development, state of economy, policies of the government, and strategic factors. Hence it is not an independent determinant of national power.

### **7. IDEOLOGY:**

Ideology is an intangible element of national power. It can be a source of both friendship and enmity in international relations. "Ideas and ideologies are elements of the power of a state." Pen is mightier than sword or at least pen has a might which can be a source of strength for a nation. The ideology that a government upholds can be a source of unity and support of the people at home and abroad. The ideology of communism served as a big source of strength for the communist states between 1917-90 period.

Ideology helps a nation to influence the exercise of its power. It serves as a source of unity and strength both at home and abroad. The adoption of the ideology of democratic socialism helped India to establish friendly and cooperative relations with the democratic west and the socialist east. It also acted as a source of popular support for the Government of India.

However, a choice of wrong ideology can be a source of weakness. Nazism weakened Hitler's Germany and Fascism did the same to Mussolini's Italy. Further, ideological differences within a nation, as well as among different nations can be a source of weakness.

Capitalism Vs. Communism paved the way for the emergence of a cold war between the West and the East. It kept the powers of two super powers conditioned and limited. The ability of the nation to use several ideological principles (particular ideologies) always determines its national power.

While evaluating the role of ideology as an element of national power, we must also take into account the means which a state has as its disposal for advertising and propagating the ideology. The propaganda and publicity facilities available to a state also act as a factor of national power.

### **8. LEADERSHIP:**

Leadership of a nation is an important human element of national power. The utilization of man power resources, natural resources, raw materials, technology, industrial capacity, military power and ideology for strengthening the national power of a state is dependent upon the qualities of the leadership that runs the government of the state.

Civil and Military planning is a function of the political leaders. To make and implement foreign policy is the responsibility of the leadership, the decision-makers of the state, in particular. National Power is basically the power of the leaders, statesmen and diplomats of the nation to act strongly in international relations.

The quality of leadership determines the nature and extent of power that a nation can use for securing its national interests. Efficient, devoted and mature leadership can be a source of national power in the sense that a judicious use of power can surely increase the national power and its operational effectiveness. National Power really means the ability of national leaders and decision-makers.

## **9. ORGANISATION AND QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT:**

The mere possession of material and human resources cannot lead to national power if the agency for steering and coordination of human efforts, that is, the government of the state is not well organised, efficient and effective. It is the business of government to coordinate direct, control men and material resources for securing power for fulfilling goals of national interest.

There are many examples which highlight the importance of this factor of national power. For decades China (Before 1949) remained a weak power because, among other reasons, the central government lacked effective control over major portions of the country. Similar was the case of France. Until De Gaulle took control in France in the year 1958, political power remained divided among a number of political parties.

This not only brought repeated crisis to the polity but also made it difficult for the French government to pursue policies on an enduring basis. Such a situation acted as a serious limitation on French power in international relations. As such, effectiveness of governmental organization and administration within the state is very essential for a nation to become powerful.

Frequent and big changes in Pakistan's leadership have been an element of its national power. It has tended to weaken Pakistan. Only a well-organised and well-functioning democratic government can be an enduring and helpful factor of national power.

## **10. NATIONAL CHARACTER AND MORALE:**

### **(i) National Character:**

An important but intangible element of national power is national character. National character is a collective name for referring to the traits of the people, their attitude and aptitude towards work and national needs. National character undoubtedly influences national power as it manifests qualitative make up of the people in their actual behaviour.

Scholars tell us that Russians are known for their sturdiness, elementary force and persistence. Americans for their inventiveness, initiative and spirit of adventure. Britishers for their un-dogmatic common sense, and Germans for discipline and industriousness, Japanese for their nationalism, Indians for their tolerance, idealism and faith in rich cultural traditions and Chinese for their cosmic un-changeability. Traits of national character definitely influence the national power of a nation.

### **(ii) National Morale:**

Along with national character, national morale is also an element of national power. National morale, in the context of national power, refers to 'the degree of determination with which a nation supports the foreign policy of its government in peace and war, it permeates all activities of a nation, its agriculture and industrial productions as well as its military establishments and diplomatic service.' (Morgenthau).

High morale means a healthy frame of mind characterised by fidelity to cause and it depends upon a combination of circumstances and the quality of leadership, and can be subject to frequent and sometimes sudden fluctuations. Indian morale became quite low after severe reverses in Sino- Indian War of 1962.

The success in 1965 and 1971 wars, the successful green revolution and the entry into nuclear club through a peaceful nuclear explosion in May 1974, followed by 1998 nuclear explosions gave vital strength and reinvigorated Indian national morale. Development of IT sector and steady economic development have how increased the morale of the people of India as well as India's credibility in the world.

A high and healthy national morale can be a big source of power which can lead to successful use of power for securing the national interest. The high morale of Indian army was a factor in the victories in 1971 Bangladesh war and 1999 Kargil war with Pakistan.

National character and morale are elements of national power but their role can be positive or negative. Further, their evaluation as factors of national power must be done with reference to other human and material factors. The intangibility of these factors particularly, national character must also be kept in mind.

## **11. DIPLOMACY:**

Diplomacy is another important element of national power. Hans J. Morgenthau regards it as the most important, though unstable element of national power. Diplomacy is the means of foreign policy and as such helps it to achieve better results through judicious hard work and persuasion in international relations. Success of foreign policy of a nation largely depends upon the quality of Diplomacy that takes it to foreign capitals.

Diplomacy of high quality can bring the ends and means of foreign policy into harmony with the available resources of national power. It can trap the hidden sources of national strength and transform these fully and squarely into political realities.

British diplomacy has been instrumental in projecting Britain as a major power in world politics, even after the loss of its status as a mighty imperial power. During the inter-war period, the USA was politically and militarily very strong but it played a minor role in world politics because of its weak diplomacy. At times, weak diplomacy has acted as a source of weakness for India.

The role of diplomacy as an element of national power has undergone a big change in contemporary times. The emergence of new diplomacy—open and conference diplomacy, has somewhat limited its role as a factor of national power. We cannot accept Morgenthau's thesis that diplomacy is the most important of all the elements of national power. Nevertheless, we cannot deny that diplomacy is an important factor of national power. A diplomacy of high quality can effectively contribute towards an effective and successful exercise of national power.

## **LIMITATIONS ON NATIONAL POWER**

### **1. Balance of Power:**

Balance of Power is a device of both power management and limitation of power. Its underlying principle is that the power of several equally powerful actors can be a source of limitation on their powers. The major actors should maintain a sort of balance in their power positions.

No state should try to become unduly powerful as can endanger the balance. If a state becomes or tries to become unduly powerful, another state or states should collectively pool their powers and create a preponderance of power against the offending state. Through use of force or coercion or other devices, these states should act to reduce the power of the threatening state and restore the balance.



No state should be eliminated completely but the power of the state should be kept under control in the name of 'balance'. Balance of power places restraints upon the states by preventing all attempts at an unjustified increase of power on the part of any member of the balance of power system.

This concept was used in the 19th century by the major European states for adjusting their relations. This system was successful in preventing the outbreak of any major war during 1815-1914 period. Currently the device of Balance of Power is used only at the regional or sub-regional level. At the global level it has lost much of its relevance and applicability.

## **2. International Law:**

International Law is the body of rules that the nation-states accept as binding upon them, and which regulates their behaviour in international relations. It is an important limitation on the power of a nation. It directs and controls the behaviour of the nations engaged in international relations.

International law constitutes a legal framework for the orderly conduct of international relations both in times of peace and war. Backed by common consent, natural law, international morality, world public opinion and its utility, International law acts as a major limitation on the misuse of power by the states. It enunciates the do's and don'ts for the states.

It declares war as an illegal means for the promotion of interests. It lays down rules for the establishment and conduct of diplomatic relations. Violations of International Law can invoke sanctions against the violating states.

However, International Law is a weak law. It is not backed by force. It is also subject to different interpretations. It often fails to meet the pressure exerted by a powerful nation pursuing aggressive nationalism. Its objective is to secure international peace, security and development, by securing orderly international relations through the prevention of use of force, war and violence. However, its weakness as a law, rather half-law, and half-morality, tends to limit its role as a limiting factor of national power.

## **3. International Morality:**

Just as human behaviour in a society is regulated by a set of moral norms or rules, likewise behaviour of states in the international environment is limited by International Morality. International community accepts certain values—peace, order, equality, goodness, mutual help, respect for life and liberty of all, and respect for Human Rights of all, as right and good values which must be accepted and followed by all states.

International Morality is "a generally accepted moral code of conduct which nations usually follow in international relations". It acts as a limitation on the national power of each state. It has played a role in strengthening human consciousness against war i.e. against misuse of national power.

## **4. World Public Opinion:**

The democratization of foreign policy and the coming of communications and IT revolutions have together made possible the rise of organised and strong World Public Opinion in contemporary international relations.

It has emerged as an important factor of international relations. The presence of strong global peace movements, strong movements in favour of Nuclear Arms Control and Disarmament, a very strong and healthy global movement for the preservation of Earth's ecological balance, the environment protection movements, Human Rights protection movements and several other such movements clearly show the presence of a strong World Public Opinion.

It is now fast emerging as a big limitation on national power. Fear of adverse world public opinion often forces a nation either not to follow a particular policy or to take a decision or even to pursue a particular goal or decision. Strong world public opinion in favour of Arms Control and Disarmament has been a factor behind the INF Treaty, the START-I, START-II, the Chemical Weapons Elimination Treaty and the continued talks on the issue of disarmament, nuclear disarmament and arms control in international relations.

Moreover, in contemporary times, the widespread support of World Public Opinion for the protection of Human Rights and Freedoms of all by all the countries has been a source or big influence on the role of national power in international relations. However, World Public Opinion is a limiting factor in itself. It often fails to neutralize or forcefully control strong and aggressive nationalism. It has failed to prevent the US war against Iraq.

## **5. International Organisations:**

Since 1919, the world has been living with a world organisation, except for the years of the Second World War. Since 1945, the United Nations has been functioning as a global organisation of all the members of the international community. Its Charter specifies certain aims and objectives which its members are committed to follow.

It specifies certain means for pacific settlement of disputes among the member states. It provides for collective security of peace in times of war and aggression. The United Nations constitutes a global platform for the conduct of international relations in a peaceful and orderly manner. Nations are bound by the UN Charter and they are expected to use their powers only in accordance with the dictates of the UN Charter.

Along with the multipurpose United Nations, there have emerged several well organised international and regional organisations like UNESCO, WHO, ILO, UNICEF, which guide, direct and control the actions of their member states in various spheres of activity. Some Regional Organisations also act as a source of limitation on the national power of each member state.

Living in this age of international interdependence which is characterised by the existence of several powerful non-state actors, the modern nation-state very often finds its power limited. This fact has also been a source a big limitation, or check against the misuse of power by the states. However, the continued love and respect for sovereignty and nationalism continues to keep the role of international organisation and non-state actors limited.

## **6. Collective Security:**

It is a device of power-management which also acts as a limitation on national power. The system of Collective Security is based on the principle that international peace and security is the common objective to be secured by all the states through collective action against any violation by any state or states. It is a device of power management and its purpose is to maintain international peace and security by the collective efforts of all the states.

As such, the power of a state which violates or seeks to violate the freedom, sovereignty or territorial integrity of any other state is limited by the fear that any aggression or any such act committed by it will be met by the collective power of all other states. In this way collective security is considered to be a deterrent against war and aggression i.e. against the misuse of power by any state.

## **7. Disarmament and Arms Control:**

Since military power is a formidable dimension of national power and armaments form a formidable part of military power, Arms Control and Disarmament are regarded as devices of limiting the national power. Arms Control refers to the control over and limitation or reduction or control of the arms race, particularly

the nuclear arms race, through internationally agreed decisions, policies and plans. Disarmament refers to the liquidation, gradually or in one stroke, of the huge stockpiles of arms and ammunition which the nation-states have come to possess till today.

Both Arms Control and Disarmament are based on the belief that by eliminating or reducing the possession and production of weapons, the military power of a nation i.e. the national power of the state can be limited. Any success towards Arms Control and Disarmament can be a source of limitation upon the national power of the states. The decision to adopt arms control and limited disarmament due to internal economic necessities has decidedly limited the role of power in contemporary international relations.

All these factors act as limitations on National Power. Several scholars, however, advocate that an effective and powerful limitation on the National Power can be the creation of a permanently organised world powers—a world government or a world state.

Well so long this does not happen; the devices discussed above can be used for keeping the national power under check as well as for keeping contained the struggle for power among nations. At least these can help the humankind to keep on avoiding a Third World War as well as to keep on working for ensuring some order in international relations.

## UNIT - III

### 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'.

#### DEVICES AND METHODS

With the passage of time the balance of power has developed certain means and methods, techniques and devices through which it can be achieved and maintained. The same are as follows:

##### 1. Armament and Disarmament

The main device of achieving balance is to arm. Whenever one nation increases its strength, its rival has no other alternative but to enter an arms' race. If the first nation can preserve its strength, the balance of power will be upset, but if its opponents can also consolidate their power through arming themselves, the balance of power is preserved. Armament race between the United States and the Soviet Union in the post-war period was perhaps the greatest of all armament races. To maintain local balance of power India and Pakistan also indulge in arms race. Like armaments, disarmament can destroy or restore a balance of power. The states concerned may agree on proportionate reduction in their arms so that balance of power among them may be stabilised. But in practice, disarmament is sparingly utilised, except on defeated powers on the conclusion of a general war. Though at times it is resorted to by victor powers to maintain a favourable balance of power yet its overall role has been disappointing. However, after 1987 and especially after the end of the cold war, the US and Russia have taken certain disarmament measures.

##### 2. Alliances and Counter-Alliances

The balance of power has often been maintained by the method of alliances and counter-alliances. Alliances have been the most convenient institutional device to increase one's insufficient power. Nations have always endeavoured to make, abandon and remake alliances depending upon their interests. Several security pacts are clearly designed to improve the military power position. Alliances can be offensive as well as defensive. Offensive alliances, however, must be condemned as they breed counter coalitions and the outcome is generally war. The triple alliance of 1882 was countered by the Triple Entente in 1907. Similarly the Axis formed in 1936 was a counterweight against the alliance between France and East European nations. The strange Alliance of the Second World War was a reaction against the Axis powers. It was,

however, formed with a defensive purpose. In the post Second World War era, the US with its allies formed NATO, SEATO, CENTO etc. and the USSR countered them with the Warsaw Pact.

### **3. Compensation and Partition**

A state enhances its power by acquiring new territories and thus tilts balance in its favour. When such thing happens the other side also takes immediate steps to increase its own power in compensation in order to preserve the balance. When some powerful nations, occupies the territories of small nations, the powerful rival nations cannot tolerate this Act. They place 3 condition either to share its prey with them or to allow them to compensate themselves elsewhere. Under such conditions the powerful rival nations divide small nations and swallow their share of the prey. The partition of Poland and later on its division between Russia, Prussia and Austria is a well known example of compensation and partition. After the Second World War, Germany, Korea and Vietnam were partitioned in a similar way. This method involves the redistribution of territory in such a way that international balance of power is not affected. Each Great Power becomes a beneficiary and a weak state their victim. Generally the question of such redistribution arises at the conclusion of war yet it may also be needed during the peace time.

### **4. Intervention and Non-intervention**

Intervention is another commonly used device of keeping balance. It is quite possible that the allies may shift their loyalty from one side to another. Under such circumstances, it is quite usual for a big nation to regain a lost ally by intervening in its domestic affairs and establishing a friendly government there. Non-intervention suggests neutrality or guarantee of neutrality for certain states, or efforts to localise war or to protect the rights of neutrals in time of war. At times neutrality also plays the role of keeping the balance of power. Before the end of World War II, Britain intervened in Greece to see that it did not fall into the hands of local communists. After World War II, the United States intervened in Guatemala, Cuba, Lebanon, Laos, Kuwait etc. and the Soviet Union in North Korea, North Vietnam, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Afghanistan etc.

### **5. Divide and Rule**

It is a time honoured policy as well as technique. This method keeps the competitors weak by dividing them or keeping them divided, and thereby maintain a balance of power. It was adopted by the Romans to keep their control over scattered peoples. Britain often used it to keep her large empire under control. She has been a notorious practitioner of this policy. It has been her cardinal policy towards Europe. Now this policy has become a device of the balance of power. Both the super powers had endeavoured to create divisions in the opposite camp. If the Soviet Union was interested in the disintegration of Western Europe, the USA was interested in creating rift in the East European camp led by the Soviet Union.

### **6. Buffer States**

The setting up of a buffer state has also operated as another device of the balance of power. Such a state is usually a weak one. It is situated between two powerful neighbours. It always keeps them safely apart, and thereby contributes to the peace and stability, and maintains the balance of power. There have been various instances of buffer states in history. Afghanistan had been a traditional buffer state between the Imperial Russia and British India, as Tibet was a buffer state between the Imperial China and the British India. In Europe, Belgium and Holland had served as buffer states between France and Germany. In the post-Second World War period, various lines, as the 38th Parallel in Korea or the 17th Parallel in Vietnam, on partitioned countries, and the cease-fire zones are indirectly serving the cause of buffer states in a new world situation. They are also designed to prevent a direct confrontation of Super powers, and thereby preserve a balance of power.

## 7. Domestic Methods

If a state feels that the balance has been tilted in favour of the rival, it will also like to become more powerful. It can do so only by improving elements of power domestically. The state concerned would try not merely to acquire more powerful weapons, but also to develop related industries and other aspects of science and economy whose total effect would make it stronger and help it in restoring the balance. Domestic measures needed for this purpose may also entail introduction of compulsory military training and allotment of more money in the defence budget. It may also include development of indigenous capability to manufacture sophisticated weapons and related military hardware including ICBMs.

### COLD WAR.

The Second World War, like the First World War significantly altered the international scene. For the first time in the history of international relations, a non-European in the history of international relations, a non-European power - the USA became a decisive factor in international politics. Both the USA and the USSR emerged as powerful states. these two states are considered as super powers 'as they have the capacity to intervene, interfere and move the armed forces in any part of the world. the world was divided into two blocs under the leadership of the USA and the USSR. The conflict between these two groups for strengthening their own blocs and taking steps to see that the other bloc is weakened without entering into direct war is called 'East and West Conflict' and the same is known as 'Cold War'.

The term 'Cold War' was first used by Bernard Baruch, an American statesman who in a speech to South Carolina Legislature on April 16, 1947 said, "Let us not be deceived, we are today in the midst of a Cold War." Walter Lipman picked up the term 'Cold War' and popularised it in 1947 with his little book by the same name wherein he described the situation that had arisen between the western powers and the Soviet Union. The 'Cold War' has been defined by Florence Elliott and Michael Sumerskill in a Dictionary of Politics as "a state of tension between countries in which each side adopts policies designed to strengthen itself and weaken the other, line following short of actual hot war." Joseph Frankel says, "The Cold War may be regarded as a sparring match between the the giant states, a succession of moves and of counter-moves.

Cold War embraces all phenomena pertaining to the conflict between communism and democratic ideologies as well as the protagonists, the Soviet Union and the United States and the two blocks led by the Super Powers; nuclear deterrence is an important strategic aspect of the situation. As the term most aptly expresses, it is neither peace nor war, a conflict which cannot be easily ended by mutual compromise and accommodation or by the use of force, as conflicts were traditionally settled in the past. "An per K. P.S. Menon, "Cold War as the world has experienced was a war between two ideologies (Capitalism and Communism), two systems (bourgeois democracy and proletarian dictatorship), two blocs (NATO and Warsaw Pact), two states (the USA and the USSR) and two personalities (John Foster Dulles and Stalin). In fact, Cold War has been basically a war of nerves between the USA and the USSR but its effects have been so widespread that we can describe the post-war era of international relations as an era of Cold War. "As a concept of international relations, Cold War denotes a state of constant conflict and strife, maintained and perpetuated without a direct armed conflict between the antagonists.

It has also been defined as "a state of intensive competition, political, economic and ideological, which yet fall below the threshold of armed conflict between states." The Cold War was a bipolar conflict in which both the sides attempted, without direct negotiations, to apply pressure by holding modern armaments on each other in order to dominate the other. Each such attempt was interpreted by the other side in the light of its own policy and led to retaliation, which in turn provoked further hostile responses from other side.

## **Characteristics of Cold War.**

- (1) Cold War was a complete breakdown of relations between former war-time allies, a breakdown so complete that although each responded and paralleled other's actions, there was no attempt to achieve a political dialogue and to reach settlement in the conflict.
- (2) The Cold War was the development of a big arms race between the two blocs.  
Because of the discovery of the atom bomb, nuclear weapons were acquired in huge numbers by both the blocs making the Cold War a very dangerous type of conflict in the world.
- (3) The Cold War between the Super Powers did not confine itself to one particular region like Europe or Asia but extended to almost all parts of the world.

