UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY
MEGHALAYA
Unveiling Excellence

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE
MPS 103- INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

w.e.f Academic Session: 2024-25

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

nirf India Ranking-2023 (151-200)

Accredited 'A' Grade by NAAC

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

SELF- LEARNING MATERIAL

M. A. POLITICAL SCIENCE

MPS 103

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Credit: 04

Academic Session 2024- 25

CENTRE FOR DISTANCE AND ONLINE EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MEGHALAYA
                              ACCREDITED 'A' GRADE BY NAAC

Self Learning Material

Centre for Distance and Online Education

University of Science and Technology Meghalaya

First Edition

Print August 2024

© CDOE- USTM

Author(s):

Dr. Md Nazeer Hussain

(Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, USTM)

Dr. Mary M. Kurbah

(Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, USTM)

Mr. Dwaipayan Choudhury

(Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, USTM)

Dr. Akankhya Kalita

(Assistant Professor, Centre for Distance and Online Education, USTM)

Edited by: Dr. Akankhya Kalita.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

This is the third paper for the M.A. in Political Science course (1st semester). As the title implies, it deals with the various concepts and theories of international relations. The course is designed and structured with the learners' needs in mind, particularly those who have somehow disconnected from traditional methods of learning but still hold an interest in continuing their education. To make the material learner-friendly, we've incorporated elements that mimic the traditional learning experience with an instructor. These include "sticky notes" on topics like the 'let's rewind' (for each topic), 'let's sum up' (for each chapter), and 'check your progress' (followed by answers) to clarify concepts. Finally, at the end of each chapter, we've added model questions that can also be treated as assignments for the given chapters. Learners encountering any complexities or confusion can refer to the "let's rewind" notes for clarification. Mention of various sources is also included for further reading, and learners are encouraged to consult them to complete their assignments.

About The Chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction to International Relations:

International Relations (IR) is the academic field dedicated to understanding the interactions between states and other global actors. The chapter includes evolution and meaning of international relations. It also deals with nature and scope of the discipline along with the differences between international relations and international politics.

Chapter 2: Approaches to the Study of International Relations:

Various theoretical perspectives offer different lenses through which to analyze international relations. The chapter includes explanations of liberalism theory, realism and system theory bringing their respective perspective of analyzing and studying the discipline.

Chapter 3: Basic Concepts in International Relations:

Key concepts highlight the importance of international relations. These concepts will help the learner understand the different aspects of international relations. This chapter, with that view has been designed to include important basic concepts like- balance of power, collective security and disarmament and national interest and ideology.

Chapter 4: World in 20th Century:

The 20th century marked a transformative era in global affairs. The World Wars drastically altered the international landscape, leading to the decline of European dominance and the rise of superpowers. The Cold War era defined by US-Soviet rivalry shaped global politics. Discussions on these pertinent issues are being included here in this chapter.

Chapter 1: Introduction to International Relations

Chapter Structure:

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

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

1.1 Introduction:

Imagine a world where headlines about global conflicts or resource scarcity spark curiosity, not fear. Studying international relations empowers you to become a global citizen – someone who understands the interconnectedness of the world. By delving into the complex web of politics, economics, and cultures, you'll gain the ability to analyze global challenges, propose innovative solutions, and navigate a future where collaboration is the key. So, let us begin with the chapter.

1.2 International Relations:

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

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

formulate the foreign policy of particular states. It is often considered a branch of political science.

Apart from political science, IR draws upon such diverse fields as economics, history, law, philosophy, geography, sociology, anthropology psychology, and cultural studies. It involves diverse range of issues including but not limited to: globalization, state sovereignty, ecological sustainability, nuclear proliferation, nationalism, economic development, global finance terrorism, organized crime, human security, foreign interventionism, and human rights. Since global developments touch upon the lives of every individual, the domain of International Relations cannot be the sole right of the Presidents, Prime Ministers or Diplomats. It becomes relevant for every single person living under the Sun. The evolution of this discipline which began after the First World War is still in a developing stage and its scope is expanding every day. It becomes a challenge for academicians and students to master the discipline in this fast-changing world.