In their efforts to expand their spheres of influence for political or strategic, ideological and economic reasons, the USA and the USSR began to intervene in the conflict of other countries to gain whatever advantage they could.

## **Nature.**

The nature of Cold War is the sharp diplomatic confrontation, propaganda war, economic warfare and war by proxy in the small areas without direct major military conflict. Cold War is a diplomatic war. In a Cold War peace time diplomatic relations are maintained while the hostilities continue at the same time. Cold War creates a feeling that at any time a hot war may burst out. Cold War was the result of the tension resulting from the formation of two blocs namely East and West. Cold War was neither peace nor war. It was an ideological war, a propaganda war, and a diplomatic war, but not a state of armed struggle.

## **Assumptions of Cold War.**

The Cold War was based on a number of assumptions.

They are :

- (1) The real threat to the world peace was posed by the military strength of Soviet Union.
- (2) The inevitability of conflict between the socialist and capitalist states, which prompted the states of both the blocs to keep themselves in a condition of constant preparedness for a final show down.
- (3) No cooperation is possible between states with different social systems.
- (4) Western tendency to equate all socialist movements with subversion.
- (5) The struggle between West and East is a struggle between freedom and tyranny.

## **Origin of Cold War.**

"The emergence of Cold War", as per Desmond Domelly, was "due to the power struggle in the Central Asia between the rival imperialism of Britain and Russia in the 19th century. " Some scholars place the Cold War as far back as the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. Even Frederick L. Schuman opined that "At all events what we have long been the 'Cold War' did not begin in 1945. " In a broader sense it began with the second Russian Revolution of 1917 within the months after Russia's October Revolution, Soviet Union and the West were at War. According to Phillip Windsor, "In a sense, indeed, the Cold War began in 1939, when the prospect of a war involving Germany and all the major European powers determined the Nazi-Soviet Pact. ' George Kennon, American Ambassador in Moscow, urged the United States to adopt a firm

policy towards the Soviet Union through a secret cablegram in February, 1946. Some official Soviet versions of the Cold War would attribute the origin of Cold War in Sir Winston Churchill's speech of March, 5, 1946, wherein he said "If the western democracies stand together in strict adherence to the principles of the United' Character, their for furthering those principles will immense and no one is likely to molest them. if however, they become divided or fail slip away -second world war phenomenon.

### **causes for the Emergence of Cold War .**

The main factors which contributed to the rise of Cold War were as follows :.

- (1) Soviet Union tried to increase its influence in Eastern Europe in violation of the terms of Yalta Agreement.
- (2) In the Balkans also Soviet Union tried to establish communist governments despite of an understanding with Britain regarding their spheres of influence in the Balkans.
- (3) Russia extended support to the communists to pull down legally constituted government in Greece which soon engulfed the country in a Civil War.
- (4) Soviet Union brought undue pressure on Turkey to modify the Straits Convention and demanded certain territories.
- (5) The attitude adopted by Soviet Union towards Germany also greatly contributed to Cold War.
- (6) Refusal of the USA and Western Powers to accord recognition to the governments of Bulgaria and Rumania.
- (7) Frequent use of veto powers by the USSR during the initial years of the working of the United Nations.
- (8) The unnecessary obstacles put by Soviet Union in the way of conclusion of peace treaties.
- (9) Bitter criticism of the capitalist system and vociferous propaganda against the USA.
- (10) The unnecessary delay by the western powers in opening the second front during the Second World War and the consequential losses suffered by the USSR.
- (11) The secrecy of Atom Bomb possession by the USSR.
- (12) Abrupt termination of lend lease aid.
- (13) Refusal of Soviet Russia to call back her forces from Iran.
- (14) Declaration of Anti-Communist Policy by Churchill.
- (15) Formation of Cominform by Russia against American Marshall Plan.

The Cold War started in 1945 and ended in 1991 when the USSR was split into 15 independent nations.

All these nations have now adopted democracy and capitalism in place of communism. Privatization took place in state-owned enterprises in these states. Further, the Russian state proposed to join NATO in July, 1994 Thus East-West conflict came to an end with the collapse of the USSR at the end of 1991.



## **Impact or Effects or Implications of Cold War.**

- (1) The phantom of Cold War had created an atmosphere of fear psychosis which generated a mad race for manufacturing of nuclear armaments. Both the blocs were viewing each other to be ahead of the other in acquiring more sophisticated nuclear armaments.
- (2) The Cold War has given rise to permanent types of alliances which are concluded much in advance of war. NATO, SEATO, CENTO and the Warsaw Pact were also formed in the wake of Cold War. This alignment system covers most countries of the world. Thus, Cold War had led to alignment system even during the peace times and constant efforts are made to strengthen them.
- (3) The Cold War has complicated the chances of achieving the objective of one world. The mutual rivalry between the Super Powers had reduced the United Nations to a simple forum of deliberations. It prevented certain countries to become members of UN.
- (4) The Cold War made both the Super Powers to spend huge amounts to acquire sophisticated nuclear weapons. This had led to diversion of money from national developmental plans to the building up armaments. In this process, both the countries are armed to the teeth.
- (5) The Cold War has affected the world economy as well. The smaller countries which are relatively poor and Possess limited resources cannot afford to enter the race for armaments.
- (6) It gave greater freedom of action to small and middle Powers. Each group tries to win them over. The influence which the Afro-Asian countries are able to exert in the UN is well know.

## **Causes for ending of Cold War.**

The causes for the end of the Cold War are as follows :

- (1) Establishment of trade relations between the states of the West Europe has become more essential. This was profitable to both sides.
- (2) Competition in nuclear weapons has become too heavy on economical undertaking.
- (3) The influence of the USA over western states had come down.

In this same way, Russian influence over eastern states had come down.

- (4) Differences which arose between Russia and China made the USSR weak morally.

## **NON-ALIGNMENT**

Meaning of Non-Alignment.—M. Gandhi has used the term 'non-alignment' in his book 'India's Foreign Policy' which was published in 1951. Michael Brecher says that Krishna Menon claimed of having used this term for the first time in the U.N. in 1953-54. There is Yugoslav theory that the word 'non-alignment' first officially originated in 1956 at Colombo.

The western scholars like Hans. J. Morgenthau, George Liska and Lawrence W. Martian and others have preferred the term 'neutral' to 'non-alignment'. George Schwarzenberger refers to a number of terms like isolationism, non-commitment, neutrality, neutralisation, unilateralism and non-involvement which are often taken as synonymous with the non-alignment. However, Schwarzenberger says that 'non-alignment' and the above synonyms do not mean the same thing and they fundamentally differ.

Non-alignment is a policy of keeping out of alliances in general and military pacts in particular. The foreign policy followed by independent nations without joining the military alliances of western states

arranged by the USA or the military alliances of communist-states under the USSR, is known as the policy of non-alignment. The group of these nations is also called the 'Third World Group'.

Non-alignment means efforts to retain independence of thought, judgment and action under conditions of cold-war which generated military alliance and agreements of all sorts. Its purpose is to enlarge the areas of peace and cooperation. So essence of non-alignment lies in the freedom and independence of a country to judge each issue as it arises on its own merits, as it affects the national interests of the country concerned and the interest of peace in the world but not on the basis of a pre-determined attitude because of alignment with one great power or another. The policy of not aligning with any bloc, but at the same time being friendly to everyone, so that it might be possible to exercise in international relations a moderating influence, came to be known as non-alignment. Thus, the policy of non-alignment is based on the principles of detachment from military blocs and faith in the solution of international disputes through mutual cooperation. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru justifies this policy and says, "By aligning ourselves with any one power, you surrender your opinion, give up the policy you would normally pursue because somebody else wants you to pursue another policy. I do not think that it would be a right policy for us to adopt. If we did align ourselves we would only fall between two stools. We will neither be following the policy based on our ideals inherited from our past or the one indicated by our present nor will be able easily to adopt ourselves to the new policy consequent on such alignment."

### **Factors Responsible for or Reasons for Promoting the Non-Alignment**

- (1) **Nationalism.**—Many states of Asia, Africa and Latin America attained independence after hard struggle against the colonial and imperialist powers. Naturally they were very keen to preserve their newly won freedom and were over suspicious of any action which posed a threat to their independence. They wanted to preserve their sovereignty and independence. They were also keen to acquire a place in the world Council as free and equal members.
- (2) **Anti-Colonialism.**—The anti-colonial feeling which persisted in the countries of Asia and Africa even after the attainment of freedom also largely contributed to the growth of policy of non-alignment. These powers were afraid that they may be again subjugated by the colonial powers and were, therefore, determined to keep-off from these colonial powers. This could be possible by avoiding membership of both the blocs and adopting an independent course of action by keeping out of all sorts of alliances.
- (3) **Under-development and Economic Aid.**—Most of the countries of Asia and Africa who gained independence were poor and underdeveloped. Their immediate aim is to improve the standard of living of their people and promote systematic development of their country. For attainment of this objective they have to desist from arms production and concentrate on more productive industrial activities. It was also essential to keep off from the international tension. As they needed capital and financial assistance from the powers of both the blocs to achieve their objectives of development, they thought it proper to keep off from political alignments and pursue a policy of non-alignment.
- (4) **Racial and cultural aspects.**—For a long time colonial powers had fed the Afro-Asian nations with the idea that they were racially as well as culturally backward and inferior. This feeling proved to be boon in disguise and evoked mutual sympathy among the people of the newly emerged states of Asia and Africa. Being victims of common economic exploitation and political domination by the European nations they felt a sense of affinity and decided to cooperate with the each other.
- (5) **Need of peace for development.**—The newly independent states wanted peace in the world so that they could concentrate on their development. Consequently, they decided to keep off from the military alliances and the two power blocs.

(6) Strong leadership.—The presence of strong leadership in the newly independent states of Asia and Africa also played an important role in the growth of non-alignment. Leaders like Nehru, Naser, Tito, Sukarano, Nkrumah, Unu etc. have been associated with the independence struggle in their respective countries and came to occupy dominant position in their respective governments after independence. They were not willing to join hands with the former imperialist powers and preferred to become non-aligned.

(7) Presence of U.N.—The U.N. provided a forum to a large number of independent states, which emerged in the post-World War II period to express themselves on the various issues, on terms of equality with big powers. This made it possible for these states to adopt independent foreign policy.

### **Motives or Features of Non-alignment**

(1) Concern for world peace.—

Non-alignment is concerned with the maintenance of peace in the world. They are of the view that war instead of solving problems, tends to aggregate them. They are against the use of force in settling international disputes.

(2) Against racial discrimination.—

The non-aligned nations have been opposed to the policy of racial discrimination by the imperialist powers and also condemned the racialist regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia.

(3) Faith in Socialism.—

Most of the non-aligned nations are underdeveloped, they believed in planning, nationalisation and government intervention with a view to overcome their backwardness. They are mostly for equal distribution of national income among the people. They favour some form of planning as a means to an expanding egalitarian economy.

(4) Revolutionary approach in domestic sphere.—

The non-aligned nations have adopted somewhat revolutionary approach to secure economic freedom to their people.

(5) Apathy to power balance system.—

As the Afro-Asian countries wanted to concentrate on their economic development they were naturally apathetic to the western nations of power balance with alliances etc.

(6) Great emphasis on defence.—

The non-aligned nations nourished a great fear of aggression from the former colonial powers and therefore spent enormous amounts on their defence.

(7) Dissociation from military alliances.—

Non-alignment stands for dissociation from military alliances that came into existence as a result of rivalry between the super-powers.

(8) Achievement of national interest.—

The non-aligned nations believe that the existence of a nation depends upon seeking its own national interest.

(9) Synthesis of national interest and internationalism.—

Promotion of national interest keeping in view the achievement of peace in the world means that non-alignment is a synthesis of nationalism and internationalism.

(10) Seeking economic assistance.—

All the nations of non-alignment were under-developed and they could develop their economy only through economic and technical assistance from the industrially developed countries.

(11) Independence of judgment on international issues.—

The most characteristic feature of the non-aligned is the independence of judgment which the non-aligned countries enjoy on international issues.

(12) Democratic approach in international relations.—

Non-aligned countries believe in a democratic approach to international relations by all the countries of the world.

(13) Establishment of new International Economic Order.—

The non-aligned countries plea for replacement of the existing old system by a New International Economic System for the development of the states of South.

## UNIT - IV

### THE ROLE OF WAR IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

War is an act of organized violence carried out by political units against each other. There are two important implications of this definition. Firstly, violence is not war unless it is carried out in the name of a political unit. Secondly, violence carried out in the name of a political unit is not war unless it is directed against another political unit.

#### Function

In the modern international system, the functions of war, as a social practice, may be considered from three perspectives: that of an individual state, that of the system of states, and that of the society of states. From the point of view of an individual state, war has been an instrument of policy, one of the means by which states objectives may be attained. As Clausewitz put it, war is a continuation of policy by other means-so, states, which possess the legitimate authority to use force, may resort to war for whatever political purpose they deem appropriate. From the point of view of the system of states, war has been the principle mechanism, in what Waltz called, the distribution of capabilities, an element rejecting the distribution of power across states in the system, and, at one and the same time, an ultimate arbiter of the shape of the system and the position of states within it. It is war, in this respect, that helps to determine whether particular states survive or are eliminated, whether they rise or decline. From the point of view of the society of states, war has a dual aspect. On the one hand, war is a manifestation of disorder, a threat of breakdown of the society of states itself and of a return to a pre-society state of affairs where war of all against all prevails. Specifically, it means that the society of states limits war to keep it within the common rules laid down by the society of states itself. On the other hand, war, as an instrument of states policies and a basis determinant of the shape of the system, is a means that the society of states employs to achieve its own purposes. Specifically, it means that the society of states embarks on war to promote the common values and interests laid down by the society of states itself. In other words, war holds an ambiguous role from this perspective of being simultaneously the decisive threat to the society of states, and the instrument of protecting it.

#### Limits

The institutions and rules, which the society of states has established, reflect that dual aspect of war. On the one hand, the society of states has been impelled to restrict and contain war. Specifically, the right to wage war, *jus ad bellum*, was restricted to sovereign states. It was the 1648 Peace of Westphalia that codified the principle of sovereignty, and its corollary rule of non-intervention, and that confined the right to wage war to sovereign states as the prerogative of their sovereignty. The society of states also restricted the way in which war is waged, *jus in bello*, as articulated in the final acts of 1899 and 1907 Hague conferences, the four 1949 Geneva Conventions, and two 1977 Additional Protocols for instance. In addition to restriction imposed on the conduct of war, the society of states also limited the geographical spread of war by enunciating laws of neutrality, laying down rights and duties of neutrals and belligerents in relation to each other. Finally, and most importantly, the society of states restricted the purposes for which states may resort to war, and what constitutes a just cause for which war may be waged: war, once having been considered, a legitimate and proportionate means for resolving international disputes, was limited to the right of self-defense, individual or collective, against aggression. It was the 1945 Charter of the United Nations that confined the right to war to self-defense against the violation of the territorial integrity or political independence of a state.

On the other hand, the society of states has also sought to use war as a means to protect and enforce common rules, to protect common values and to maintain international order: a critical aspect of war, bearing in mind that international order lacks mechanisms of just change. Specifically, the goals of the United Nations, as laid down by its Charter, are to develop friendly relations among states, to achieve international co-operation and solve international problems of all kinds, and, most importantly, to maintain international peace and security by taking effective collective action for the prevention and removal of the threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression. To that end, the Security Council, the executive body of the United Nations, has been provided with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security to take enforcement action in order to address the threats to the peace and suppress the acts of aggression. In doing so, the Security Council possesses the legitimate authority to make war decisions on behalf of the society of states to enforce its rules, to protect its values, and to achieve its purpose. This concept of a legitimate war extends to war waged in self-defense or collective defense against aggression, but not beyond it. War is today, as sixty years ago when the Charter was ratified, legitimate only as an enforcement measure taken or sanctioned by the Security Council in maintaining international peace and security, or as an exercise of a self- and collective defense against an aggressor on the part of an individual state, and a group of states respectively.

### Means

Despite the fact that war is no longer deemed to be a legitimate and proportionate means for resolving international disputes, war is not a fading social practice of international politics. It still performs the functions described above. War is still a valuable instrument of policy, despite the codification of *jus contra bellum* as a primary rule governing the conduct of interstate relations within the society of states, and the fact that the availability of such an option is to the benefit of great powers, and to the detriment of other states, which either do not have necessary capability to wage war, or prefer other means to settle their international disputes. Although the character of wars being fought in the past changed with the end of the Cold War; today the vast majority of wars are rather within states than between them; the interstate war as a continuation of policy by other means is still present, as the Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the wars between newly independent states of then Yugoslavia, or the recent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, for instance, may demonstrate.

War is also still a means of preserving the balance of power, which has been considered as essential to the survival of the system in the Walzian sense. Although recent wars does not seem to bear this assumption out, there is no certainty that wars, once fought between the United States and the Soviet Union in Vietnam, Caribbean, Africa, Afghanistan, and elsewhere around the world during the Cold War struggle, could not be replaced by new ones as a result of the change in distribution of capabilities across states in the system after the end of the Cold War. The war in Afghanistan and Iraq may already point to this direction.

With regard to the war waged on behalf of the society of states, this kind of war is also not vanishing. After the Cold War the United Nations, or more appropriately, the Security Council, became increasingly active in addressing international threats. With the mandate of the Security Council, the society of states repelled the aggression against Kuwait, intervened in North and South Iraq, Bosnia, Somalia, Haiti, Rwanda, Kosovo, East Timor, Democratic Republic of Congo and other places to protect its common values and interests.

Clearly, war has an important role in international politics, and despite the fact that it is no longer permitted for a state to use war as an apt and proportionate means for settling international disputes, except for the exercise of the right of self-defense and the collective action of the United Nations, war is still present in intrastate relations and still plays a vital role in the maintenance of international order and the promotion of the common values and interests of the society of states as whole, occasional breaks of its rules notwithstanding

## **NON – ALIGNED MOVEMENT (NAM) :**

The Non – Aligned movement emerged in the 1960s during the cold war between USA and former Soviet union (1949 – 89) Although originally used by poorer states, the non aligned movement was enriched by members of oil producing countries. NAM consists of 113 members; hold more than half the world's population and 85 of oil resources, but only 7 of global GDP (1995). Non – alignment is not a doctrine. It is not a dogma. It is a process. It is a way of looking at issues in a particular way. It is a need, not a creed. It is against hegemony, against formation of blocs by the powerful nations.

### **Origin of the Movement :**

During the Cold War, between the former USSR and Eastern Europe on the one hand and the USA and Western Europe on the other, the world divided into two power blocs. However, during the 1960s a third bloc, the nonaligned movement emerged. It includes countries that had gained independence from the European empires in the period after World War II. The NAM tried to act as a stabilizing force between the two – superpower blocs. It provided its members a more powerful voice through unity. The origins of the movement lay in the 1955 Bandung Conference, Indonesia, at which Asian and African States met to find common ground and agreement for future co – operation, and proclaimed anti colonialism and neutrality between East and West power blocs. The Indian Premier Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, Ghana's Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah, Egypt's Preseident Gamal Abdel Nasser, Indionesia's President Ahmed Sukarno, and Yugoslavia's President Tito founded the movement at the Belgrade Conference, Yugoslavia, in 1961.

### **Non - Aligned Movement, During the Cold War :**

During the cold War, both the USA and USSR tried to influence members of the nonaligned movement and attract them into their respective blocs. Monetary aid was given to development projects, such as the Soviet funding of Egypt's Aswan High Dam project during the 1960s. The nonaligned movement was not a strongly unified group like the north Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or Warsaw Pact. Members of NAM were weaker economically and militarily than the superpower blocs. Therefore, although its members were able to increase their status through unity and cooperative voting in the UN General Assembly, they were never able to challenge the dominance of the two superpowers. After the cold war membership of the nonaligned movement grew from 25 states in 1961 to 113 members and 17 observer states in 2000. The movement's members are drawn from Asia, Africa, South America, Central America, the Caribbean, and the Middle East, Malta. Yugoslavia is the only European members of the nonaligned movement. Conferences are held every three years. The movement has no permanent secretariat. With the end of the cold war, the major issue promoted by the movement have been international action against poverty, environmental destruction, nuclear testing, and drug trafficking.

### **Relevance of NAM :**

The Cold war had ended but peace in the world is still threatened by forces of extremism, discord, aggressive nationalism, and terrorism and large stocks of weapons of mass destruction. Besides the dynamics of globalisation have produced a whole set of new problems which the Non – aligned Movement must address in coming years. Therefore, NAM is relevant in the contemporary international world political and economic order.

While the developing world is largely supportive of mutually beneficial global integration, it has major concerns that are not being addressed in the (new) global agenda.