1.2.1 Meaning:

International relations (IR) is a multifaceted discipline that examines the interactions between states, international organizations, and non-state actors on a global scale. While traditionally focused on state-centric diplomacy and power politics, the field has expanded to encompass a broader range of actors, issues, and processes. The core of IR involves understanding the complex interplay of political, economic, and social factors shaping the international system. It seeks to explain patterns of cooperation and conflict among nations, as well as the evolution of global governance and international institutions. By studying IR, scholars and policymakers aim to develop a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities presented by the interconnected world, and to inform the development of effective foreign policies.

Morgenthau and others viewed the core of international relations to be international politics and the subject matter of international politics to be struggle for power among sovereign nations. Padelford and Lincoln also opine that, when people speak of 'international relations', they are usually thinking of the relationships between states. They further contend that such relationships between states constitute international politics' which is the interaction of state policies within the changing patterns of power relationship.

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

1.2.1 Evolution of the Study of IR

International Relations (IR) has traversed a complex path from its origins in diplomatic history to its present status as a multifaceted academic discipline. This evolution is marked by significant shifts in focus, methodologies, and theoretical frameworks, mirroring the transformations in the global political landscape.

- **The Pre-World War I Era: Diplomatic History and Normative Thought:**

Prior to the First World War, IR was largely synonymous with diplomatic history. Scholars primarily focused on chronicling the interactions between states, emphasizing treaties, alliances, and the conduct of diplomacy. This period was characterized by a descriptive and normative approach, with a strong emphasis on the state as the primary actor and the maintenance of international order as the central goal. Thinkers like Hugo Grotius and Thomas Hobbes laid the philosophical foundations for international law and the concept of sovereignty, respectively.

- **The Interwar Period: Idealism and the Search for Peace:**

The cataclysmic events of World War I prompted a profound re-evaluation of international relations. Idealism emerged as a dominant perspective, seeking to understand the causes of the war and prevent future conflicts. Scholars emphasized the importance of international cooperation, collective security, and the rule of law. The League of Nations was seen as a crucial step towards a more peaceful world order. Figures like Woodrow Wilson and Norman Angell championed the idea of a global community united by shared values and institutions.

- **The Cold War Era: Realism and Behavioralism:**

The Cold War ushered in a new era for IR, characterized by the dominance of realism. This perspective emphasized the centrality of power, national interest, and the anarchic nature of the international system. The bipolar world order, dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union, provided a stark backdrop for the development of realist theories. Scholars like Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz focused on the struggle for power, the balance of power, and the challenges of cooperation in a hostile environment. Additionally, the Cold War witnessed the rise of behavioralism, which sought to apply scientific methods to the study of international relations.

- **The Post-Cold War Era: Theoretical Pluralism and Global Challenges:**

The collapse of the Soviet Union marked a watershed moment in IR. The end of the Cold War led to a proliferation of new challenges and opportunities, such as globalization, regionalization, and the rise of non-state actors. This period was characterized by theoretical pluralism, with the emergence of diverse perspectives including neoliberalism, constructivism, feminism, and postcolonialism. Neoliberals emphasized the role of international institutions and economic interdependence in promoting cooperation. Constructivists challenged the materialist assumptions of realism and liberalism, focusing on the role of ideas, norms, and identities. Feminists and postcolonialists brought critical perspectives to the study of international relations, highlighting the experiences and perspectives of marginalized groups.

- **Contemporary IR: Complexity and Interconnectedness:**

The twenty-first century presents IR with a complex and interconnected global landscape. Issues such as climate change, terrorism, and global inequality have become central concerns. Scholars continue to grapple with the implications of these challenges for traditional IR theories while exploring new approaches and methodologies. There is a growing emphasis on interdisciplinary research, as well as recognition of the importance of non-state actors and transnational networks.

Key Trends in the Evolution of IR

- **Shift from normative to empirical analysis:** IR has moved from prescribing how states ought to behave to explaining how they actually behave.
- **Expansion of the unit of analysis:** Beyond the state, the study of IR now encompasses international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and transnational corporations.
- **Interdisciplinary influences:** IR has increasingly drawn on insights from economics, sociology, anthropology, and psychology.
- **Global challenges:** The discipline has grappled with new issues such as environmental degradation, terrorism, and human rights.

Let's Rewind

The discipline of International Relations (IR) studies how states, international organizations, and other actors on the world stage interact. IR scholars delve into the reasons behind foreign policy decisions and the competition for power, but also explore the significance of international law, institutions, and cooperation. The study of IR has developed over time, with various schools of thought emerging to explain global events. Realists, for example, believe that national interest and power are the driving forces in international politics, while liberals emphasize cooperation and interconnectedness. In recent times, scholars have begun to explore critical and non-positivist approaches that challenge traditional IR assumptions. Ultimately, the field of IR aims to understand the intricate forces that shape our world and how various actors interact on a global scale.

Check Your Progress:

- How would you define International Relations as a discipline?
- Who authored the book "Theory of International Politics"?
- Who authored the book "Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism"?

1.3.1. Nature of International Relations

International Relations (IR) is a dynamic and multifaceted discipline that examines the interactions between states, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and other actors on the global stage. It delves into the complex interplay of political, economic, social, and cultural factors that shape these relationships.

Key characteristics of IR:

- **Anarchic System:** Unlike domestic politics with a central authority, the international system is characterized by anarchy, where there is no overarching governing body with coercive power. States are sovereign and independent, leading to a complex web of interactions.
- **Interdependence:** The growing interconnectedness of states through trade, finance, communication, and environmental issues has created a high degree of interdependence. This interdependence can both foster cooperation and intensify competition.
- **Diversity of Actors:** IR encompasses a wide range of actors beyond states, including international organizations (UN, EU, NATO), non-governmental organizations (Amnesty International, Greenpeace), multinational corporations (Google, Apple), and even individuals.
- **Multidisciplinary Nature:** IR draws upon various disciplines like political science, economics, history, sociology, and law to understand the complexities of global interactions.
- **Focus on Global Issues:** IR addresses a broad spectrum of global challenges, including war and peace, economic development, human rights, environmental sustainability, and global governance.

1.3.2 Scope of International Relations:

The scope of IR is vast and constantly evolving. It encompasses a wide range of topics and subfields:

- **Diplomacy and Foreign Policy:** The art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of states.
- **International Security:** The study of threats to national security, including war, terrorism, and nuclear proliferation.
- **International Political Economy:** The interplay of economics and politics in the global arena, focusing on trade, finance, and development.
- **International Organizations and Law:** The role of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and international law in shaping global governance.
- **Global Governance:** The complex system of rules, norms, and institutions that shape global interactions.
- **Human Rights and Humanitarian Intervention:** The protection of human rights and the ethical dilemmas surrounding intervention in other countries.
- **Environmental Politics:** The impact of environmental issues on international relations and the search for sustainable solutions.
- **Global Development:** The study of economic and social development in different regions of the world.

Key themes within IR:

- **Power and its distribution:** Examining the distribution of power among states and other actors.
- **Cooperation and conflict:** Analyzing the conditions under which states cooperate or engage in conflict.
- **Identity and culture:** Exploring the role of national identity and cultural differences in international relations.
- **Globalization and its consequences:** Assessing the impact of globalization on states, societies, and individuals.

In essence, International Relations seek to understand the complex and dynamic interactions shaping our world, from the causes of war to the challenges of global governance. It provides a framework for analyzing global issues and developing policies to address them.

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px;">

Let's Rewind:

The nature and scope of IR centers around conflict. Conflict is the core principle underlying international relations. It arises from the inherent incompatibility of needs and desires between groups, which in the international sphere translates to nations. Driven by ever-evolving wants, these groups engage in a continuous struggle for power to influence each other and secure their objectives. This competition for power creates a dynamic of conflict, the intensity of which can fluctuate over time. While cooperation exists, it's viewed as a temporary outcome of conflict resolution or a strategic tool employed by nations with aligned interests against common rivals. Consequently, the study of international relations delves into this process of conflict management, power politics, and the crucial role of foreign policy decisions in shaping interactions between nations.