These are equitable balance between rights and obligations of investors, particularly multi – national corporations (MNC's), extra – territorial application of domestic laws, intrusive and calculated invoking of human rights, and conditionality of environmental protection and preservation and opening up of national

economies tied to grant of aid and trade concessions. Non – aligned countries are increasingly exposed to pressures to conform to an agenda that is being defined and driven by others particularly the G – 8 nations. NAM relevance lies in providing the ideal forum to oppose,

1. Disregarding the U.N. and diluting the authority of the Security Council by ignoring or simply by passing it.
2. To curtail the hegemonic tendencies on the part of “rogue states”, and
3. To slow down economic and social development of Third

World nations.

India should take the lead and revitalize NAM, give it direction, coherence, and efficiency. To accelerate the process of revitalization, NAM should devote “more time and effort to promote cooperation among member – countries both in the economic and political fields.” There is “renewed interest” among developing Countries in NAM. The fact that we are living in a unipolar world and the increasing unilateralism being shown by certain countries in world affairs should make NAM countries more united. There have been attempts by a group of countries to portray NAM as irrelevant and outdated.

## **DISARMAMENT**

### **The Meaning of Disarmament**

The term 'Disarmament' is used to refer to 'the reduction or control or elimination of all kinds of weapons in order to avoid war and establish peace.' Disarmament allows a nation to maintain weapons for the purpose of internal security only. Its objective is the obliteration of all offensive weapons.

Disarmament is popularly taken to mean the stricture on the production and maintenance of all nuclear weapons. In less developed countries where money is needed for more pressing needs like providing food, education and medical care for the people, disarmament implies that there should be a curb on money spent on weapons.

For disarmament to be effective it is essential that all countries abide by it.'

In World War II, the Russian troops defeated the German army by using only conventional weapons. As Japan was still carrying on the war, U.S.A. dropped “Little Boy”, a uranium bomb, on Hiroshima on 6th August, 1945. Three days later U.S.A. dropped “Fat Man”, a plutonium bomb, on Nagasaki. Both these cities are in Japan. These bombs were used in World War II for the first time. They had a devastating effect. Nearly 2 lakh Japanese lost their lives and about 6 lakh Japanese were maimed. Those who survived became victims of deadly diseases. In this manner, U.S.A. defeated Japan. This defeat brought the World War to an end.

After the Second World War, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. started distrusting each other. A cold war developed between the two, U.S.A. formed military alliances like North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), and Central European North Treaty Organisation (CENTO) to stand up against communism. U.S.S.R. retaliated by concluding a Warsaw Pact. Both U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. started a nuclear and missile race. They thought that a nuclear stockpile -would act as an effective deterrent.

The result was that they amassed so much nuclear capability that the entire world could be destroyed many times over. All the countries knew that if a nuclear war broke out even by inistake or, accident, it would mean the extinction of the entire human race. Therefore, the concept of disarmament was born.



As early as in 1954, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India called upon the nuclear powers to stop the testjag.of nuclear weapons. U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and U.K., the three nuclear powers of that time a moratorium on nuclear testing during 1958-61. Meanwhile, France started conducting a series of nuclear tests and explosions. These tests prompted U.S.A. under the President ship of Kennedy to embark on a massive nuclear build up programme. U-S.S.R. also followed suit.

The Cubah missile nuclear war in order to reduce the chances of nuclear war, U.S.A, Soviet Union and U.K concluded the Moscow Test Ban Treaty in 1963. This Treaty was quite comprehensive. It disallowed nuclear explosions in the air. Despite this Treaty, the two Stepper MVer's went turn conducting underground nuclear tests. The mad race for piling up of nuclear arms continued Unabated.

However, efforts at "detente" between the two Super Powers resulted in two important treaties on nuclear testing. The first was the Threshold Test Ban Treaty (TBT) in 1974, which restricted the yield of underground nuclear explosions to 150 kilotons and below. The second was the Peaceful Nuclear Explosion Treaty (PNET) in 1976 under which the 150 kilotons restriction in the 1974 Treaty was extended to peaceful nuclear explosions also.

Instead of reversing the arms race, U.S.A. went one step further by announcing its "Star Wars Programme" (Strategic Defence Initiative). This programme carries the arms race to the outer space. The star war missiles will be powered with nuclear energy charged laser beams. These missiles will be capable of destroying the enemy warheads and missiles at their bases or in their launching pads even before they are fired.

Notwithstanding the lukewarm attitude of U.S. A., Mr. Gorbachev of U.S.S.R. announced its unilateral decision to suspend all kinds of nuclear testing for a period of 5 months from July, 1985. Later, the period of this moratorium was extended from time to time. Not only that, U.S.S.R. announced that it was prepared for a substantial reduction of the Soviet nuclear warheads on the European mainland provided U.K., France and West Germany agreed not to allow the U.S.A. to station cruise missiles on their soil. Another goodwill gesture made by U.S.S.R. was its willingness to reduce the size of its conventional forces and withdraw them to the Soviet border from the Warsaw Pact countries.

In November 1985, a two-day Summit between U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. ended in Geneva. The joint statement said, though "serious differences remain on a number of critical issues" each side agreed that a nuclear war cannot be won and must not be fought. They again met in Washington in 1986 and in Mexico in 1987.

The Soviet President, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, and the U.S. President, Mr George Bush, signed the historic strategic arms reduction treaty in Moscow in July 1991 in order to reduce their nuclear arsenals by about 30 percent. The signing of the treaty has strengthened the world desire that the mad race for arms should be stopped as early as possible.

It is more disturbing that arms manufacture has become a major industry in the advanced countries like U.S.A., Russia, France and Britain. These countries deliberately disturb the conditions in Third World countries so that they are forced to buy arms and ammunition from them. It is estimated that while Asia, Africa and Latin America spend staggering sums on acquire arms 15 million people in these poverty stricken continents die of hunger and malnutrition every year, 600 million remain unemployed, 800 million are without education and 1500 million are deprived of medical assistance. The military expenditure of Third World countries has also gone up tremendously.

More than 40 million people joined the ranks of the chronically hungry in 2008 taking the world further away from its millennium goal of reducing hunger by 2015, according to preliminary data released by UN's Food and Agriculture Organization in December. FAO's latest report, according to a release accompanying the report, the number of the world's chronically hungry currently stands at 963 million. There are now 963m hungry people, accounting for almost 15% of the world population.

The developing countries account for more than 93% (901 million out of 963 million) of the world's hungry, the report says. Out of these, 65% are from seven countries alone – India, China, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Congo, Indonesia and Ethiopia. The report says these countries are key to fighting poverty and malnutrition. India is home to the largest number of hungry people in the world, accounting for more than 20% of the total.

China and India together account for 40 per cent of Asia's military spend, a peace institute said on 11-06-2007. India is the main military spender in South Asia, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute said. Global military spending rose to a high in 2006 as nations around the world spent \$1,204 billion (at current rates) on military goods and services.

At a speech delivered at the White House in Washington on December 13, 2001, the U.S. President, Mr. George W. Bush, served notice to Russia that the U.S.A. was withdrawing from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Defence (NMD) system. The U.S. President disclosed that both Mr. Putin and he had agreed that any U.S. decision to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty would not undermine their friendly ties between the U.S.A. and Russia.

If the Super Powers take effective disarmament measures, the money thus saved can be utilised by them to aid developing countries. The Gross National Product (GNP) of Third World countries can go up. Disarmament can result in a several-fold increase in the industrial output of Third World countries. This will lead to a stabler world economic order. In reality, disarmament is the only hope for the survival of mankind. It alone can usher in an era of world peace and prosperity.

### **THE STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TREATY (SALT)**

The Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) were two rounds of bilateral conferences and corresponding international treaties involving the United States and the Soviet Union—the Cold War superpowers—on the issue of armament control. The two rounds of talks and agreements were SALT I and SALT II.

Negotiations commenced in Helsinki, Finland, in November 1969. SALT I led to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and an interim agreement between the two countries. Although SALT II resulted in an agreement in 1979, the United States Senate chose not to ratify the treaty in response to the Soviet war in Afghanistan, which took place later that year. The Soviet legislature also did not ratify it. The agreement expired on December 31, 1985 and was not renewed.

The treaties led to the STARTs, or Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties, which consisted of START I (a 1991 completed agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union) and START II (a 1993 agreement between the United States and Russia, which was never ratified by the United States), both of which proposed limits on multiple-warhead capacities and other restrictions on each side's number of nuclear weapons. A successor to START I, New START, was proposed and was eventually ratified in February 2011.

#### **SALT I Treaty**

SALT I is the common name for the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks Agreement signed on May 26, 1972. SALT I froze the number of strategic ballistic missile launchers at existing levels and provided for the addition of new submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) launchers only after the same number of older intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) and SLBM launchers had been dismantled. SALT I also limited land-based ICBMs that were in range from the northeastern border of the continental United States to the northwestern border of the continental USSR. In addition to that, SALT I limited the number of SLBM capable submarines that NATO and the United States could operate to 50 with a maximum of 800 SLBM launchers between them. If the United States or NATO were to increase that number, the USSR could respond with increasing their arsenal by the same amount.

The strategic nuclear forces of the Soviet Union and the United States were changing in character in 1968. The total number of missiles held by the United States had been static since 1967 at 1,054 ICBMs and 656 SLBMs but there was an increasing number of missiles with multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle (MIRV) warheads being deployed. MIRVs carried multiple nuclear warheads, often with dummies, to confuse ABM systems, making MIRV defense by ABM systems increasingly difficult and expensive.

One clause of the treaty required both countries to limit the number of sites protected by an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system to two each. The Soviet Union had deployed such a system around Moscow in 1966 and the United States announced an ABM program to protect twelve ICBM sites in 1967. A modified two-tier Moscow ABM system is still used. The United States built only one ABM site to protect a Minuteman base in North Dakota where the "Safeguard" Program was deployed. Due to the system's expense and limited effectiveness, the Pentagon disbanded "Safeguard" in 1975.

Negotiations lasted from November 17, 1969, until May 1972 in a series of meetings beginning in Helsinki, with the US delegation headed by Gerard C. Smith, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Subsequent sessions alternated between Vienna and Helsinki. After a long deadlock, the first results of SALT I came in May 1971, when an agreement was reached over ABM systems. Further discussion brought the negotiations to an end on May 26, 1972, in Moscow when Richard Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev signed both the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the Interim Agreement Between The United States of America and The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. A number of agreed statements were also made. This helped improve relations between the United States and the USSR.

## SALT II

SALT II was a series of talks between United States and Soviet negotiators from 1972 to 1979 which sought to curtail the manufacture of strategic nuclear weapons. It was a continuation of the SALT I talks and was led by representatives from both countries. SALT II was the first nuclear arms treaty which assumed real reductions in strategic forces to 2,250 of all categories of delivery vehicles on both sides.

SALT II helped the United States to discourage the Soviets from arming their third-generation ICBMs of SS-17, SS-19 and SS-18 types with many more multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs). In the late 1970s the USSR's missile design bureaus had developed experimental versions of these missiles equipped with anywhere from 10 to 38 warheads each. Additionally, the Soviets secretly agreed to reduce Tu-22M production to thirty aircraft per year and not to give them an intercontinental range. It was particularly important for the United States to limit Soviet efforts in the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) rearmament area.

The SALT II Treaty banned new missile programs (a new missile defined as one with any key parameter 5% better than in currently deployed missiles), so both sides were forced to limit their new strategic missile types development. However, the United States preserved their most essential programs like the Trident missile, along with the cruise missiles President Jimmy Carter wished to use as his main defensive weapon as they were too slow to have first strike capability. In return, the USSR could exclusively retain 308 of its so-called "heavy ICBM" launchers of the SS-18 type.

An agreement to limit strategic launchers was reached in Vienna on June 18, 1979, and was signed by Leonid Brezhnev and Carter.

Six months after the signing, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, and in September of the same year, the United States discovered that a Soviet combat brigade was stationed in Cuba. (Although President Carter claimed this Soviet brigade had only recently been deployed to Cuba, the unit had been stationed on the

island since the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.) In light of these developments, the treaty was never ratified by the United States Senate. Its terms were, nonetheless, honored by the U.S. until it expired. The Soviet Union never abided by either of the SALT treaties.

### **START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty)**

START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) was a bilateral treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms. The treaty was signed on 31 July 1991 and entered into force on 5 December 1994.[1] The treaty barred its signatories from deploying more than 6,000 nuclear warheads atop a total of 1,600 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and bombers. START negotiated the largest and most complex arms control treaty in history, and its final implementation in late 2001 resulted in the removal of about 80 percent of all strategic nuclear weapons then in existence. Proposed by United States President Ronald Reagan, it was renamed START I after negotiations began on the second START treaty.

The START I treaty expired 5 December 2009. On 8 April 2010, the replacement New START treaty was signed in Prague by U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev. Following ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Federal Assembly of Russia, it went into force on 26 January 2011.

### **LEAGUE OF NATIONS**

Born with the will of the victors of the First World War to avoid a repeat of a devastating war, the League of Nations represents an important milestone in the direction of achieving the age old global community aspiration of a global body. It was the first significant institution with a clear objective to maintain universal peace within the framework of the fundamental principles of the Pact accepted by its Members: to develop cooperation among nations and to guarantee them peace and security. The League's goals included disarmament, preventing war through collective security, settling disputes between countries through negotiation diplomacy and improving global welfare. The diplomatic philosophy behind the League represented a fundamental shift in thought from the preceding hundred years. After a number of notable successes and some early failures in the 1920s, the League ultimately proved incapable of preventing aggression by the Axis Powers in the 1930s. The onset of the Second World War suggested that the League had failed in its primary purpose — to avoid any future world war. In spite of its political failure, the legacy of the League of Nations at the same time appears clearly in a number of principles stated by the Charter and in the competencies and experiences developed in the area of technical cooperation: the majority of the specialized institutions of the United Nations system can in fact be considered the legacy of the work initiated by the League of Nations.

#### **Founding of the League of Nations:**

It was during the World War I, numerous groups started organising to look after the way to maintain peace and prevent future wars. Initially the effort was confined only to the private initiative which later got received the official support. For example, the League to Enforce Peace founded in 1915 in the United States (US), former President William Howard Taft as the important leader of this movement. A year later, President Woodrow Wilson addressed a meeting of the League to Enforce Peace, and gradually he came to endorse many of its principles. By January 1917, Wilson, in an address to the US Senate, advocated a "League for Peace" backed by superior collective force. However, the idea of the actual League of Nations appears to have originated with British Foreign Secretary Edward Grey, and it was enthusiastically adopted by Wilson and his advisor Colonel Edward M. House as a means of avoiding bloodshed like that of World War I. In 1918, a little more than a hundred years after the foundation of the first peace societies in the United States and England (and with the support of both countries' Leagues to Enforce Peace), the idea of a "League of Nations" took form with the pledge to prevent future wars. The creation of the League was a

centrepiece of Wilson's Fourteen Points for Peace in 1918, specifically the final point: "A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike." The Fourteen Points were subsequently adopted, with minor exceptions, by the Allied powers and committed to the establishment of a security organisation as a part of their plans for peace. On January 18, 1919, the peace conference, under the chairmanship of Wilson, convened in Paris. The Paris Peace Conference accepted the proposal to create the League of Nations on January 25, 1919. President Wilson was then made Chairman of the 19 member Commission established to formulate a list of "rules and regulations" for an international organization whose purpose was to preserve world peace through open diplomacy and global consensus. The resulting document was the draft of an agreement or "Covenant" between nations. Less than four months later, on 29 April 1919, the final version of the Covenant of the League of Nations was adopted, and it became Part I of the Treaty of Versailles. In accordance with President Wilson's ideals, the Covenant outlined the League of Nations' three basic objectives: to ensure collective security, to assure functional cooperation, and to execute the mandates of peace treaties. However, the League of Nations could only begin to function, formally and officially, after the Peace Treaty of Versailles came into effect. Thus, the League of Nations was officially inaugurated on 10 January 1920. The 32 original Members of the League of Nations were also Signatories of the Versailles Treaty. In addition, 13 additional States were invited to accede to the Covenant. The League of Nations was open to all other States, providing they fulfilled certain requirements. Those which had obtained a two-thirds majority of "yes" votes cast in the Assembly were admitted. The headquarters of the League moved to Geneva on November 1, 1920, where the first general assembly of the League was held on November 15, 1920 with representatives from 42 nations in attendance

**The Covenant of the League of Nations:**

The Covenant of the League of Nations consists of a short foreword or "Preamble" which introduces its three primary objectives; the 26 Articles which follow outline the means of carrying them out. In general, Article 1 describes the conditions of membership, admission and withdrawal. Articles 2 to 5 specify the nature and power of the Assembly and the Council, the two main bodies of the Organization. Articles 6 to 7 discuss the appointment of a Secretary-General, the establishment of the League of Nations' Secretariat at Geneva, and its budget. Articles 8 to 9 deal with the subject of disarmament and the League of Nations' objective of reducing the number of arms to the lowest possible level through open discussion between Members. Articles 10 to 21 clarify the political and social mandates the newly formed international organization was expected to carry out, spelling out the obligations and rights of the Member States in order to promote international cooperation, and thus achieve international peace and collective security. Articles 22 to 23 detail the League of Nations' intention of extending international relations in the fields of finance, trade, transport by land, sea and air as well as the promotion of health and the struggle against drugs, prostitution and slavery.

**The Structure of the League of Nations:**

The League had three principal organs: a Secretariat (headed by the General Secretary and based in Geneva), a Council, and an Assembly. The League also had numerous Agencies and Commissions. Authorization for any action required both a unanimous vote by the Council and a majority vote in the Assembly.

**The Assembly:**

All members of the League were automatically members of the Assembly. Each Member State had one vote but was permitted to send up to three delegates. The Assembly held its sessions once a year in September. Paul Hymans of Belgium acted as President of the First Assembly. Amongst other things, the Assembly enjoyed the following powers and duties :

- a) Control of the budget
- b) Admission of the new members to the League
- c) All matters affecting world peace
- d) Making amendments to the Covenant and revision of treaties
- e) Electing non-permanent members to the Council
- f) Formulation of rules regarding the selection and terms of Council members

g) Consideration of matters to it by the Council  
 The Assembly accomplished most of its work through six main committees. These dealt with: (1) legal questions, (2) technical organizations, (3) reduction of armaments, (4) budget and finance, (5) social and humanitarian questions, and (6) political questions. Each member was entitled to be represented on all committees. Committee decisions could be taken by majority vote, but final approval on most issues had to face the requirement of unanimity in plenary session of the Assembly.

### **The Council:**

The Council was a coalition of the four permanent members: France, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom. Germany joined in 1926, but left in 1935. In September 1934, the Soviet Union entered the League of Nations. Up to 10 non-permanent Council members were elected by the Assembly for a three-year period. The most important task of the Council was to settle international disputes. It met, on average, five times a year, and in extraordinary sessions when required. The Council reported to the Assembly on its activities. In total, 107 public sessions were held between 1920 and 1939. Its first President was Lord Balfour, the Council's British representative. The allocation of powers and duties between the Assembly and the Council indicates the greater importance attached to the Council by the framers of the Covenant. The Council was assigned the following formidable responsibilities:

- a) The conciliation of disputes
- b) The expulsion of members of the League that violated the Covenant
- c) The supervision of the mandates
- d) The approval of staff appointments to the Secretariat
- e) The authority to move the League headquarters
- f) The formulation of plans for disarmament
- g) The recommendation of methods for carrying out the provisions of the Covenant for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the application of sanctions
- h) The obligation to meet the request of any League member to consider any threat to international peace

A few powers were shared by the Council and Assembly. Both the organs were authorized to deal with any matter under League's jurisdiction or affective world peace. Both were also authorized to seek advisory opinions from the Permanent Court of International Justice. In addition, three other responsibilities were thrust upon them such as: a) the appointment of Secretary-General, b) the election of members of the Permanent Court of International Justice, and c) the approval of changes in the allocation of permanent and non-permanent seats on the Council.

## **The Secretariat**

The staffs of the League's secretariat were responsible for preparing the agenda for the Council and Assembly and publishing reports of the meetings and other routine matters, effectively acting as the civil service for the League. It was headed by a Secretary-General, two Deputy Secretaries-General, and two Assistant Under-Secretaries. Over the life of the League from 1920 – 1946, there were three Secretaries General, namely Sir James Eric Drummond, 7th Earl of Perth (UK) (1920-1933), Joseph Avenol (France)(1933-1940), and Seán Lester (Ireland) (1940-1946). The General Secretary wrote annual reports on the work of the League.