</div>

Check Your Progress:

- Name three important things relevant to international relations.
- Conflict is a continuing phenomenon in international relations. True or False?

1.4 Subject Matter Of IR

International Relations (IR) is a dynamic and complex discipline that investigates the interactions among states, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and other actors within the global arena. It seeks to understand the patterns of cooperation and conflict, power dynamics, and the evolution of the global order.

Core Concerns of IR

At its core, IR examines:

- **The distribution of power:** How power is distributed among states and non-state actors, and how this distribution influences global politics.
- **Cooperation and conflict:** The conditions under which states cooperate or engage in conflict, and the factors that facilitate or hinder cooperation.
- **Global governance:** The development and implementation of rules, norms, and institutions to manage global affairs in the absence of a world government.
- **The impact of globalization:** How economic, technological and cultural interconnectedness shape international relations.
- **Non-state actors:** The role of transnational corporations, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations in global politics.

Key Areas of Inquiry

IR encompasses a wide range of subfields, including:

- **International Security:** Focuses on the threats to national security, such as war, terrorism, and nuclear proliferation.
- **International Political Economy (IPE):** Examines the interplay of economics and politics in the global arena, including trade, finance, and development.
- **Diplomacy and Foreign Policy:** Studies the conduct of diplomacy, foreign policy decision-making, and the strategies states employ to achieve their objectives.
- **International Law:** Investigates the development and application of international law, including treaties, conventions, and customary norms.
- **Human Rights and Humanitarian Intervention:** Examines the protection of human rights and the ethical dilemmas surrounding intervention in other countries.
- **Environmental Politics:** Analyzes the impact of environmental issues on international relations and the search for sustainable solutions.

IR is inherently interdisciplinary, drawing on insights from political science, economics, history, sociology, law, and other fields. This multidisciplinary approach is essential for understanding the complexity of global issues. By exploring these core concerns, subfields, and challenges, IR seeks to deepen our understanding of the complex and interconnected world in which we live. The vast topics which have now come to dominate the study of IR may again not be sufficient with the changing needs of time. Prospects of change remain as world conditions change.

Challenges and Debates

The study of IR is constantly evolving in response to new global challenges. Some of the key debates in the field include:

- The relative importance of different theoretical perspectives (realism, liberalism, constructivism, etc.)
- The impact of globalization on state sovereignty and national identity
- The effectiveness of international organizations in addressing global problems
- The ethical dimensions of foreign policy and humanitarian intervention

Let's Rewind:

International Relations (IR) is a dynamic discipline constantly adapting to a more complex world. Initially focused on the traditional areas of diplomacy, foreign policy, and international law, IR's scope has broadened significantly. The post-World War II era, marked by decolonization and Cold War tensions, necessitated the inclusion of new states, theories, and methodologies for analysis. Behavioralism emerged in the 1960s and 70s, emphasizing the motivations and behaviors of states and their leaders. Today, IR scholars delve into core areas like diplomacy, trade, conflict and cooperation between states, international security, and the intricate dynamics of the global political economy. The evolving international system, with the rise of multinational corporations and terrorist groups, demands continuous adaptation. Consequently, the study of IR now encompasses a wider range of topics, including foreign policy making, state interactions, conflicts and cooperation, national power, and the role of international organizations. While core themes of security, war, cooperation, peace, and global justice remain central, IR has broadened its lens to consider economic interdependence, human

rights violations, and pressing environmental issues. This "new agenda" for IR also tackles contemporary challenges like pandemics, migration, and the growing emphasis on human security. As the world continues to evolve, IR's scope will undoubtedly expand further to address emerging issues and navigate the complexities of the international landscape.

1.5 Differences Between International Relations And International Politics

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

What is 'International Relations'?

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

What is International Politics?

- International politics is the core element of international relations.

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

To be more specific-

'**International Relations'** is the broader umbrella that examines the entire landscape of global interactions while **International Politics** is a specific focus within IR, concentrating on the political dimensions of these interactions. 'International relations' is an academic discipline that studies the relationships (both political as well as non-political) between states as well as non-state actors in the international stage. International politics, on the other hand, is an academic discipline that studies the operation of political power in the state level as well as among other states in the international stage. Thus, this is the main difference between international relations and international politics.

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

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

Distinguishing IR from Domestic Politics

While IR shares some similarities with domestic politics, it is distinct in several ways:

- **Anarchy:** The absence of a central authority in the international system creates a unique context for interactions.
- **Multiple Actors:** IR involves a wider range of actors, including states, international organizations, and non-state actors.
- **Global Scope:** IR focuses on interactions across borders and the global implications of domestic policies.

Let's Rewind:

International Relations (IR) is a vast discipline studying the interactions, both political and non-political, between nations and other actors on the global stage. International Politics (IP), a subfield of IR, focuses more narrowly on the dynamics of political power among states. IR examines the full spectrum of interactions, encompassing economic, legal, and social aspects, while IP delves specifically into political maneuvering and diplomacy employed by states. Both fields share specializations like International Communication (facilitating information flow), International Security (addressing threats like cyberwarfare), International Law (navigating legal complexities across borders), and International Economics (promoting global economic stability). In essence, IR offers a broader lens to analyze the outcomes of these interactions on various aspects of nations. On the other hand, IP provides a deeper understanding of the political strategies and power dynamics that shape the international landscape.

Check Your Progress:

- The scope of international relations is broader than the scope of international politics. Is it true?
- 'International Politics' mainly deals with the political aspect of international relations. Is it true?

1.6 Let's Sum Up:

International Relations (IR) is a dynamic field that examines the complex web of interactions between states, international organizations, and other actors on the world stage. It delves into the motivations behind foreign policy decisions, the competition for power, and the role of cooperation and international institutions in shaping global events. Scholars debate various theories, with some like Realists emphasizing national interest and power, while others like Liberals focus on cooperation and interdependence. Recently, critical approaches have emerged to challenge traditional assumptions about IR. Ultimately, IR aims to understand the intricate forces, both cooperative and conflicting, that shape our ever-evolving world.

The study of IR acknowledges the potential for conflict arising from competition for power and resources. However, it also recognizes cooperation as a crucial element in international relations, emerging from conflict resolution or shared interests. Therefore, IR explores both conflict management and power politics, alongside the role of foreign policy in shaping interactions between actors on the global stage.

1.7 References And Further Reading:

- John W. Young and John Kent, International Relations since 1945 A Global History, OUP, USA, 2004
- Mahendra Kumar, Theoretical Aspects of International Politics, Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala, 1967
- Peu Ghosh, International Relations, PHI Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2010

1.8 Answers To Check Your Progress:

- How would you define International Relations as a discipline?
- ➢ International Relations (IR) is a field of study that examines the interactions of states, international organizations, and other global actors.
- Who authored the book "Theory of International Politics"?

14

- ➢ Kenneth Waltz authored the book.
- • Who authored the book "Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism"?
- ➢ Lenin authored the book.
- • Name three important things relevant to international relations
- ➢ Three important things relevant to international relations are: national interests, conflict and power.
- • Conflict is a continuing phenomenon in international relations. True or False?
- ➢ True.
- • The scope of international relations is broader than the scope of international politics. Is it true?
- ➢ True.
- • 'International Politics' mainly deals with the political aspect of international relations. Is it true?
- ➢ True.

1.9 Model Questions/ Assignment:

1. Define International Relations. Discuss the evolution of International Relations after the end of the First World War to its present form.
2. Discuss the nature and Scope of International Relations.
3. Discuss the nature and scope of IR.
4. Write an essay on the various similarities & differences between International Relations & International Politics.