## **Other bodies**

The League oversaw the Permanent Court of International Justice and several other agencies and commissions created to deal with pressing international problems. These were the Economic and Financial Organisation, the Organisation for Communications and Transit, the Disarmament Commission, the Health Organization, the International Labour Organization, the Mandates Commission, the Permanent Central Opium Board, the Commission for Refugees, and the Slavery Commission. While the League itself is generally branded a failure, several of its Agencies and Commissions had successes within their respective mandates. Several of these institutions were transferred to the United Nations after the Second World War. In addition to the International Labour Organisation, the Permanent Court of International Justice became a UN institution as the International Court of Justice, and the Health Organization was restructured as the World Health Organization.

## **The Mandate System:**

League of Nations Mandates were established under Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. These territories were former colonies of the German Empire and the Ottoman Empire that were placed under the supervision of the League following World War I.

The territories were governed by "Mandatory Powers", such as the United Kingdom in the case of the Mandate of Palestine and the Union of South Africa in the case of South-West Africa, until the territories were deemed capable of self-government. There were fourteen mandate territories divided up among the six Mandatory Powers of the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, New Zealand, Australia and Japan. In practice, the Mandatory Territories were treated as colonies and were regarded by critics as spoils of war. With the exception of Iraq, which joined the League on October 3, 1932, these territories did not begin to gain their independence until after the Second World War, a process that did not end until 1990. Following the demise of the League, most of the remaining mandates became United Nations Trust Territories. In addition to the Mandates, the League itself governed the Saarland for 15 years, before it was returned to Germany following a plebiscite, and the free city of Danzig (now Gdańsk, Poland) from 15 November 1920 to 1 September 1939.

## **The Permanent Court of International Justice:**

Although the Permanent Court of International Justice was theoretically not a part of the League, but closely affiliated with it. The Court was established in 1921, three years after the end of World War I. The court was directed to decide disputes brought before it on the basis of existing treaty law and customary international law. It was composed of 11 judges and 4 Deputy Judges. The Court enjoyed three kinds of jurisdiction—Voluntary, Compulsory and Advisory. Some of the diplomats and lawyers drafting the statute of the court feared, however, that disputes might arise over new international issues for which there would be no settled custom or applicable treaty. They decided, and the nations voting for the statute agreed, to add a third source of law—"general principles of law recognized by civilized nations"—to allow the court

to draw upon widely recognized legal principles in national law. In this way, the court would not have to refuse to settle a dispute because of the absence of international law. General principles that have been applied by the court and its successor, the United Nations International Court of Justice, include the “clean hands” doctrine (it is improper to accuse some one of misconduct that the accuser has also engaged in), the principle that individuals should not be a judge in their own dispute, and the principle of *res judicata* (a case that is decided cannot be tried again).

### **General Weaknesses of the League of Nations:**

The League did not, in the long term, succeed. The outbreak of World War II was the immediate cause of the League’s demise, but there was also a variety of other, more fundamental, flaws. The League, like the modern United Nations, lacked an armed force of its own and depended on the Great Powers to enforce its resolutions, which they were very reluctant to do. Economic sanctions, which were the most severe measure the League could implement short of military action, were difficult to enforce and had no great impact on the target country, because they could simply trade with those outside the League. The problem is exemplified in the following passage, taken from

The Essential Facts About the League of Nations, a handbook published in Geneva in 1939 “As regards the military sanctions provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 16, there is no legal obligation

to apply them... there may be a political and moral duty incumbent on states... but, once again, there is no obligation on them.”

The League’s two most important members, Britain and France, were reluctant to use sanctions and even more reluctant to resort to military action on behalf of the League. So soon after World War I, the populations and governments of the two countries were pacifist. The British Conservatives were especially tepid on the League and preferred, when in government, to negotiate treaties without the involvement of the organization. Ultimately, Britain and France both abandoned the concept of collective security in favour of appeasement in the face of growing German militarism under Adolf Hitler. Representation at the League was often a problem. Though it was intended to encompass all nations, many never joined, or their time as part of the League was short. One key weakness of the League was that the United States never joined, which took away much of the League’s potential power. Even though US President Woodrow Wilson had been a driving force behind the League’s formation, the United States Senate voted on November 19, 1919 not to join the League. The League also further weakened when some of the main powers left in the 1930s. Japan began as a permanent member of the Council, but withdrew in 1933 after the League voiced opposition to its invasion of the Chinese territory of Manchuria. Italy also began as a permanent member of the Council but withdrew in 1937. The League had accepted Germany as a member in 1926, deeming it a “peace-loving country,” but Adolf Hitler pulled Germany out when he came to power in 1933. Another major power, the Bolshevik Soviet Union, was a member only from 1934, when it joined to antagonise Germany (which had left the year before), to December 14, 1939, when it was expelled for aggression against Finland. In expelling the Soviet Union, the League broke its own norms. Only 7 out of 15 members of the Council voted for the expelling (Great Britain, France, Belgium, Bolivia, Egypt, South African Union and the Dominican Republic), which was not a majority of votes as was required by the Charter to do so. Three of these members were chosen as members of the Council the day before the voting (South African Union, Bolivia and Egypt). The League of Nations practically ceased functioning after that and was formally dismissed in 1946. The League’s neutrality tended to manifest itself as indecision. The League required a unanimous vote of its nine (later fifteen) member Council to enact a resolution, so conclusive and effective action was difficult, if not impossible. It was also slow in coming to its decisions. Some decisions also required unanimous consent of the Assembly; that is, agreement by every member of the League. Another important weakness of the League was that it tried to represent all nations, but most



members protected their own national interests and were not committed to the League or its goals. The reluctance of all League members to use the option of military action showed this to the full. If the League had shown more resolve initially, countries, governments and dictators may have been more wary of risking its wrath in later years. These failings were, in part, among the reasons for the outbreak of World War II. Moreover, the League's advocacy of disarmament for Britain and France (and other members) whilst at the same time advocating collective security meant that the League was unwittingly depriving itself of the only forceful means by which its authority would be upheld. This was because if the League was to force countries to abide by international law it would primarily be the Royal Navy and the French Army which would do the fighting. Furthermore, Britain and France were not powerful enough to enforce international law across the globe, even if they wished to do so. For its members League obligations meant there was a danger that states would get drawn into international disputes which did not directly affect their respective national interests. On 23 June 1936, in the wake of the collapse of League efforts to restrain Italy's war of conquest against Abyssinia, British Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin told the House of Commons that collective security "failed ultimately because of the reluctance of nearly all the nations in Europe to proceed to what I might call military sanctions.... [T]he real reason, or the main reason, was that we discovered in the process of weeks that there was no country except the aggressor country which was ready for war.... [I]f collective action is to be a reality and not merely a thing to be talked about, it means not only that every country is to be ready for war; but must be ready to go to war at once. That is a terrible thing, but it is an essential part of collective security." It was an accurate assessment and a lesson which clearly was applied in the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which stood as the League's successor insofar as its role as guarantor of the security of Western Europe was concerned.

## **UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATION (UNO)**

### **Origin of the UNO**

The League of Nations did not prevent the outbreak of wars or the invasion of one country by another. While the Second World War was in full swing, the Allied powers, for political and psychological reasons, felt the necessity for creating a new international organisation better than the League of Nations for preventing the loss of property and lives and for establishing peace. The following efforts were made for the establishment of the United Nations Organisation (UNO).

### **Objectives of the UNO**

The objectives of the United Nations are enshrined in the Preamble to the Charter. There are four major objectives :

- (1) To save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war.
- (2) To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the work and dignity of human person and equal rights of men, women and nations large and small.
- (3) To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained;
- (4) To promote social progress and better standard of life in larger freedom.

These objectives envisage a better and peaceful life to the people of the world through practising tolerance and living together in peace and harmony with one another. This spirit has facilitated the emergence of the concept of peaceful co-existence among the states despite political, economic and ideological differences prevailing between them. The Preamble envisages the principle of collective security to maintain international peace and security.

## **Purposes of the UNO**

The purposes of the UNO are set forth in Article 1 of the Charter—These are :

- (i) Maintenance of international peace and security;
- (ii) Development of friendly relations among nations;
- (iii) International cooperation in solving problems of economic, social, cultural and humanitarian nature; promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; and
- (iv) To be a centre for harmonising the actions of nations to achieve the above ends.

## **Principles of the UNO**

The UNO acts in accordance with the following principles as envisaged in Article 2 of the Charter in order to fulfill the purposes for which the UNO was established :

- (i.) The organisation is based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all its members;
- (ii) All members shall fulfil in good faith the obligation they have assumed under the Charter;
- (iii) They shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means;
- (iv) They shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of United Nations;
- (v) They shall give the United Nations every assistance with the Charter, and to refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the organisation is taking preventive or enforcement action;
- (vi) The United Nations is to ensure that non-member act in accordance with these principles so far as is necessary for maintaining international peace and solidarity;
- (vii) The organisation shall not intervene in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. This provision shall not, however, prejudice the application of enforcement action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression.

## **Membership:**

there are two kinds of membership—original and new. According to Article 3 of the Charter, the original members of the U.N. shall be the states which having participated in the U.N. Conference on International Organisation at San Francisco, or having previously signed the Declaration by U.N. of January 1, 1942, sign the present Charter and ratify it in accordance with Article 110.

In all 51 states are regarded as original members. Article 4 of the Charter states that membership in the U.N. is open to all other peace-loving states (beside 51 signatories) which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organisation, are able and willing to carry out these obligations. The admission of any such state to membership in the U.N. will be affected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. Any prospective country desiring to become member must submit an application including a declaration that it accepts the obligations envisaged in the Charter. New members are admitted by two thirds vote of the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council. Membership becomes effective on the date the Assembly accepts the application. At present 192 states have membership in the UNO (in 2007).

## **Suspension and Expulsion of Membership**

According to Article 5 of the Charter, a member of the U.N. against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council. Article 6 of the Charter states that a member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the organisation by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The Security Council recommends the admission of a state and the General Assembly decides to admit or refuse and also suspend or expel the members. The requirement of unanimity among the big five on the question of admission created hardships in the admission of new members due to cold war situation.

## **Principal Organs of the United Nations Organisation**

The United Nations may be simply defined as an organisation of independent States which have accepted the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945. There are six principal (main) organs of the UNO. They are :

- (i) General Assembly;
- (ii) Security Council;
- (iii) Economic Social Council-
- (iv) Trusteeship Council;
- (v) Secretariat; and

International Court of Justice,

## **General Assembly**

The chief organ of the UNO is the General Assembly. All states who are members of the UNO have membership in this Assembly. Each member sends upto five delegates to the General Assembly but only one has the right to vote based on the principle of equality of states. The General Assembly elects a President who, by convention does not belong to any permanent member state and Vice-Presidents every year. The President presides over the session and regulates debate. The Assembly meets once a year for three to four months starting from the third Tuesday in September every year. Extraordinary or special session can be convened on the request of a majority of states or by the Security Council. Emergency sessions can be convened to discuss any specified problem that may arise. The General Assembly decides its own international rules and regulations.

## **Security Council of the UNO Composition**

Security Council is the most important organ of the U.N.O. It is called the 'Enforcement Wing' of the UNO. It is a much smaller body than the General Assembly. It consists of fifteen (originally eleven) members of the UNO. China, France, Russia, the U.K. and the USSR are the permanent Members of the Security Council. The General Assembly shall elect ten (originally six) other Members of the UNO to be non-permanent members of the Security Council for a term of two years. The non-permanent members are not eligible for immediate re-election. While electing, due regard being paid to the contribution of the members of the U.N. to the maintenance of international peace and security and to other purposes of the organisations and also to equitable geographical distribution. (Five from Afro-Asian nations,

one from Eastern Europe, two from Latin America and two from Western Countries as per Gentlemen's Agreement). Each member of the Security Council has one representative on the Council. Every month one member of the Security Council acts as President. Those act as Presidents every month based on the list of members arranged in alphabetical order in English while the Security Council is considering a matter pertaining to a particular state which is not a member of the Security Council its representative is permitted to participate in the proceedings of the Council but does not enjoy the right to vote. The Security Council does not have fixed sessions; it meets as and when necessary. Its organisation and powers are such that it must be able to take quick decisions and action. However, it meets periodically as well even without being requested by any member state. Every member state of Security Council has a permanent representative resident in New York. So many changes have been taken place since the inception of the UNO. The number of countries has increased. The USSR has been split into 15 countries. Japan, Germany, and India have become giant economic powers in the world. There is pressure on the UNO to increase the number of permanent members by including Japan Germany, India, Brazil etc. depending upon the population, economy, technology etc.

### **The Economic and Social Council of the UNO**

Purpose of International Economic and Social Cooperation With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self determination of peoples, the U.N. shall promote : (a) higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; (b) solutions of international economic, social health, and related problems and international cultural and educational cooperation; and (c) universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. To discharge the economic and social functions of the UNO the organ, 'Economic and Social Council' has been constituted working under the authority of the General Assembly. The Economic and Social Council seeks to build a world of greater prosperity, stability and justice. It is this organ which directs and coordinates the economic and social works of the UN and related agencies.

### **The Trusteeship Council of the UNO**

Mandatory system in the League of Nations has been converted into the Trusteeship Council of the UNO. The Trusteeship Council is constituted differently from the Mandates Commission, under the League of Nations. The Trusteeship Council is composed of Member States, whereas the Members of the Mandate Commission were expert appointed by the League of Nations and were representatives of their governments. The Trusteeship Council is a more vigorous body than the Mandates Commission, but it is also more political. Under the League the supervision of the Mandate System lay with the Council, assisted by the Permanent Mandates Commission, the deliberate decision was taken at San Francisco to set-up a special organ to deal with trusteeship and, moreover, an organ answerable to the Assembly rather than to the Security Council. The Trusteeship Council is answerable to the Security Council only to the extent that it assists the Security Council with functions relating to 'Strategic Areas'. The Trusteeship Council is created as a principal organ of the UN to administer some of the territories ruled by colonial powers to prepare these territories for self-government and independence. In all, eleven territories were placed under the system. The Trusteeship Council is placed under the authority of the General Body. The General Assembly decides upon the terms of trusteeship and the authority that ensues from these terms. The Trusteeship Council receives annual reports from the states entrusted with the administration of territories, receives petitions from individuals or groups in the trust territories and organises periodical visits to these territories. The Council in turn presents its reports to the General Assembly.

## **Secretariat of the U.N.O.**

The Secretariat is the headquarters of the United Nations Organisation. The Article 7 of the Charter of U.N. has described the Secretariat as one of the 'principal organs' of the Organisation and Article 97 of the Charter of U.N. provides that "the Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary-General and such staff as the Organisation may require." The Secretary-General, as the head of the Secretariat, plays an important role both from the point of view of the day-to-day functioning of the organisation, and by virtue of his personal political action in international relations. The U.N. Secretariat now consists of more than ten thousand officials. The Secretariat services may be called an international civil service. The Secretary-General is the Chief administrative officer of the Secretariat. He shall be appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. This implies unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council. As a matter of convention, the Secretary-General does not belong to the permanent member states of the Security Council. Though the General Assembly reserves the right to reject the name recommended by the Security Council it cannot make its own choice. In such a case the General Assembly has to wait until another candidate is recommended by the Security Council.

## **The International Court of Justice of the UNO**

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the judicial arm of the UNO. It is one of the principal organs of the UNO. The statute of the International Court of Justice is based upon the statute of the Permanent Court of Justice of the League. The Statute of International Court of Justice is a part of the Charter of the UNO. All Members of the U.N. are *ipso facto* parties to the statute of International Court of Justice. A state which is not a member of the U.N. may become a party to the statute of International Court of Justice on condition to be determined in each case by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. Each Member of the U.N. undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which it is a party. If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment. Nothing in the present Charter shall prevent members of the U.N. from entrusting the solution of their differences to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future. In 1946, the ICJ succeeded the permanent Court of the League of Nations. The new court meets at the Hague in Netherlands in the same building as the old one and cites the judgments and opinions of its predecessor as readily as its own. Indeed two of the judges of the Permanent Court of Justice of League were elected to the new one.

### **Composition.—**

The statute lays down that the Court shall consist of fifteen judges "elected regardless of their nationality from among persons of high moral character, who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries of appointment to the higher judicial offices, or are jurists, consultants of recognised competence in international law." Although the judges of the court are to be elected regardless of their nationality no two of them can be nationals of the same state. To ensure that no particular region dominates the court, it is provided that main forms of civilization and the principal legal system of the world shall be represented in the Court.

## **DIPLOMACY**

Diplomacy is a part and parcel of international relations. Foreign policy comes into action only through diplomacy.

## Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

By making a foreign policy, government of every state participates in international politics and maintains interstate relations. One of the major instruments or techniques of executing foreign policy is diplomacy. Further the diplomats are the personnel or state officials who practise method or technique of diplomacy in day-to-day international affairs and in achieving foreign policy goals. Though the terms foreign policy and diplomacy are used interchangeably and are inter-dependent yet these are technically different. Foreign policy is the business of governments (top political leaders as policy makers such as head of government, cabinet ministers, parliament; and top foreign ministry bureaucrats and advisors) whereas diplomacy is the job of trained officials (diplomats such as envoys, ambassadors, high commissioners, charge d'affairs, counsellors, secretaries, attaches; consuls general, consuls, consular agents etc.). The former is substance, the latter is method. J.R. Childs has made a similar distinction between the two. In his words, the foreign policy of a state is "the substance of foreign relations" whereas "diplomacy proper is the process by which policy is carried out."<sup>1</sup>

Notwithstanding the above distinction both are interdependent and complementary in this complex contemporary world. The foreign policy making is closely related to one important function of diplomacy that is reporting and negotiation. The feed-back and reports received from ambassadors by the home government as well as negotiations carried on simultaneously at different world capitals and the UNO greatly influence its foreign policy decisions. This way diplomacy plays important role in foreign policy decision-making process. On the other hand in these days politicians not only frame foreign policy but at times conduct negotiations, participate in summits and conferences and actively indulge in diplomacy of foreign visits. These functions of policy makers are akin to roles of diplomats. Moreover, the policy makers continue to monitor the progress of diplomats in respect of the accomplishment of objectives determined by them and give necessary help wanted by the latter.

### Meaning and Definition

To achieve foreign policy objectives and to fulfil national interests, governments, communicate with those whose actions and behaviour they wish to deter, change or reinforce. No doubt very quick and sophisticated means of communication are available in this scientific world yet centuries old formal diplomatic channels are used by governments in addition to direct communication between foreign ministers and heads of state. That is why Frankel defines diplomacy as "the business of communicating between governments."<sup>2</sup> Similarly Lerche and Said define diplomacy as "a technique of state action... whereby communications from one government go directly into the decision-making apparatus of another ... If the operational purpose of policy is to secure the agreement of other states to national designs, it is only by diplomatic means that such assent can be formally registered and communicated. In this sense, diplomacy, is the central technique of foreign policy."

The Oxford English Dictionary, offers the following definition of diplomacy: "the management of international relations by negotiation; the method by which these relations are adjusted and " managed by ambassadors and envoys; the business or art of the diplomatist." According to the Chamber's Twentieth Century Dictionary, diplomacy is "the art of negotiation, especially of treaties between states; political skill."

In the words of Panikkar, an Indian diplomat, "Diplomacy, used in relation to international politics is the art of forwarding one's interests in relation to other countries." In this art diplomat has "to yield as little and gain as much as possible", in the interest of his country, "diplomacy involves a pitting of wits against each other."

“Diplomacy” defines Sir Ernest Satow “is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states.”

Harold Nicolson, a great scholar and practitioner of diplomacy in the twentieth century explains five different meanings of the word diplomacy. These are (1) as a synonym for foreign policy, (2) as negotiation, (3) the machinery by which such negotiation is carried out, (4) as a branch of the foreign service, and (5) as “an abstract quality or gift, which, in its best sense, implies skill in the conduct of international negotiation; and, in its worst sense, implies the more guileful aspects of tact.”<sup>6</sup> However, finally he also accepts the above mentioned definition given by the Oxford English Dictionary.

Quincy Wright explains at two levels. In the popular sense it means the tact, shrewdness, skill and intelligence with which negotiations are carried out; in the specific sense it means “the art of negotiation, in order to achieve the maximum of groups objectives with a minimum of costs, within a system of politics in which war is a possibility.”<sup>7</sup>

### **Nature and Characteristics of Diplomacy**

From the above definitions it may be deduced that the nature of diplomacy consists of the following:

1. It is a technique of implementing foreign policy.
2. Diplomacy is a channel or business of communicating between governments.
3. It is a method of adjusting and managing inter-state relations.
4. It is the art of forwarding nation’s interests.
5. It is a quality or skill of international negotiation.
6. It is a bargaining game aiming at achieving maximum and giving minimum.
7. It requires tact, intelligence, shrewdness and wit.
8. It implies both compromise and threat, persuasion and penalty, reward and punishment, carrot and stick and so on.
9. It is workable and useful both in peace and war.
10. For successful and effective working it requires trained and professional diplomats.

### **CLASSIFICATION OF DIPLOMATS**

In a technical and professional sense diplomacy includes two types of personnel: (i) diplomatic officers and (ii) consular officers.

(i) **Diplomatic personnel.** The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961) divided the heads of diplomatic missions into three general categories. The first category comprises ambassadors and high commissioners; the second comprises Envoys extra-ordinary and Ministers Plenipotentiary; and the third category is made of charges d’affaires. The diplomats of first two categories are accredited (officially presented) to the head of the host state whereas charges d’affaires are accredited to the foreign minister or secretary of the state of the host country.

A good number of diplomatic officials who work under the above in mission or embassy are (1) counsellors of embassy or legation who rank highest among diplomatic staff. (2) secretaries of an embassy or legation, usually ranked as first, second and third secretaries; and (3) attache’s who may be junior career officers or noncareer persons serving on a temporary basis.

**(ii) Consular personnel.** Related to the diplomatic function is the consular function and services. Consular functions (codified in the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, 1963) include processing and issuing entry and exit visas, facilitating commercial and other activities related to investment, processing ships' papers, and providing information about the home state to all interested parties. Consuls are divided into five classes: (1) Consul general; (2) Consuls; (3) Vice consuls of career; (4) Vice consuls not of career; and (5) Consular agents. Consular personnel enjoy less diplomatic privileges and immunities than diplomatic personnel in the host country.

## **Functions of Diplomacy**

Owing to the revolution in communications and growing trend of direct diplomacy between Heads of State and politicians the traditional functions of diplomacy have changed and diminished. Despite this change diplomacy in contemporary times has assumed new role and significance in many ways. In addition to the main role of diplomats in bargaining and communicating information, they perform several other functions which are discussed below:

### **(1) Representation.**

The diplomat represents his country abroad. This representation is of three types—symbolic, legal and political. As his country's symbolic representative he attends a number of ceremonies and functions such as Independence Day, Republic Day parades etc. As legal representative he casts his vote at international conferences on behalf of his government. As political representative, the diplomat is to sell the foreign policy of his country and project 'a favourable image of his country. "Whether in agriculture, medicine, music, physics, or military policies, if their government has some stake in a project, diplomats must symbolise that stake by their physical presence and continuing concern. In their symbolic capacity, ambassadors are concerned with the totality of relations—whether political or not—between their own country and the one to which they have been sent,"<sup>8</sup> summarizes Holsti.

### **(2) Negotiation.**

The second important function of diplomats is negotiating. It involves the transmission of messages between the foreign ministries of the home and the host states. Diplomats are mainly negotiators. Negotiation is the pursuit of agreement by compromise, bargaining and direct personal contact. Their function is to draft a wide variety of bilateral and multilateral agreements, treaties, conventions, protocols and other documents of a political, social and economic nature. Development in communication has reduced the role of the diplomat as negotiator, but the function of negotiation continues. Now mostly this role is performed by Heads of State/government and foreign ministers. As a negotiator diplomat is to bargain and strike a balance between 'giving what is asked and getting what is wanted.' Success in negotiation depends upon several factors such as preparation of agenda, maintenance of due secrecy, the spirit of compromise and the strength of military or economic power backing it. '

### **(3) Obtaining Information.**

According to Holsti, "information and data are the raw materials of foreign policy, the gathering of information—by official acts, at cocktail parties, or by covert means—is the most important task of the diplomat aside from his or her bargaining activities. Precise information must be made available to those who formulate policy if there is to be a minimum discrepancy between the objective environment and the image of the environment held by policy makers."<sup>9</sup> Only a resident diplomat can have the real feel of the political, economic, social and other conditions prevailing in the host foreign country.



#### **(4) Reporting.**

After gathering information next step is reporting the same to the home country. The way he interprets the obtained information and sends the same to home greatly helps his home country taking an effective decision. For instance, economic attache's will send reports to their home offices on balance of payments, growth rates, inflation and unemployment of the host state and trade and investment opportunities therein. Political officers usually report on the structures, processes and personalities of political movements and political parties in the host country. Relative electoral strength of different parties, their personalities, their friendliness or hostility towards the home state are also regularly reported. Military attache's send information regarding the host country's military force; the quality of its military leadership, military equipment, weapon system, strategic, military installations, tactical sites etc. Reports about religious activities, youth affairs, class structures, vital social statistics, ethnic, religious and social group activities are of great significance to political, economic and military analysis.

#### **(5) Protection of Nationals and National Interest.**

The diplomat has to protect the nationals of his country resident in the land in which he is stationed. He has to safeguard the interests of businessmen and other nationals who are living or travelling abroad and to prevent any sort of discrimination against them in foreign land. During catastrophes or civil disorders, the role of diplomat becomes more crucial. "Nationals have to be protected or evacuated, if necessary, they must be represented by legal counsel if jailed, and their property or other interests abroad must be protected if the local government does not provide such service,"<sup>10</sup> explains Holsti. The diplomats has to look after national interests as interpreted by policy makers and according to treaties and principles of international law. To promote own country's interests diplomat usually seeks to strengthen relations with friendly countries and neutralizes force hostile to itself.

#### **(6) Making Policies.**

These days diplomats also provide advice to makers of foreign policy and occasionally take significant policy decisions themselves. "All diplomats serve in a sense as policy makers, because they provide a large portion of the information upon which policy is based. A principal contribution of diplomats in the policy-making process thus comes from their skill of interpretation and judgement about conditions in the country to which they are accredited,"<sup>11</sup> observes Holsti. But their advice or warnings are not always considered or heeded by the top politicians that matter in their home countries.

#### **(7) The Substantive Functions.**

In the opinion of Poullada, "there are both substantive and procedural aspects" of the functions of diplomacy.

Five substantive functions of diplomacy, according to him are:

- i. conflict management,
- ii. problem solving,
- iii. cross-cultural interaction,
- iv. negotiation and bargaining, and
- v. program management. "

In order to perform these substantive functions the diplomat uses certain procedural arts and crafts such as the refinements of protocol, diplomatic drafting, press relations, yes, and even gastronomy,"

## **Instruments and Techniques of Diplomacy**

There are number of instruments and techniques of diplomacy that may be employed to achieve the goals of foreign policy. Kautilya, the ancient Indian master of statecraft and diplomacy has given four instruments of diplomacy that may be employed singly or jointly in a given situation. These are sama-reconciliation or negotiation, dana - giving gift or concession, danda-punishment and Wzeda-creating dissension. Similarly many modern writers are of the opinion that states usually adopt three basic mode of behaviour to achieve diplomatic objectives—cooperation, accommodation and opposition. Lerche and Said have put forward the following four techniques of diplomacy:

### **1. Coercion.**

Coercive moves made by other means are communicated diplomatically. In many cases, rupture of diplomatic relations has a coercive element, as does exclusion of the target state from international conferences or organizations. Coercion may also be applied in negotiation by an ultimatum, by establishment of a rigid time limit for the conclusion of an arrangement, or by the registration of a formal or informal protest or complaint.

### **2. Persuasion.**

The advancement of arguments and the proffering of quid pro quo, both persuasive devices, are within the exclusive province of diplomatic technique. While the actual line between coercion and persuasion is very thin, and the two techniques of tenly mix with each other, there is a real difference in both motivation and atmosphere, and most diplomatic initiatives are at least initially cast in persuasive form.

### **3. Adjustment.**

Diplomacy is an art of give and take. Adjustment is admirably suited to the task of enabling two states to modify their positions on an issue in order to reach a stable relationship. Its directions of communication, its potentially non-coercive nature, and its subtlety and flexibility all contribute to its usefulness. However, the adjustment function of diplomacy is effective only if both parties are amenable to negotiation and give and take; nothing in the diplomatic instrument can overcome a state's rigidity or unwillingness to change a policy.

### **4. Agreeinent.**

Diplomacy is a technique for reaching agreement. Usually it is believed that diplomacy is the art of negotiating written agreements. Agreement may involve coercion, persuasion, or adjustment, and that no agreement is possible unless both parties wish it. Formal written agreements are the most binding structures on international commitment offered by international politics, and can be reached only by diplomatic means.

## **Good Diplomacy and Ideal Diplomat**

Effectiveness and goodness of diplomacy depends upon the qualities and abilities of diplomats. A good number of scholars from ancient to present times have endeavoured to point out the qualities of an ideal diplomat. Indian ancient scholar Kautilya was of the opinion that an ideal diplomat should belong to a noble family and be skilful, possessed of a good memory, eloquent, honest and loyal to his own prince. Ottaviano Maggi in his work *De Legato* (1596) contended that an ambassdor should be trained theologian, should be well versed in Aristotle and Plato, and should be able to solve the abstruse problems in correct dialectical form. Sometimes it was demanded that 'a handsome youngman with a good complexion', or 'a capacity for absorbing without derangement vast quantities of intoxicating liquor' was considered essential in an envoy. No doubt these qualities are now not considered essential.

In 1716 Monsieur de Callieres in his treatise on diplomacy gave a list of qualities of a good diplomat, which are recognized even today. Instead of deception, deceit and intrigue, de Callie' res stresses integrity, continuity, good faith, and confidential but honest negotiation by professional diplomats. Two hundreds years after Callie' res, M. Jules Camleon also expressed the similar opinion. According to Camleon essential qualifications of a diplomat are moral authority, personal credibility, genial personality, compromising ability and lack of hotheadedness. K. Anatoliev believes that circumspection and an ability to evoke and maintain confidence are perhaps the most important qualities that an ideal diplomat should possess. By circumspection he means not to display hastiness in the assessment of various phenomena, in the policy of a country.

An authority on diplomacy, Nicolson 16 has enumerated the following seven qualities of an ideal diplomat which are widely acclaimed.

1. Truthfulness.

By this Nicolson means "not merely abstention from conscious misstatements, but a scrupulous care to avoid the suggestion of the false or the suppression of the true." It enhances an ambassador's long-range credibility and subsequent effectiveness.

2. Precision.

This means 'not merely intellectual accuracy but moral accuracy.' The diplomat should be accurate both in 'mind and soul.' Intellectual accuracy is the faithful description of the reality perceived by the ambassador. Moral accuracy is the ability of ambassadors to express their views boldly and to avoid providing the home office with ambiguous or politically agreeable reports.

3. Calm.

He should avoid "displaying irritation when confronted by the stupidity, dishonesty, brutality or conceit," and eschew all personal animosities, predilections, prejudices and exaggerations.

4. Good Temper.

He should be able to keep his temper under complete control at all times. A display of anger, for example, is regarded as a betrayal of weakness.

5. Patience.

Nicolson considers it an indispensable quality for the successful negotiator, and he quotes the words of French Ambassador M. Jules Camleon, "the wind is bound to be contrary at times, and then one has to tack to get into port."<sup>17</sup>

6. Modesty.

Modesty is a central quality. He should avoid variety and should not be flattered by or, worse, boast about their diplomatic victories and successes.

7. Loyalty.

loyalty that will prompt him to tell his government what it ought to know rather than what it wants to hear. And finally Nicolson reminds us the qualities of intelligence, charm, industry and courage and even tact.

## UNIT – V

# GLOBALIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

### What is 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 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.

### Meaning and Definition

A typical definition of globalization can be taken from the IMF (International Monetary Fund) which defines “Globalization as the growing economic interdependence of countries world wide 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 thus 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.”

A precise definition of globalization is elusive, but it is widely accepted that the world is becoming increasingly interconnected in terms of its economic, political and cultural life and that information technology (IT) is deeply implicated in the change process. It is an often misused word, as are all of its derivatives: global market, global economy, global business, global players, global power elite and so on. J. B. Gelinas has defined globalization as a system, a process and an ideology, a modern mythology and an alibi. Globalization may well be all these things, depending on ones point of view.

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 justify the established political and economic system and make people accept it as the only one that is legitimate, respectable and possible. The ideology of globalization is roughly the neo-liberal creed.

### Dimensions

All definition appears to agree that globalization has economic, political, cultural and technological aspects that may be closely intertwined. Whatever definition one accepts from whatever approach one might take, globalization is, obviously, a multidimensional process with, four primary dimensions. They are:

## 1. The Economic

This central dimension of globalization refers primarily to the increase in international trade and the success of the free market economy. What is startlingly new, however, is that these recent economic policies have effectively created a world market where workers, consumers, and companies have the potential (whether they know it or not) to enter into economic relationships with other workers, consumers and companies anywhere in the world. This is often known as economic globalization 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. It also involves increase in international trade, increase in international flow of capital through Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), increased role of international organization like WTO, IMF, and World Bank, increase in economic practices like outsourcing by MNCs, etc. Private capital flows to developing countries soared during the 1990s, replacing “aid” or development assistance which fell significantly after the early 1980s. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) became the most important category. Depending on the paradigm, economic globalization can be viewed as either a positive or a negative phenomenon.

## 2. The Technological

The technological dimension of globalization refers primarily to the advancements of (a) NICTs 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, which have done much to create the interconnectedness of the world, to improved logistics systems, which have enabled industries worldwide to function more efficiently and profitably, to modern agronomic practices, which are restoring infertile lands and opening up new opportunities in agriculture. 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. Technological innovations or technological transfer benefit most of the developing and Least Developing Countries (LDCs). Copyright laws and patents became established in the global competitive market.

## 3. The Political

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 neoliberalism. Neoliberalism—promoted by the Reagan and Thatcher governments of the 1980s—essentially calls for a less interventionist state in both economic and social arenas, and its adherents, who have been in power at the World Bank and International Monetary Fund for over twenty years, 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

The cultural dimension of globalization appears at first glance to be a schizophrenic one. On the one hand, our 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. International travel and tourism also accelerated as part of the globalization process. 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. But while the cultural dimension of globalization is certainly a significant one, the focus here, since we are concerned primarily with sustainable development, will be more on the economic, technological and political.

#### Impacts of Globalization

Globalization is the source of much debate and controversy about its nature and its merits. It is a complex process constantly redefined as world trends keep shifting and changing. Such debates have been fierce, with its supporters seeing Globalization as an economic savior for the world's poor and as helping to improve the quality of life; its opponents consider it to be oppressing the developing world, destroying local culture and contributing to global warming. Sharply differing and conflicting views on the impacts and implications of globalization has been juxtaposed. An issue of central importance in the globalization debate today concerns the impact of increasing economic openness upon national economy. Openness has, therefore, been interpreted differently. There is a hot debate on the issue between two prominent schools of globalization – “Constraints” and “the Sceptics”.

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. Also 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 other school is “the Sceptics” often referred to as “institutional adaptationists”. They 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”.

As more nations, people, and cultures adapt to the ever changing international community, diplomats, politicians, and representatives must meet and deal with accordingly to the needs and wants of nations. Diplomacy can be exerted in many forms; through peace talks, written constitutions, field experiences, etc. Culture is a familiar term and remains unchanged by definition. However, globalization and international relations have constantly altered culture both positively and negatively.

Globalization increases worldwide technology, and the readability of fast, effective communication and consumption of popular products. Globalization links cultures and international relations on a variety of levels; economics, politically, socially, etc. International relations have used globalization to reach its goal: of understanding cultures. International relations focus on how countries, people and organizations interact and globalization is making a profound effect on International relations.

## THEORIES OF GLOBALIZATION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS:

International relations theory is the study of international relations (IR) from a theoretical perspective. It attempts to provide a conceptual framework upon which international relations can be analyzed. Ole Holsti describes international relations theories as acting like pairs of coloured sunglasses that allow the wearer to see only salient events relevant to the theory; e.g., an adherent of realism may completely disregard an event that a constructivist might pounce upon as crucial, and vice versa. The three most prominent theories are realism, liberalism and constructivism.

International relations theories can be divided into “positivist/rationalist” theories which focus on a principally state-level analysis, and “post-positivist/reflectivist” ones which incorporate expanded meanings of security, ranging from class, to gender, to postcolonial security. Many often conflicting ways of thinking exist in IR theory, including constructivism, institutionalism, Marxism, neo-Gramscianism, and others. However, two positivist schools of thought are most prevalent: realism and liberalism. Constructivism, however, is increasingly becoming mainstream.

The study of International relations as theory can be traced to E. H. Carr’s *The Twenty Years’ Crisis* which was published in 1939 and to Hans Morgenthau’s *Politics Among Nations* published in 1948. International relations as a discipline is believed to have emerged after the First World War with the establishment of a Chair of International Relations at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth. Early international relations scholarship in the interwar years focused on the need for the balance of power system to be replaced with a system of collective security. These thinkers were later described as “Idealists”. The leading critique of this school of thinking was the “realist” analysis offered by Carr.

However, a more recent study by David Long and Brian Schmidt in 2005, offers a revisionist account of the origins of the field International Relations. They claim, that the history of the field can be traced back to late 19th Century imperialism and internationalism. The fact that the history of the field is presented by “great debates”, such as the realist-idealist debate does not correspond with the historic evidence found in earlier works: “We should once and for all dispense with the outdated anachronistic artifice of the debate between the idealists and realists as the dominant framework for and understanding the history of the field”. Their revisionist account claims that up until 1918, International Relations already existed in the form of colonial administration, race science and race development.

Explanatory and constitutive approaches in international relations theory is a distinction made when classifying international relations theories. Explanatory theories are ones which see the world as something external to theorize about it. A constitutive theory is one which believes that theories actually help construct the world.

### REALISM:

Realism or political realism has been the dominant theory of international relations since the conception of the discipline. The theory claims to rely upon an ancient tradition of thought which includes writers such as Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Hobbes. Early realism can be characterized as a reaction against interwar idealist thinking. The outbreak of World War II was seen by realists as evidence of the deficiencies of idealist thinking. There are various strands of modern-day realist thinking. However, the main tenets of the theory have been identified as statism, survival, and self-help.

- Statism: Realists believe that nation states are the main actors in international politics. As such it is a state-centric theory of international relations. This contrasts with liberal international relations theories which accommodate roles for non-state actors and international institutions. This difference is sometimes expressed by describing a realist world view as one which sees nation states as billiard balls, liberals would consider relationships between states to be more of a cobweb.

- **Survival:** Realists believe that the international system is governed by anarchy, meaning that there is no central authority. Therefore, international politics is a struggle for power between self-interested states.
- **Self-help:** Realists believe that no other states can be relied upon to help guarantee the state's survival.

Realism makes several key assumptions. It assumes that nation-states are unitary, geographically based actors in an anarchic international system with no authority above capable of regulating interactions between states as no true authoritative world government exists. Secondly, it assumes that sovereign states, rather than intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, or multinational corporations, are the primary actors in international affairs. Thus, states, as the highest order, are in competition with one another. As such, a state acts as a rational autonomous actor in pursuit of its own self-interest with a primary goal to maintain and ensure its own security—and thus its sovereignty and survival. Realism holds that in pursuit of their interests, states will attempt to amass resources, and that relations between states are determined by their relative levels of power. That level of power is in turn determined by the state's military, economic, and political capabilities.

Some realists, known as human nature realists or classical realists] believe that states are inherently aggressive, that territorial expansion is constrained only by opposing powers, while others, known as offensive/defensive realists, believe that states are obsessed with the security and continuation of the state's existence. The defensive view can lead to a security dilemma, where increasing one's own security can bring along greater instability as the opponent(s) builds up its own arms, making security a zero-sum game where only *relative gains* can be made.

### **Neorealism:**

Neorealism or structural realism is a development of realism advanced by Kenneth Waltz in *Theory of International Politics*. It is, however, only one strand of neorealism. Joseph Grieco has combined neo-realist thinking with more traditional realists. This strand of theory is sometimes called "modern realism". Waltz's neorealism contends that the effect of structure must be taken into account in explaining state behavior. Structure is defined twofold as: a) the ordering principle of the international system which is anarchy, and b) the distribution of capabilities across units. Waltz also challenges traditional realism's emphasis on traditional military power, instead characterizing power in terms of the combined capabilities of the state.

### **LIBERALISM:**

The precursor to liberal international relations theory was "idealism". Idealism (or utopianism) was viewed critically by those who saw themselves as "realists", for instance E. H. Carr. In international relations, idealism (also called "Wilsonianism" because of its association with Woodrow Wilson who personified it) is a school of thought that holds that a state should make its internal political philosophy the goal of its foreign policy. For example, an idealist might believe that ending poverty at home should be coupled with tackling poverty abroad. Wilson's idealism was a precursor to liberal international relations theory, which would arise amongst the "institution-builders" after World War II.

Liberalism holds that state preferences, rather than state capabilities, are the primary determinant of state behavior. Unlike realism, where the state is seen as a unitary actor, liberalism allows for plurality in state actions. Thus, preferences will vary from state to state, depending on factors such as culture, economic system or government type. Liberalism also holds that interaction between states is not limited to the political/security ("high politics"), but also economic/cultural ("low politics") whether through commercial



firms, organizations or individuals. Thus, instead of an anarchic international system, there are plenty of opportunities for cooperation and broader notions of power, such as cultural capital (for example, the influence of films leading to the popularity of the country's culture and creating a market for its exports worldwide). Another assumption is that absolute gains can be made through co-operation and interdependence—thus peace can be achieved.

The democratic peace theory argues that liberal democracies have never (or almost never) made war on one another and have fewer conflicts among themselves. This is seen as contradicting especially the realist theories and this empirical claim is now one of the great disputes in political science. Numerous explanations have been proposed for the democratic peace. It has also been argued, as in the book *Never at War*, that democracies conduct diplomacy in general very differently from non-democracies. (Neo)realists disagree with Liberals over the theory, often citing structural reasons for the peace, as opposed to the state's government. Sebastian Rosato, a critic of democratic peace theory, points to America's behavior towards left-leaning democracies in Latin America during the Cold War to challenge democratic peace. One argument is that economic interdependence makes war between trading partners less likely. In contrast realists claim that economic interdependence increases rather than decreases the likelihood of conflict.

### **Neoliberalism**

Neoliberalism, liberal institutionalism is an advancement of liberal thinking. It argues that international institutions can allow nations to successfully cooperate in the international system.

### **Complex Interdependence**

Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, in response to neorealism, develop an opposing theory they dub "Complex interdependence." Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye explain, "... complex interdependence sometimes comes closer to reality than does realism." In explaining this, Keohane and Nye cover the three assumptions in realist thought: First, states are coherent units and are the dominant actors in international relations; second, force is a usable and effective instrument of policy; and finally, the assumption that there is a hierarchy in international politics.

The heart of Keohane and Nye's argument is that in international politics there are, in fact, multiple channels that connect societies exceeding the conventional Westphalian system of states. This manifests itself in many forms ranging from informal governmental ties to multinational corporations and organizations. Here they define their terminology; interstate relations are those channels assumed by realists; transgovernmental relations occur when one relaxes the realist assumption that states act coherently as units; transnational applies when one removes the assumption that states are the only units. It is through these channels that political exchange occurs, not through the limited interstate channel as championed by realists.

Secondly, Keohane and Nye argue that there is not, in fact, a hierarchy among issues, meaning that not only is the martial arm of foreign policy not the supreme tool by which to carry out a state's agenda, but that there are a multitude of different agendas that come to the forefront. The line between domestic and foreign policy becomes blurred in this case, as realistically there is no clear agenda in interstate relations.

Finally, the use of military force is not exercised when complex interdependence prevails. The idea is developed that between countries in which a complex interdependence exists, the role of the military in resolving disputes is negated. However, Keohane and Nye go on to state that the role of the military is in fact important in that "alliance's political and military relations with a rival bloc."

## Post-liberalism

One version of post-liberal theory argues that within the modern, globalized world, states in fact are driven to cooperate in order to ensure security and sovereign interests. The departure from classical liberal theory is most notably felt in the re-interpretation of the concepts of sovereignty and autonomy. Autonomy becomes a problematic concept in shifting away from a notion of freedom, self-determination, and agency to a heavily responsible and duty laden concept. Importantly, autonomy is linked to a capacity for good governance. Similarly, sovereignty also experiences a shift from a right to a duty. In the global economy, International organizations hold sovereign states to account, leading to a situation where sovereignty is co-produced among "sovereign" states. The concept becomes a variable capacity of good governance and can no longer be accepted as an absolute right. One possible way to interpret this theory, is the idea that in order to maintain global stability and security and solve the problem of the anarchic world system in International Relations, no overarching, global, sovereign authority is created. Instead, states collectively abandon some rights for full autonomy and sovereignty. Another version of post-liberalism, drawing on work in political philosophy after the end of the Cold War, as well as on democratic transitions in particular in Latin America, argues that social forces from below are essential in understanding the nature of the state and the international system. Without understanding their contribution to political order and its progressive possibilities, particularly in the area of peace in local and international frameworks, the weaknesses of the state, the failings of the liberal peace, and challenges to global governance cannot be realised or properly understood. Furthermore, the impact of social forces on political and economic power, structures, and institutions, provides some empirical evidence of the complex shifts currently underway in IR.

## CONSTRUCTIVISM:

Constructivism or social constructivism has been described as a challenge to the dominance of neo-liberal and neo-realist international relations theories. Michael Barnett describes constructivist international relations theories as being concerned with how ideas define international structure, how this structure defines the interests and identities of states and how states and non-state actors reproduce this structure.] The key element of constructivism is the belief that "International politics is shaped by persuasive ideas, collective values, culture, and social identities." Constructivism argues that international reality is socially constructed by cognitive structures which give meaning to the material world. The theory emerged from debates concerning the scientific method of international relations theories and theories role in the production of international power. Emanuel Adler states that constructivism occupies a middle ground between rationalist and interpretative theories of international relations.

Constructivist theory criticises the static assumptions of traditional international relations theory and emphasizes that international relations is a social construction. Constructivism is a theory critical of the ontological basis of rationalist theories of international relations. Whereas realism deals mainly with security and material power, and liberalism looks primarily at economic interdependence and domestic-level factors, constructivism most concerns itself with the role of ideas in shaping the international system; indeed it is possible there is some overlap between constructivism and realism or liberalism, but they remain separate schools of thought. By "ideas" constructivists refer to the goals, threats, fears, identities, and other elements of perceived reality that influence states and non-state actors within the international system. Constructivists believe that these ideational factors can often have far-reaching effects, and that they can trump materialistic power concerns.

For example, constructivists note that an increase in the size of the U.S. military is likely to be viewed with much greater concern in Cuba, a traditional antagonist of the United States, than in Canada, a close U.S. ally. Therefore, there must be perceptions at work in shaping international outcomes. As such, constructivists do not see anarchy as the invariable foundation of the international system, but rather argue,

in the words of Alexander Wendt, that “anarchy is what states make of it”. Constructivists also believe that social norms shape and change foreign policy over time rather than security which realists cite.

## **MARXISM AND CRITICAL THEORY:**

Marxist and Neo-Marxist international relations theories are structuralist paradigms which reject the realist/liberal view of state conflict or cooperation; instead focusing on the economic and material aspects. Marxist approaches argue the position of historical materialism and make the assumption that the economic concerns transcend others; allowing for the elevation of *class* as the focus of study. Marxists view the international system as an integrated capitalist system in pursuit of capital accumulation. A sub-discipline of Marxist IR is Critical Security Studies. Gramscian approaches rely on the ideas of Italian Antonio Gramsci whose writings concerned the hegemony that capitalism holds as an ideology. Marxist approaches have also inspired Critical Theorists such as Robert W. Cox who argues that “Theory is always for someone and for some purpose”.

One notable Marxist approach to international relations theory is Immanuel Wallerstein’s World-system theory which can be traced back to the ideas expressed by Lenin in *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of capitalism*. World-system theory argues that globalized capitalism has created a core of modern industrialized countries which exploit a periphery of exploited “Third World” countries. These ideas were developed by the Latin American Dependency School. “Neo-Marxist” or “New Marxist” approaches have returned to the writings of Karl Marx for their inspiration. Key “New Marxists” include Justin Rosenberg and Benno Teschke. Marxist approaches have enjoyed a renaissance since the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe.

Criticisms of Marxists approaches to international relations theory include the narrow focus on material and economic aspects of life.

## **Role of Non-State actors in contemporary International Politics**

Non-state actors are categorized as entities that (i) participating or acting in the sphere of international relations; organizations with sufficient power to influence and cause change in politics which are (ii) not belonging to or existing as a state-structure or established institution of a state; are not holding the characteristics of this, these being legal sovereignty and some measure of control over a countries people and territories.

Types of non-state actors

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)

These groups are typically considered a part of civil society.

Multinational Corporations (MNCs; also known as Transnational Corporations

The International Media

Violent non-state actors

Armed groups, including groups such as Al-Qaeda Criminal organizations.

Religious Groups

Transnational diaspora communities

Most types of non-state actors would be considered part of civil society, though some function within the international market (e.g. MNCs and organized crime). The proliferation of non-state actors in the post-Cold War era has been one of the factors leading to the theorizing of the Cobweb Paradigm in International Politics. Under this paradigm, the traditional Westphalian nation-state is experiencing an erosion of power and sovereignty, and non-state actors are part of the cause. Facilitated by globalization, non-state

actors have challenged nation-state borders and claims to sovereignty. MNCs are not always sympathetic to the home country's or host country's national interests, but instead loyalty is given to the corporation's interests. NGOs are challenging the nation-state's sovereignty over internal matters through advocacy for societal issues, e.g. human rights and the environment.

There exist many armed non-state actors, e.g. opposition groups, that operate without state control and are involved in trans-border conflicts. The prevalence of these groups in armed conflicts has added layers of complexity to traditional conflict management and resolution. These conflicts are often fought not only between non-state actors and states, but also between non-state actors.

Any attempts at intervention in such conflicts has been particularly challenging given the fact that international law and norms governing the use of force for intervention or peacekeeping purposes has been primarily written in the context of the nation-state. So, the demands of non-state actors at the local and international level have further complicated international relations. Non-state actors have increasingly become vital for opinion building in international forum and actively participate in a number of multilateral processes, such as the Human Rights Council. International Organizations also rely on non-state actors, particularly NGOs in the form of implementing partners in the national context.

For the most part of the discipline's history, international relations scholars have disregarded non-state actors like businesses, civic groups, transnational terrorist organizations and so on, since they appeared to stand on the border lines of world politics. They persisted, but their size, power and activities made them third-rate factors in making an analysis of world relations. Most scholars have seen states as the primary actors and, therefore, the sole legitimate object of study because state action – mainly in the form of military, diplomatic and policy activity – shaped the maps of international collective life to a large extent. This disregard for non-state actors began to change towards the end of the last century. In the beginning, scholars demonstrated that non-state actors, even though still lie within the shadow of states, remarkably control the behaviour of state. They started to view non-state actors as transnational pressure groups that porch or else try to control government officials. As time passed, it became clear that non-state entities were not merely outgrowths to the state-system, but they had their individual political life.

Transnational businesses, especially multinational corporations, change the economic scenario of world relations. Public minded non-governmental organizations not only porch government officials in different countries, but function to transfer vast cultural understandings concerning human rights, environmental protection and international peace. Humanitarian relief organizations go through action on the ground to feed, clothe, shelter and provide medical aid to those in times of need. Global media outlets form and broadly disseminate new understandings of world relations. Terrorist networks instill fright and change political calculations in different parts of the world. Apart from being at the borders of political life, non-state actors seem to be key players.

The mount of non-state actors such as multinational corporations is fraction of a wider prototype mainly in terms of the growth of complex interdependencies in the international scheme. Many transnational interactions are not under the control of states, but will yet be affected by decisions taken by states. On the other hand, the state in its turn will be affected by the activities of other actors as well as by the complex network of transnational interactions that has become an increasingly vital constituent in international relations. The crash of transnational support networks could well be outweighed by the blow of subterranean networks which challenge global norms, undermine global governance and look for to counterbalance instead of mobilizing the power of states. Appreciation of the significance of non-state actors rapidly gave way to love. International relations scholars began to view certain non-state actors as promising agents of progressive social change. Scholars gave hope in these organizations and saw them as harbingers of a just, peaceful, economically viable and environmentally sane world. In fact, many scholars viewed non-state

actors, on the whole, as boosting a nascent global democracy wherein transnational civil society would provide a non-state form of global representation.

## **International Terrorism - Causes, Interpretations and Preventives**

Terrorism is fundamentally an attack on the state. It may be described as an act of violence, committed against innocent people to create fear, with an underlying political motive. This fear is an intended effect and not merely a by-product of terrorism. International Terrorism has international or trans-national consequences in which terrorists strike targets outside and beyond their country of origin such as the 11th September World Trade Centre attack or the strikes by Pakistan-based outfits in Jammu and Kashmir (J&K). International Terrorism also implies that such terrorist groups, e.g. Jammat-e-Islami, Al Qaida, etc. have an organization/network/linkage in a number of countries. International terrorism is not a new phenomenon to the world. The September 11th incident has only demonstrated another facet of international terrorism – the tremendous potency of technology and innovation – besides the globalization of economies, which have come to transcend national boundaries. Multi-national corporations and non-state players now have a worldwide reach. These have compromised the authority of the state. Non-state players and black money as well as narcotics trade have acquired power, making some of the terrorist groups (JEI, LTTE & PLO) financially viable and independent. The revolution in information technology (IT) and communication also enables instant transmission of ideas and information at a global level, by the terrorist outfits who can now exploit 'cyber' terrorism as well as the deadly and sophisticated Precision-Guided Missiles (PGMs), and other weapons of mass destruction. Terrorism today, therefore, has been transformed into a trans-national, high-tech, lethal and global phenomenon. The response to terrorism needs to be structured accordingly and the decision making process also needs to be modernized.

### **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. Economic interests of national and multi-national corporations (MNCs) pre-dominate all other interests. Therefore, unfriendly acts by some of our neighbors are not questioned. The lack of international cooperation to undertake anti-terrorist action till the September 11 incident also contributed to the growth of terrorism. There are also some political, cultural and psychological undercurrents which have also played behind terrorism.

#### **1. Political Causes**

In some cases the dissidents have what may best be described as political motivations. It's said that war is diplomacy by other means; violent political conflict could be described as politics by other means. 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. In the case of oppressed minorities, opposed by a strong, entrenched regime, terrorism may be seen as the only available option. This is especially true where demands for political reform are ignored, where there are few, if any, external allies, and where the regime resorts to collective punishment for what are seen as reasonable and justified demands.

### 3. Psychological Causes

A surprising number of pro-government analysts favor this explanation, which asserts that 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. This can include cases where the goal is the psychological benefit achieved by vengeance. Psychologically motivated terrorism is simply a criminal act, like serial killing.

#### Interpretations on International Terrorism

While interpreting terrorism, in addition to those situations already covered by the existing anti-terrorist instruments, it should be made clear that acts defined as terrorism can never be justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature. It's doubtful that terrorism is any sane person's first choice. Most disgruntled people would start with a petition stating their grievances and setting forth their demands for reform. If denied, they might organize to demonstrate, or protest and might engage in civil disobedience – all designed to attract public attention and broaden their support. If denied again, they might attempt legal action, if such avenues are open to them. The reactions of the state government can directly influence the course of future events. Oftentimes, counter-demonstrators who fear that the government will give into dissident's demands confront demonstrators. These clashes can lead to violence and destroy hope for resolution of the problems.

There are three perspectives of terrorism: the terrorist's, the victim's, and the general public's. In the perspective of the terrorist, ideology and motivation will influence the objectives of terrorist operations, especially regarding the casualty rate and the phrase, one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter, is a view terrorists themselves would accept. Groups with non-religious goals will attempt to target as minimal number of casualties in comparison to religious and military oriented who attempt to inflict as many casualties as possible. The type of target selected will often reflect motivations and ideologies and they conduct attacks on representative individuals whom they associate with economic exploitation, social injustice, or political repression. Also, due to the secretive nature and small size of terrorist organizations, they often offer opponents no clear organization to defend against or to deter.

As for the victims, they are generally devastated beyond description, and severely traumatized; view the terrorists as extremely volatile, unpredictable, unsympathetic and merciless. They do get help and aid from the government, but live the rest of the lives in paranoia and suffering, emotionally, physically and psychologically. The general public is very adversely affected too, though to a lesser extent in comparison to the victims, they generally become more alert to the world happenings, governmental processes, and protests and uproars from different segments of the world's population.

#### Cures

It is clear that a long-term strategy is required to counter terrorism. It has to be comprehensively addressed on all fronts, political, economic, social and military. This strategy needs to be evolved from our national aims and objectives to protect 'core values'. International terrorism cannot effectively be fought alone. At the international level states should aim for a rapid conclusion of the negotiations on the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism and the draft international convention for the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism with a view to adopting these instruments expeditiously, as called for in Security Council resolution 1566 (2004) and in the report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. International organizations, including in particular regional organizations and their member States, should adopt without delay 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, in order to give prompt and full effect to the legal measures identified in Security Council Resolution 1566 (2004).

States should develop modalities for international cooperation and coordination within the regional and universal organizations of which they are members, taking advantage of the modalities already in place within existing organizations of which they may not be members. 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. In order to help States identify terrorist organizations to whom financial support is prohibited by the Convention on the Suppression of Terrorist Financing and Security Council resolution 1373 (2001), the Counter Terrorism Committee (CTC) established by the Security Council should develop a core list of organizations that the CTC determines to be involved, directly or indirectly, with acts of financing of terrorism. States would also remain free to impose sanctions on non-listed organizations that the State determines to be involved in terrorism.

In acting under chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council should pay due regard to obligations that States have assumed under international law by virtue of human rights treaties and customary international law. This applies in particular if a decision by the Council may affect someone's civil rights and obligations, since the right to judicial review exists in the determination of such rights and obligations. The Committee established under Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) should extend technical assistance to States in the implementation of the resolution, in particular, by way of assistance in preparing the necessary domestic legislation and establishing effective domestic control measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons and their means of delivery. Effective multilateral and bilateral assistance to the safety and justice sector in low- income and middle-income countries is an essential component in the efforts to prevent or suppress terrorism. The international community should therefore contribute financially to advocacy, public awareness and training activities, targeting a larger body of experts, and make sure there is information and cooperation with respect to existing best practices among States. In order to ensure the quality of this assistance it should be subject to continuous third- party evaluation. In the prevention or suppression of terrorism the same standard should apply to all. For the purpose of preventing and suppressing terrorism, States should co-operate through joint actions or the establishment of international institutions. Regional organizations should engage actively in efforts to prevent or suppress terrorism, if they have not already done so. The periodic meetings between the United Nations Counter Terrorism Committee and representatives of such organizations should be a particularly useful tool to ensure synergies and avoid dispersion.

Non-governmental organizations that are in a position to extend assistance to States in the process of ratifying and implementing conventions against terrorism should make this known. States that have not ratified or acceded to the relevant international instruments against terrorism should be linked with those who have done so and who are in a position to offer assistance in subscribing to these instruments. The possibility of treating specific acts of terrorism which involve systematic attacks against the civilian population as crimes within the existing jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court (ICC) should be considered, bearing in mind that individual States have primary responsibility to prosecute suspected perpetrators of the most serious crimes and that the ICC is complementary to national jurisdiction. The Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute should also explore ways and means of including acts of terrorism which constitute serious international crimes under existing international instruments relating to terrorism or as defined in a future comprehensive convention on terrorism, as a crime within the scope of the ICC Statute.

## ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:

Environmental issues first emerged as a focus for international politics in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the context of International agreements to manage resources. For example, the River Commissions for the Rhine and the Danube which are now deeply involved with environmental policy began life as arrangements to facilitate economic use of the rivers as waterways. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) was formed in 1948, more or less as a 'shipowners club' to facilitate international shipping and navigation and promote safety. But in 1954 the IMO was given responsibility for implementing a landmark treaty on marine pollution: the Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by oil.

The first international treaty on flora, signed in Bern in 1889, was primarily concerned with preventing the spread of a disease (Phylloxera) which threatened to destroy European vineyards. This was followed by a series of global and regional agreements on flora in the 1920's and 1950's, which were all similarly concerned with maintaining healthy stocks of cultivated plants or preventing disease. Likewise, the first agreement on fauna was the 1902 Convention for the Protection of Birds useful to Agriculture. In 1911, the USA, Canada, and Russia agreed a Convention for the Protection of Fur Seals, which were being unsustainably culled. In 1945, the UN Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) was set up with the conservation of natural resources included in its mandate. The 1946 International Whaling Convention essentially established a club of whaling nations to manage the harvesting of whales. Even at the time, however, there was emerging concern to protect wildlife for its own sake as well as an economic resource. Conventions were signed to protect birds, in large part due to public pressures mobilised by groups such as the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. It was in the 1960's, however, that International concern about pollution and the preservation of the natural environment began to develop rapidly, particularly in developed countries.

## THE STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE: United Nations Conference on the Human Environment

The **United Nations Conference on the Human Environment** was held in Stockholm, Sweden from June 5-16 in 1972.

When the UN General Assembly decided to convene the 1972 Stockholm Conference, at the initiative of the Government of Sweden to host it, UN Secretary-General U Thant invited Maurice Strong to lead it as Secretary-General of the Conference, as the Canadian diplomat (under Pierre Trudeau) had initiated and already worked for over two years on the project.

Sweden first suggested to ECOSOC in 1968 the idea of having a UN conference to focus on human interactions with the environment. ECOSOC passed resolution 1346 supporting the idea. General Assembly Resolution 2398 in 1969 decided to convene a conference in 1972 and mandated a set of reports from the UN secretary-general suggesting that the conference focus on "stimulating and providing guidelines for action by national government and international organizations" facing environmental issues.

## STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE:

The meeting agreed upon a Declaration containing 26 principles concerning the environment and development; an Action Plan with 109 recommendations, and a Resolution. Principles of the Stockholm Declaration:

1. Human rights must be asserted, apartheid and colonialism condemned
2. Natural resources must be safeguarded
3. The Earth's capacity to produce renewable resources must be maintained
4. Wildlife must be safeguarded
5. Non-renewable resources must be shared and not exhausted



6. Pollution must not exceed the environment's capacity to clean itself
7. Damaging oceanic pollution must be prevented
8. Development is needed to improve the environment
9. Developing countries therefore need assistance
10. Developing countries need reasonable prices for exports to carry out environmental management
11. Environment policy must not hamper development
12. Developing countries need money to develop environmental safeguards
13. Integrated development planning is needed
14. Rational planning should resolve conflicts between environment and development
15. Human settlements must be planned to eliminate environmental problems
16. Governments should plan their own appropriate population policies
17. National institutions must plan development of states' natural resources
18. Science and technology must be used to improve the environment
19. Environmental education is essential
20. Environmental research must be promoted, particularly in developing countries
21. States may exploit their resources as they wish but must not endanger others
22. Compensation is due to states thus endangered
23. Each nation must establish its own standards
24. There must be cooperation on international issues
25. International organizations should help to improve the environment
26. Weapons of mass destruction must be eliminated

One of the seminal issue that emerged from the conference is the recognition for poverty alleviation for protecting the environment. The Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in her seminal speech in the conference brought forward the connection between ecological management and poverty alleviation.

Some argue that this conference, and more importantly the scientific conferences preceding it, had a real impact on the environmental policies of the European Community(that later became the European Union). For example, in 1973, the EU created the Environmental and Consumer Protection Directorate, and composed the first Environmental Action Program. Such increased interest and research collaboration arguably paved the way for further understanding of global warming, which has led to such agreements as the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement, and has given a foundation of modern environmentalism.

### Climate change

Climate change is now widely recognized as the major environmental problem facing the globe. Climate change has long-since ceased to be a scientific curiosity, and is no longer just one of many environmental and regulatory concerns. As the United Nations Secretary General has said, it is the major, overriding environmental issue of our time, and the single greatest challenge facing environmental regulators. It is a growing crisis with political, economic, health and safety, food production, security, and other dimensions. Climate change refers to a change in the state of the climate that can be identified by changes in the variability of its properties, and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer. It refers to any change in climate over time, whether due to natural variability or as a result of human activity.

Climate change is one of the defining challenges of our time. Receding forests, changing rainfall patterns and rising sea levels will exacerbate existing economic, political and humanitarian stresses and affect human development in all parts of the world. As the leading global organization in the fight against poverty, with a presence in 177 countries and territories, UNDP is responding on the front lines of climate change. UNDP works with national, regional, and local planning bodies to help them respond effectively to climate change and promote low-emission, climate-resilient development. Climate change is expected to hit

developing countries the hardest. Its effects—higher temperatures, changes in precipitation patterns, rising sea levels, and more frequent weather-related disasters pose risks for agriculture, food, and water supplies. Impacts are already being seen in unprecedented heat waves, cyclones, floods, salinisation of the coastline and effects on agriculture, fisheries and health.

At stake are recent gains in the fight against poverty, hunger and disease, and the lives and livelihoods of billions of people in developing countries. Tackling this immense challenge must involve both mitigation and adaptation techniques. Shifting weather patterns, for example, threaten food production through increased unpredictability of precipitation, rising sea levels contaminate coastal freshwater reserves and increase the risk of catastrophic flooding, and a warming atmosphere aids the pole-ward spread of pests and diseases once limited to the tropics. The changing climate impacts society and ecosystems in a broad variety of ways. For example climate change can increase or decrease rainfall, influence agricultural crop yields, affect human health, cause changes to forests and other ecosystems, or even impact our energy supply. Climate-related impacts are occurring across regions of the country and across many sectors of our economy. Many state and local governments are already preparing for the impacts of climate change through adaptation, which is planning for the changes that are expected to occur.

For India and other developing countries, climate change is a potential threat to sustainable development. Through a multitude of government, private, and individual initiatives, the country is making serious efforts to conserve energy, harness renewables, protect forests, and enhance understanding about climate change. By adopting this climate-friendly path to development, India is contributing effectively to global efforts for protecting our planet. Like other developing countries, several sections of the Indian populace will not be able to buffer themselves from impacts of global warming. With close economic ties to natural resources and climate-sensitive sectors such as agriculture, water and forestry, India may face a major threat, and require serious adaptive capacity to combat climate change. As a developing country, India can little afford the risks and economic backlashes that industrialized nations can. With 27.5% of the population still below the poverty line, reducing vulnerability to the impacts of climate change is essential. Many studies have underscored the nation's vulnerability to climate change. With changes in key climate variables, namely temperature, precipitation and humidity, crucial sectors like agriculture and rural development are likely to be affected in a major way. India is home to a third of the world's poor, and climate change will hit this section of society the hardest. Set to be the most populous nation in the world by 2045, the economic, social and ecological price of climate change will be massive.

### Global warming

Global warming is the rise in the average temperature of Earth's atmosphere and oceans since the late 19th century, and its projected continuation. Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, and scientists are more than 90% certain that it is primarily caused by increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases produced by human activities such as deforestation and the burning of fossil fuels. These findings are recognized by the national science academies of all major industrialized nations. An increase in global temperature will cause sea levels to rise and will change the amount and pattern of precipitation, as well as cause a probable expansion of subtropical deserts. Other likely effects of the warming include a more frequent occurrence of extreme-weather events including heat waves, droughts and heavy rainfall, species extinctions due to shifting temperature regimes, and changes in crop yields. Warming and related changes will vary from region to region around the globe, with projections being more robust in some areas than others.

Vulnerability of human societies to climate change mainly lies in the effects of extreme-weather events rather than gradual climate change. Impacts of climate change so far include adverse effects on small islands, adverse effects on indigenous populations in high-latitude areas, and small but discernable effects on human health. Over the 21st century, climate change is likely to adversely affect hundreds of millions

of people through increased coastal flooding, reductions in water supplies, increased malnutrition and increased health impacts. Most economic studies suggest losses of world gross domestic product (GDP) for this magnitude of warming. In small islands and mega deltas, inundation as a result of sea level rise is expected to threaten vital infrastructure and human settlements. This could lead to issues of statelessness for population from countries including the Maldives and Tuvalu and homelessness in countries with low lying areas such as Bangladesh.

The global warming controversy refers to a variety of disputes, significantly more pronounced in the popular media than in the scientific literature, regarding the nature, causes, and consequences of global warming. The disputed issues include the causes of increased global average air temperature, especially since the mid-20th century, whether this warming trend is unprecedented or within normal climatic variations, whether humankind has contributed significantly to it, and whether the increase is wholly or partially an artifact of poor measurements. Additional disputes concern estimates of climate sensitivity, predictions of additional warming, and what the consequences of global warming will be. From 1990–1997 in the United States, conservative think tanks mobilized to undermine the legitimacy of global warming as a social problem. They challenged the scientific evidence; argued that global warming will have benefits; and asserted that proposed solutions would do more harm than good.

Policy responses to global warming include mitigation by emissions reduction, adaptation to its effects, and possible future geoengineering. Most countries are parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), whose ultimate objective is to prevent dangerous anthropogenic (i.e., human-induced) climate change. Parties to the UNFCCC have adopted a range of policies designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to assist in adaptation to global warming. Parties to the UNFCCC have agreed that deep cuts in emissions are required, and that future global warming should be limited to below 2.0 °C (3.6 °F) relative to the pre-industrial level. A 2011 report of analyses by the United Nations Environment Programme and International Energy Agency suggest that efforts as of the early 21st century to reduce emissions may be inadequate to meet the UNFCCC's 2 °C target. There are different views over what the appropriate policy response to climate change should be. These competing views weigh the benefits of limiting emissions of greenhouse gases against the costs. In general, it seems likely that climate change will impose greater damages and risks in poorer regions.

Article 2 of the UN Framework Convention refers explicitly to “stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations.” In order to stabilize the atmospheric concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions worldwide would need to be dramatically reduced from their present level. Most countries are Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The ultimate objective of the Convention is to prevent dangerous human interference of the climate system. As is stated in the Convention, this requires that GHG concentrations are stabilized in the atmosphere at a level where ecosystems can adapt naturally to climate change, food production is not threatened, and economic development can proceed in a sustainable fashion. The Framework Convention was agreed in 1992, but since then, global emissions have risen.

During negotiations, the G77 (a lobbying group in the United Nations representing 133 developing nations) pushed for a mandate requiring developed countries to take the lead in reducing their emissions. This was justified on the basis that: the developed world's emissions had contributed most to the stock of GHGs in the atmosphere; per-capita emissions (i.e., emissions per head of population) were still relatively low in developing countries; and the emissions of developing countries would grow to meet their development needs. This mandate was sustained in the Kyoto Protocol to the Framework Convention, which entered into legal effect in 2005. In ratifying the Kyoto Protocol, most developed countries accepted legally binding commitments to limit their emissions. These first-round commitments expire in 2012. Former US President George W. Bush rejected the treaty on the basis that “it exempts 80% of the world, including major

population centers such as China and India, from compliance, and would cause serious harm to the US economy.” At the 15th UNFCCC Conference of the Parties, held in 2009 at Copenhagen, several UNFCCC Parties produced the Copenhagen Accord. Parties associated with the Accord (140 countries, as of November 2010) aim to limit the future increase in global mean temperature to below 2 °C. The 16th Conference of the Parties (COP16) was held at Cancun in 2010. It produced an agreement, not a binding treaty, that the “.Parties should take urgent action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to meet a goal of limiting global warming to 2 °C above pre-industrial temperatures. It also recognized the need to consider strengthening the goal to a global average rise of 1.5 °C.

## **Nuclear Weapons and Proliferation: Challenges and Opportunities**

A nuclear weapon is an explosive device that derives its destructive force from nuclear reactions, either fission or a combination of fission and fusion. Because of the immense military power they can confer, the political control of nuclear weapons has been a key issue for as long as they have existed; in most countries the use of nuclear force can only be authorized by the head of government or head of state. Nuclear proliferation is a term now used to describe the spread of nuclear weapons, fissile material, and weapons-applicable nuclear technology and information, to nations which are not recognized as ‘Nuclear Weapon States’ by the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, also known as the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty or NPT. Proliferation has been opposed by many nations with and without nuclear weapons, the governments of which fear that more countries with nuclear weapons may increase the possibility of nuclear warfare, de-stabilize international or regional relations, or infringe upon the national sovereignty of states.

The two types of proliferation are horizontal and vertical proliferation. Horizontal proliferation refers to nation-states or non-state entities that do not have, but are acquiring, nuclear weapons or developing the capability and materials for producing them. Vertical proliferation refers to nation-states that do possess nuclear weapons and are increasing their stockpiles of these weapons, improving the technical sophistication or reliability of their weapons, or developing new weapons. Because nation-states or other entities that wish to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons need methods for delivering those weapons, proliferation of delivery mechanisms must also be prevented. Controlling proliferation and ultimately abolishing nuclear weapons known as nuclear disarmament involves national governments, intergovernmental organizations, nongovernmental and professional organizations, and society at large. Nuclear disarmament refers to both the act of reducing or eliminating nuclear weapons and to the end state of a nuclear-free world, in which nuclear weapons are completely eliminated.

### **Challenges**

There is a set of serious, short-term dilemmas confronting the international community on nuclear issues. These include the question of the North Korean and alleged Iranian nuclear weapons programs, and the ever-present fear that terrorists will acquire nuclear or radiological weapons compatibility. Cold War nonproliferation measures mainly addressed the possibility of proliferation to and by states. Although recent initiatives attempt to extend coverage to non-state actors these are partial, administratively cumbersome, and difficult to enforce. Moreover, steps to gather intelligence about potential terrorist threats are corrosive of basic civil liberties and civilian oversight.

Confidence in the NPT is eroding and it is not clear that it can adequately handle proliferation risks. The Security Council has been unable to deal effectively with referrals of NPT noncompliance or withdrawal from treaties. At a time when many analysts predict substantial growth in reliance on nuclear energy, states can still legally develop indigenous fuel cycle capabilities, with apparently inadequate protection against diversion to military programs. If the Iranians are perceived to have successfully kept a nuclear

weapons option, it is assumed that several other Middle East states will begin down the nuclear path (or have already begun). And while the pressures might not be as intense in Northeast Asia there is a strong argument that the North Korean program might not be rolled back lending greater fragility and complexity to regional and global security calculations. If the Middle East or Northeast Asia becomes a proliferating region, we can assume that other states will rethink their non-nuclear status especially those that already have the technological capability to produce weapons.

Another related problem to the prospect of new states acquiring nuclear weapons capabilities, is the possibility that the erosion of the international nuclear nonproliferation regime could lead to a more competitive, multipolar international security system in general. In such a system, other states might seek to balance the US, including through the possession of nuclear weapons. The emergence of a multipolar world would be facilitated by the breakdown or weakening of the international nuclear nonproliferation regime. A fourth dimension of the emerging nuclear scenario is that there is little support for strengthening the international nonproliferation regime. The international community has an existing, but frayed verification and enforcement system for nuclear inspections. If this system weakens further, countries may "head for the exit" and take hedging actions. According to some observers, the international nuclear nonproliferation regime as a whole has suffered from insufficient leadership from its most interested states. The problem is not the absence of the tools in the regime, but the failure of will to use the tools of the regime for their stated purpose. There is a crisis of confidence.

Much of the international discussion of nuclear weapons issues concerns nuclear proliferation, but it is important to remember that the danger of nuclear proliferation is only one aspect of the threat posed by the integration of nuclear weapons into international life. A world where there was no further proliferation, but in which nuclear-armed states were at war, would still not be a safe world. The reason, of course, is that the explosion of nuclear weapons on the scale contemplated by military doctrines would have devastating consequences for human and other life, and for the physical environment. Moreover, the deliberate detonation of even a small weapon, by a state or a terrorist group, would not only cause many deaths and create profound economic dislocation, but would likely lead to great instability in the international system. Even if no additional states acquire nuclear weapons capability, current arsenals stand at nearly 27,000 warheads, over 95 percent of which are held by Russia and the United States. There are some agreements in place to continue stockpile reductions, but their eventual implementation would leave stockpiles still far beyond minimal deterrence levels.

Controlling the proliferation of nuclear weapons is one of the major challenges we face as a global society. Nuclear weapons pose a particularly destructive threat. Prevention of the proliferation and use of nuclear weapons is urgently important to public health. The threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons has 3 major aspects:

1. The development of the capability for producing or acquiring nuclear weapons by countries that do not currently have nuclear weapons (horizontal proliferation).
2. The increase of weapon stockpiles by countries that currently have nuclear weapons, the improvement of technical sophistication or reliability of these weapons, and the development of new weapons.

The greatest risk from nuclear weapons proliferation comes from countries which have not joined the NPT and which have significant unsafeguarded nuclear activities. While safeguards apply to some of their activities, others remain beyond scrutiny. A further concern is that countries may develop various sensitive nuclear fuel cycle facilities and research reactors under full safeguards and then subsequently opt out of the NPT. If a nuclear-capable country does leave the NPT, it is likely to be reported by the IAEA to the UN Security Council, just as if it were in breach of its safeguards agreement. Trade sanctions would then be

likely. IAEA safeguards, together with bilateral safeguards applied under the NPT can, and do, ensure that uranium supplied by countries does not contribute to nuclear weapons proliferation. In fact, the worldwide application of those safeguards and the substantial world trade in uranium for nuclear electricity make the proliferation of nuclear weapons much less likely.

### Opportunities to Control Proliferation

Governments thus far have attempted to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons through bilateral and multilateral treaties. Intergovernmental bodies, such as the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the International Court of Justice (World Court), have also attempted to control proliferation. Nongovernmental organizations including professional organizations, such as the Federation of American Scientists, the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), and Physicians for Social Responsibility (IPPNW's US affiliate) have worked to control proliferation through education, information dissemination, and advocacy aimed at governments and governmental organizations. An increasing number of individuals and organizations, including senior US statesmen, believe that the only way to address the danger of nuclear weapons is to eliminate them entirely.

The Additional Protocol, once it is widely in force, will provide credible assurance that there are no undeclared nuclear materials or activities in the states concerned. This will be a major step forward in preventing nuclear proliferation. Another important component of the nuclear proliferation issue involves delivery mechanisms. In order to pose a nuclear threat, nations or other entities not only need these weapons but also need missiles or other methods for delivering them.

There have been a number of significant and controversial treaties to try and control nuclear weapons:

#### The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

The NPT was ratified in 1975. It has been ratified by 187 countries, more than any other arms limitation and disarmament agreement. The objective is "to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament." Some 180 plus countries thus agreed not to pursue nuclear weapons in exchange for the nuclear powers to adhere to treaties that would have the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons. However, as others have put more bluntly, this treaty was to prevent new members from joining the "nuclear club."

#### The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty

The ABM Treaty, signed in 1972, prohibits the use of defensive systems that might give an advantage to one side in a nuclear war. The Mutually Assured Destruction scenario was invoked here to assure that each nation had enough weapons to survive a nuclear attack and therefore have the ability to annihilate the other. Their rationale was that as long as both sides remained defenseless, in this respect, neither country would dare attack the other.

#### The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)

The CTBT was designed to prevent testing of nuclear weapons and hence reduce the chance of an arms race. It bans all nuclear explosions in all environments, for military or civilian purposes. It was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 September 1996. The CTBT has achieved near universal adherence, however, Article XIV of the Treaty requires ratification by 44 named states; before the Treaty can enter into force.

## The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties, START I and START II

START I and II were designed to reduce the weapons that Russia and the US have. While the major nuclear powers have agreed to eliminate their nuclear arsenal at a UN review of the NPT, it remains to be seen how much of that will be rhetoric and how much real political will there will be to follow it through. Unfortunately, the nuclear weapons states, and particularly the United States, seem to have made virtually zero progress in the past five years. Despite its pledges to do otherwise, the United States has failed to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; opposed a verifiable fissile material cutoff treaty; substituted the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), which is fully reversible, for the START treaties; scrapped the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, opening the door for deployment of missile defenses and moves toward placing weapons in outer space; kept nuclear weapons at the center of its security policies, including research to create new nuclear weapons; and demonstrated no political will toward the elimination of its nuclear arsenal.

Traditional safeguards are arrangements to account for and control the use of nuclear materials. This verification is a key element in the international system which ensures that uranium in particular is used only for peaceful purposes. Parties to the NPT agree to accept technical safeguard measures applied by the IAEA. These require that operators of nuclear facilities maintain and declare detailed accounting records of all movements and transactions involving nuclear material. Over 550 facilities and several hundred other locations are subject to regular inspection, and their records and the nuclear material being audited. Inspections by the IAEA are complemented by other measures such as surveillance cameras and instrumentation.

The inspections act as an alert system providing a warning of the possible diversion of nuclear material from peaceful activities. Material Accountancy – tracking all inward and outward transfers and the flow of materials in any nuclear facility. This includes sampling and analysis of nuclear material, on-site inspections, and review and verification of operating records.

All NPT non-weapons states must accept these full-scope safeguards. In the five weapons states plus the non-NPT states (India, Pakistan and Israel), facility-specific safeguards apply. IAEA inspectors regularly visit these facilities to verify completeness and accuracy of records. The terms of the NPT cannot be enforced by the IAEA itself, nor can nations be forced to sign the treaty. In reality, as shown in Iraq and North Korea, safeguards can be backed up by diplomatic, political and economic measures. While traditional safeguards easily verified the correctness of formal declarations by suspect states, in the 1990s attention turned to what might not have been declared. The weakness of the NPT regime lay in the fact that no obvious diversion of material was involved. The uranium used as fuel probably came from indigenous sources, and the nuclear facilities were built by the countries themselves without being declared or placed under safeguards. Nevertheless, the activities were detected and brought under control using international diplomacy.

In 1993 a program was initiated to strengthen and extend the classical safeguards system, and a model protocol was agreed by the IAEA Board of Governors 1997. The measures boosted the IAEA's ability to detect undeclared nuclear activities, including those with no connection to the civil fuel cycle. Innovations were of two kinds. Some could be implemented on the basis of IAEA's existing legal authority through safeguards agreements and inspections. Others required further legal authority to be conferred through an Additional Protocol. This must be agreed by each non-weapons state with IAEA, as a supplement to any existing comprehensive safeguards agreement. Weapons states have agreed to accept the principles of the model additional protocol.

As of 20 December 2010, 139 countries have signed Additional Protocols, 104 have brought them into force, and one (Iraq) is implementing its protocol provisionally. The IAEA is also applying the measures of the Additional Protocol in Taiwan. Among the leading countries that have not signed the Additional Protocol are Egypt, which says it will not sign until Israel accepts comprehensive IAEA safeguards, and Brazil, which opposes making the protocol a requirement for international cooperation on enrichment and reprocessing, but has not ruled out signing. The Nuclear Suppliers Group communicated its guidelines, essentially a set of export rules, to the IAEA in 1978. These were to ensure that transfers of nuclear material or equipment would not be diverted to unsafeguarded nuclear fuel cycle or nuclear explosive activities, and formal government assurances to this effect were required from recipients. The Guidelines also recognised the need for physical protection measures in the transfer of sensitive facilities, technology and weapons-usable materials, and strengthened retransfer provisions. The group began with seven members – the United States, the former USSR, the UK, France, Germany, Canada and Japan – but now includes 46 countries including all five nuclear weapons states.

In May 1995, NPT parties reaffirmed their commitment to a Fissile Materials Cut-off Treaty to prohibit the production of any further fissile material for weapons. This aims to complement the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty of 1996 (not entered into force as of 2011) and to codify commitments made by the United States, the UK, France and Russia to cease production of weapons material, as well as putting a similar ban on China. This treaty will also put more pressure on Israel, India and Pakistan to agree to international verification. As of February 2006 Iran formally announced that uranium enrichment within their borders has continued. Iran claims it is for peaceful purposes but the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and the United States claim the purpose is for nuclear weapons research and construction.

#### POVERTY AND DEVELOPMENT:

Different conceptions of poverty underpin the mainstream and alternative views of development. There is basic agreement on the material aspect of poverty, such as lack of food, clean water, and sanitation, but disagreement on the importance of non-material aspects. Also, key differences emerge in regard to how material needs should be met, and hence about the goal of development: cash transactions in the market, or subsistence via community regulated common resources such as land, water, and fodder.

Most governments, international organizations, citizens in the west and ,any elsewhere adhere to the orthodox conception of poverty. This refers to a situation where people do not have the money to buy adequate food or satisfy other basic needs, and are often classified as unemployed or underemployed. For example, the Report of the South Commission- an important statement on development in the 'South' drawn up by eminent persons of southern origins reflects an orthodox conception of poverty when it claims that a billion people in the developing countries are too poor to buy enough food to sustain their energy(South Commission 1990:84).

This mainstream understanding of poverty based on money has arisen as a result of the globalization of Western culture and the attendant expansion of the market. Thus a community which provides for itself outside of monetized cash transactions and wage labour, such as a hunter-gatherer Pygmy group, is regarded as poor. Consequently it is increasingly common for people around the world to regard as poor those 'who provide for themselves rather than sell their crops and buy commercially produced food ... wear handmade clothes rather than factory-made garments... build their own houses with the help of their neighbours rather than by paid teachers'(The Ecologist 1993:96).

For more than five decades, the world has focused on development and yet the destination is not in sight.the prime focus of the development work in the past was on the eradication of poverty and yet it is poverty that defied all prescriptions.To be sure,radical reforms in the economy and the policy have brought about



significant changes in the societies of the developing world. But the ugly face up poverty still refuses to disappear, several activities favouring the poor and against poverty were, and are being, carried out both the individual governments and the international community and yet we have sizable number of the poor and horrifying manifestation of poverty. The Secretary-General of the United Nations admitted the 1994 report, "Absolute poverty, hunger, disease and illiteracy are the lot of 1/5 of the world population. There can be no more urgent task for development than to attack both the causes and symptoms of these ills. It is a tasks that requires action and commitment. It is an agenda that requires the widest possible distribution of development efforts, the implementation of broad based strategies and the orientation of development efforts towards projects that enhance people rather than national prestige."

### **Identifying the poor and indexing poverty:**

The key question for the social scientists is to evolve a methodology for identifying the poor and for indexing poverty. To quote Amartya Sen : "The requirements of a concept of poverty must include two distinct – but not unrelated – exercises, namely –

- i) A method of identifying a group of people as poor (identification) and;
- ii) A method of aggregating the characteristics of the set of poor people into an overall image of poverty- (aggregation)."

Who are poor ? There are several ways in which the poor can be identified. Let us discuss some of these criteria and their limitations.

1) Poor are those who could not meet their daily needs. This is the most commonly used criterion. And those using it reduce the concept of daily needs to nutritional requirements usually expressed in terms of calorie intake, while it is a convenient yardstick; it is deceptive. There are no standards to define the minimal nutritional requirement. There are people who may be regarded as malnourished but they live long lives and carry out arduous tasks that many well nourished coming from the affluent stratum of society many find difficult to do. Moreover, it is not always possible to translate the nutritional requirement into food requirement.

ii) Poor are those who are socially deprived.

" Social deprivation may lead to the down grading of the social status and may even adversely affect the economic well being of the family or the caste, but such a consequence cannot be equated with poverty.:

- a) poverty may exists among those who are not regarded as socially deprived,
- b) Not all those belong to the category of socially deprived groups – caste or tribes – can be classed as poor.

In the present context, one can point a finger at a number of so- called Dalit leaders to indicate that no yardstick can place them in the category of the poor. Just at there are both rich and the poor families in any upper caste, so is also the case in any Dalit Caste. Thus, not only inequality needs to be distinguished from poverty, but poverty should also be delinked from caste.

iii) Poor are those who feel relatively deprived

Several writings on poverty blur the distinction between relative and absolute poverty. There is a worldwide commitment to 'eradicate' poverty is with regard to absolute poverty and at the level of the people. The concept of poverty line sure such as SI (PPP) Per capita per day refers to those who are indeed destitute. In terms of relative deprivation, all those whose income is below the average income can be regarded as non-rich.

There is no easy way to define poverty or identify the poor. People can be rendered poor by a variety of factors. Any strategy for the poverty eradication has to be pro-poor and against the phenomenon of poverty. Those who are living in poverty do not constitute a homogenous group and therefore there cannot be a single replicable prescription for the amelioration of their situation. It is, therefore, necessary for first investigate the context in which a given poor resides, identify the source that has caused his/her poverty.

### **Causes of Poverty :**

Many different factors have been cited to explain why poverty occurs, no single explanation has gained universal acceptance.

### **Possible factors include :**

#### **1) Economic Causes:**

a) Recession, in general, the major fluctuations in poverty rates over time are driven by the business cycle. Poverty rates increase in recessions and decline in booms. Extreme recessions, such as the great depression have a particularly large impact on poverty.

b) Economic inequality– even if average income is high, it may be the case that the poverty rate is also high if incomes are distributed unevenly. However, the evidence on the relationship between absolute poverty rates and inequality is mixed and sensitive to the inequality index used. In addition, to income inequality, and unequal.

#### **2) Governance:**

a) Lacking Democracy in poor countries the effectiveness of Governance has a major impact on the delivery of socio-economic outcomes for poor populations. Weak rule of law can discourage investment and thus perpetuate poverty. Failure of governments to provide essential infrastructures worsens poverty. Poor access to affordable education traps individuals and countries in the cycles of poverty. High levels of corruption undermine efforts to make a sustainable impact on poverty.

#### **3) Social Factors:**

Over populations and lack of access to birth control methods, crime, white collars, blue color, historical factors such as imperialism, colonialism, wars including civil war, genocide, discrimination of various kinds, such as age discrimination, stereotyping, gender discrimination, racial discrimination, caste discrimination results into more poverty. With this, poor access to affordable health care makes individual less resilient economic hardship and more vulnerable to poverty. Inadequate nutrition in childhood, itself an effect of poverty undermines the ability of individuals to develop their full human capabilities and thus makes them more vulnerable to poverty.

Diseases, specially AIDS, Malaria, tuberculosis, and other overwhelming affect developing nations which perpetuate poverty. Similarly, substance abuse, including for e.g. alcoholism and drug abuse when not properly treated undermines resistance and can consign people to vicious poverty cycles.

#### **4) environmental factors:**

Factors like access to fertile land, fresh water, minerals, energy and other natural resources, deforestation, climatic change or environment, desertification of land, draught and water crisis are leading to poverty.

## **Effects of Poverty :**

The effects of poverty may also be causes, as listed above thus creating a 'poverty cycle' operating across multiple levels, individuals, local, national and global.

### **i) Health :**

Those living in poverty are lacking access to essential health services, suffering hunger or even starvation, experience mental and physical health problems which make it harder for them to improve the situation. One third of deaths. Some 18mn. People a year or 50,000 per day are due to poverty related causes: in total 270 mn people; most of them women and children, have died as a result of poverty since 1990.

My Diseases of poverty reflect the dynamic relationship between poverty and poor health, which such infectious diseases results directly from poverty, they also perpetuate and deepen impoverishment by snapping personal and national health and financial resources. Foreg. Malaria decreases GDP growth by upto 1.3% In some developing nations, and by killing tens of Sub-Saharan Africa, AIDS also threatens the economies, social structures, and political stability of entire societies.

### **ii) Education:**

Research has found that there is a high risk of educational underachievement for children who are from low-income housing circumstances. This often is a process that begins in primary school for some less fortunate children. These children are at higher risk, special placements during the school's hours and even not completing their high school education.

### **iii) Violence :**

Areas strongly affected poverty tends to more violent. In one survey, 67% of children from disadvantaged inner cities said they had witnessed a serious assault and 33% reported witnessing a homicide.

## **Eradicating Poverty :**

The goal of eradicating poverty in the world through decisive national actions and international co-operation, as an ethical, social, political and economic imperative of humankind. To this end, at the national level, in partnership with all actors of civil society and in the context of multidimensional and integrated approach. We have to :

- a) Formulate or strengthen, as a matter of urgency, for the eradication of poverty, national policies and strategies geared to substantially reducing overall poverty in the shortest possible time, reducing inequalities and eradicating absolute poverty by a target date to be specified by each country in its national context.
- b) Focus our efforts and policies to address the root causes of poverty and to provide for the basic needs of all these efforts should include the elimination of hunger and malnutrition, the provision of food security, education, employment and livelihood, primary health care, safe drinking water and sanitation and adequate shelter and participation in social and cultural life.
- c) Ensure that people living in poverty have access to productive resources, including credit, land, education and training, technology, knowledge and information, as well as to public services and participate in decision making on a policy and regulatory environment that would enable them to benefit from expanding employment and economic opportunities.

- d) Develop and implement policies to ensure that all people have adequate economic and social protection during unemployment, ill health, maternity, child rearing, widowhood, disability, and old age.
- e) Ensure that national budgets and policies are oriented, as necessary, to meeting basic needs, reducing inequalities, and targeting poverty, as a strategic objective.
- f) Seek to reduce inequalities, increase opportunities and access to resources and income and remove any political, legal, economic and social factors and constraints that faster and sustain inequality.

Apart from these, the programme of action, proposed by World Summit for Social Development (WSSD) to honour the commitment to eradicate poverty, has focused on following ten points :

- i) National policies ought to be formulated to considerably reduce the incidence of poverty while fixing a target date that is regarded nationally feasible.
- ii) Support may be sought of international organization in the national efforts to eradicate poverty.
- iii) Tools to be developed to measure different types of poverty in a given country context and immediate relief be provided to those groups that in high risk category.
- iv) Economic policies and national budgets should be regularly reviewed and amended as necessary to meet the objective of poverty eradication.
- v) Opportunities may be expanded to enable the poor people to enhance their overall capacities and improve their social and economic conditions, ensuring sustainability of resources.
- vi) Emphasis may be laid on human resources development and important of infrastructural facilities..
- vii) There must be a comprehensive provision for the basic needs of all.
- viii) Adequate economic and social protection may be provided to all during periods of unemployment, ill health, maternity, disability and old age.
- ix) Policies may be formulated to strengthen the family and contribute to its stability.
- x) To assist poverty stricken areas all resources – public and private, be mobilized and involvement at the civil society may be ensured.

It need not be stressed that poverty excluded and marginalizes people. The high degree of illiteracy, malnutrition and ill health and general neglect suffered by the poor results in their having an indifference towards the society and the polity. Economic marginalization leads to civil and political marginalization. The answer therefore, is seen in one mobilization of the poor, and their empowerment.

To successfully fight against poverty, the need is to first identify the poor families and the poor geographical areas and then to carry out systematic investigations with an open mind to understand the strategies employment to combat it. This will help in building a new theoretical perspective of an interdisciplinary character and in developing a dependable portfolio for affirmative action and prophylactic treatment.

Development has always remained and will remain a basic human nature. Human being by nature are always strove to achieve a better ways to life. Therefore the concept of development does not merely remind confined to the economic and industrial growth, but also providing space to the needs and demands of every section of the society. Hence, we find that different people have had proposed different ways out to achieve a comprehensive development of the society and nation. Thus, we find a range of alternatives have been suggested by different thinkers and ideologies to advance the process of development. Main

among them are Capitalist model of development, Socialist or Communist model of development and a mixed model.

The basis of the development model therefore would have to be, as so well explained by Schumacher in *Small is Beautiful*:

- An important part of the development effort should by-pass the big cities and be directly concerned with the creation of an agro-industrial structure in the rural and small town areas.
- Primary need is creation of work-places, literally millions of work-places. We have to maximize work opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed.

To quote Gabriel Ardant, it is important that there should be enough work for all because that is the only way to eliminate anti-productive reflexes and create a new state of mind that of a country where labor has become precious and must be put to the best possible use.

### **Concept of Sustainable development**

It means achieving a balance between the process of development and protection of environment. It means conservation of resources for the benefit of future generations.

The concept of sustainable development focused attention on finding strategies to promote economic and social development in ways that avoid environmental.

The new development model must satisfy the following criteria:

1. Workplaces must be created in villages and small towns where people are living now
2. Workplaces must be cheap enough for creation in large numbers without high capital inputs and imports
3. Production methods must be simple, not requiring high skills.
4. Production must be mainly from local materials and mainly for local use.

### **HUMAN RIGHTS:**

**Human rights** are moral principles or norms, which describe certain standards of human behaviour, and are regularly protected as legal rights in municipal and international law. They are commonly understood as inalienable fundamental rights "to which a person is inherently entitled simply because she or he is a human being," and which are "inherent in all human beings" regardless of their nation, location, language, religion, ethnic origin or any other status. They are applicable everywhere and at every time in the sense of being universal, and they are egalitarian in the sense of being the same for everyone. They require empathy and the rule of law and impose an obligation on persons to respect the human rights of others. They should not be taken away except as a result of due process based on specific circumstances; for example, human rights may include freedom from unlawful imprisonment, torture, and execution.

The doctrine of human rights has been highly influential within international law, global and regional institutions. Actions by states and non-governmental organizations form a basis of public policy worldwide. The idea of human rights suggests that "if the public discourse of peacetime global society can be said to have a common moral language, it is that of human rights." The strong claims made by the doctrine of human rights continue to provoke considerable skepticism and debates about the content, nature and justifications of human rights to this day. The precise meaning of the term right is controversial and is the subject of continued philosophical debate; while there is consensus that human rights encompasses a wide

variety of rights such as the right to a fair trial, protection against enslavement, prohibition of genocide, free speech, or a right to education, there is disagreement about which of these particular rights should be included within the general framework of human rights; some thinkers suggest that human rights should be a minimum requirement to avoid the worst-case abuses, while others see it as a higher standard.

Many of the basic ideas that animated the human rights movement developed in the aftermath of the Second World War and the atrocities of The Holocaust, culminating in the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Paris by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. Ancient peoples did not have the same modern-day conception of universal human rights. The true forerunner of human rights discourse was the concept of natural rights which appeared as part of the medieval natural law tradition that became prominent during the European Enlightenment with such philosophers as John Locke, Francis Hutcheson, and Jean-Jacques Burlamaqui, and which featured prominently in the political discourse of the American Revolution and the French Revolution. From this foundation, the modern human rights arguments emerged over the latter half of the twentieth century, possibly as a reaction to slavery, torture, genocide, and war crimes, as a realization of inherent human vulnerability and as being a precondition for the possibility of a just society.

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world...

—*1st sentence of the Preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

—*Article 1 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)*

#### HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION:

**Humanitarian intervention** has been defined as a state's use of "military force against another state when the principal publicly declared aim of that military action is ending human-rights violations being perpetrated by the state against which it is directed." This definition may be too narrow as it precludes non-military forms of intervention such as humanitarian aid and international sanctions. On this broader understanding, "Humanitarian intervention should be understood to encompass... non-forcible methods, namely intervention undertaken without military force to alleviate mass human suffering within sovereign borders."

There is no one standard or legal definition of humanitarian intervention; the field of analysis (such as law, ethics or politics) often influences the definition that is chosen. Differences in definition include variations in whether humanitarian intervention is limited to instances where there is an absence of consent from the host state; whether humanitarian intervention is limited to punishment actions; and whether humanitarian intervention is limited to cases where there has been explicit UN Security Council authorization for action. There is, however, a general consensus on some of its essential characteristics:

1. Humanitarian intervention involves the threat and use of military forces as a central feature
2. It is an intervention in the sense that it entails interfering in the internal affairs of a state by sending military forces into the territory or airspace of a sovereign state that has not committed an act of aggression against another state.
3. The intervention is in response to situations that do not necessarily pose direct threats to states' strategic interests, but instead is motivated by humanitarian objectives.

The customary international law concept of humanitarian intervention dates back to Hugo Grotius and the European politics in the 17th century. The subject of humanitarian intervention has remained a compelling foreign policy issue, especially since NATO's intervention in Kosovo in 1999, as it highlights the tension between the principle of state sovereignty – a defining pillar of the UN system and international law – and evolving international norms related to human rights and the use of forces. Moreover, it has sparked normative and empirical debates over its legality, the ethics of using military force to respond to human rights violations, when it should occur, who should intervene, and whether it is effective.

To its proponents, it marks imperative action in the face of human rights abuses, over the rights of state sovereignty, while to its detractors it is often viewed as a pretext for military intervention often devoid of legal sanction, selectively deployed and achieving only ambiguous ends. Its frequent use following the end of the Cold War suggested to many that a new norm of military humanitarian intervention was emerging in international politics, although some now argue that the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the US “war on terror” have brought the era of humanitarian intervention to an end. James Pattison, however, argued in 2011 that the NATO intervention in Libya breaks this trend.

International humanitarian law and international human rights law are two distinct but complementary bodies of law. They are both concerned with the protection of the life, health and dignity of individuals. IHL applies in armed conflict while human rights law applies at all times, in peace and in war.

Both international humanitarian law and human rights law apply in armed conflicts. The main difference in their application is that international human rights law allows a State to suspend a number of human rights if it faces a situation of emergency. IHL cannot be suspended (except as provided in Article 5 to the Fourth Geneva Convention).

However, a State cannot suspend or waive certain fundamental rights that must be respected in all circumstances. These include the right to life, the prohibition of torture and inhuman punishment or treatment, the outlawing of slavery or servitude, the principle of legality and the non-retroactivity of the law and the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

States have a legal duty to respect and implement both IHL and human rights law. Compliance with IHL requires a state to introduce national legislation to implement its obligations, to train its military and to bring to trial those in grave breach of such law. Human rights law also contains provisions requiring a State to take legislative and other appropriate measures to implement its rules and punish violations.

IHL is based on the Geneva and Hague Conventions, Additional Protocols and a series of treaties governing means and methods of waging war such as those banning blinding laser weapons, landmines and chemical and biological weapons, as well as customary law.

International human rights law is more complex and unlike IHL includes regional treaties. The main global legal instrument is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1948. Other global treaties include the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as well as treaties on the prevention and punishment of torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, on the elimination of racial discrimination and discrimination against women, or on the rights of the child.

Regional human rights conventions or charters have been adopted in Europe, the Americas, Africa, and the Arab region.

In situations of armed conflict, human rights law complements and reinforces the protection afforded by International Humanitarian Law.

**B.A. B.L. (HONS) DEGREE (SEMESTER) EXAMINATIONS**  
**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

**Time : 2 1/2 Hours**

**Maximum: 70 Marks**

**Part – A**

**Answer any Two of the following in about 500 words each**

**(2 X 2 = 24 marks)**

1. Examine the various approaches to the study of International relations
2. Critically examine the theory of balance of Power
3. Critically evaluate the role of UN in the era of globalization

**Part – B**

**Answer any Two of the following in about 300 words each**

**(2 X 7 = 14 marks)**

4. Discuss the importance of international relations
5. Discuss the new international economic order
6. Define International Law and Discuss its sources

**Part – C**

**Write short notes on five of the following**

**(5 X 4 = 20 marks)**

7. Legal personality of UN
8. International Society
9. Bi-polar System
10. National Power
11. International Terrorism
12. Cold War
13. Disarmament

**Part – D**

**Answer any Six of the following very briefly**

**(6 X 2 = 12 marks)**

14. International Actors
15. Non-permanent member
16. International court of Justice
17. WHO
18. SAARC
19. World Public opinion
20. Bi-polar world
21. Nazism