1.10 Activity Sheet

Q. How do you see international relations as a discipline? Do relations between two neighboring states constitute the subject matter of international relations? Marks: 5

CHAPTER 2 APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

CHAPTER STRUCTURE:

Learning Outcome

Utility of Learning the Approaches

2.1 Liberalism

2.2 Realism

2.3 Systems Theory

Let's Sum Up

Further Reading

Answers To Check Your Progress

Model Questions/ Assignment

LEARNING OUTCOME

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

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

UTILITY OF LEARNING THE APPROACHES
'International Relations' (IR) is about unlocking the "why" behind world events. Different approaches to IR, like Realism and Liberalism, act as unique lenses, each revealing a distinct perspective on global interactions. By studying these approaches, you'll gain the ability to see the world not in black and white, but in a vibrant spectrum of motivations and strategies employed by nations. The knowledge will empower you to navigate our increasingly interconnected world with confidence.

2.1 LIBERALISM

Liberal political thought, championed by thinkers such as Kant, Jefferson, Madison, Mill, Locke, Hume, Rousseau, and Smith, underwent a revival and transformation after World War I, giving rise to the liberal approach in international relations. Figures like Zimmern, Angell, Shotwell, and Wilson became prominent advocates of this perspective, often labeled as liberal idealists or simply idealists. However, E.H. Carr criticized them as utopian.

Liberal thinkers posit humans as fundamentally rational and moral beings capable of progress. They believe societal challenges can be addressed through institutional reform. Central to this view is the idea that humans can overcome irrational and immoral behavior by addressing ignorance and misunderstanding through education and improved social and political structures.

Liberals are optimistic about the potential for harmony and cooperation among individuals and nations. They contend that mutual benefits and shared interests can outweigh conflicts. Unlike realists who emphasize competition and power struggles, liberals focus on the possibility of collaborative arrangements that promote individual freedom and economic prosperity.

Liberals are confident in the capacity of humans to learn from experience and make progress. They reject the realist notion of a static international system, arguing instead that human rationality will lead to the rejection of destructive practices like war. This belief in progress is underpinned by the assumption that humans are inherently rational creatures.

Liberal thought is grounded in several core beliefs. These include the inherent goodness of human nature, the potential for human progress through cooperation, the root of harmful behavior in flawed institutions, the preventability of war through institutional reform, the necessity of a multilateral approach to global challenges, and the importance of democratic governance for both domestic and international peace.

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

1. Human nature is essentially "good" or altruistic and people are, therefore, capable of mutual aid and collaboration.
2. The fundamental human concern for others' welfare makes progress possible.

3. Bad human behaviour, such as violence, is the product not of flawed people but of evil institutions which encourage people to act selfishly and to harm others.
4. War is not inevitable and its frequency can be reduced by eradicating the institutional arrangements that encourage it.
5. War is an international problem requiring collective or multilateral, rather than national, efforts to control it.
6. The international society must reorganize itself in order to eliminate the institutions that make war likely and nations must reform their political systems so that self-determination and democratic governance within states can help pacify relations among states.

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

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

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

Liberal Institutionalism: David Mitrany (1966) and Ernst Haas (1968) were the earlier liberal institutionalists who believed that integration through international and regional institutions would help to solve common problems. Their work provided impetus for increased cooperation

between the European states. The later liberal institutionalists such as Keohane and Nye emphasized the centrality of actors other than the states and focused on trans-nationalism and interdependence. The core content of these contending liberalisms was, however, akin to the emphasis on economic freedom, support for national self-determination, international system organized and regulated on the basis of norms and rules, doctrine of non-intervention, opposition to authoritarian rule, outlawing war and disarmament.

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

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

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

Criticisms

Most of the assumptions of the idealist have been criticized on a number of grounds. They have been considered as impracticable, utopian and most of the liberal principles are charged of being

culture-specific and ethnocentric. They portray Western values and try to impose those on the non-Western values. Free trade, interdependence, democracy are concepts wedded to Western liberal tradition and looked at with much contentions by the developing world. For, it is the big and powerful states which control the functioning of international politics. The liberals attempt for peace, effective international organization and disarmament efforts have met with little success. Further, idealism has been criticized vehemently by the realists for not taking into account the realities of human nature and, hence, politics. Pursuit of self-interest becomes the sole guiding principle in case of individual actions and state activities. Morality has least importance in the arena of politics, As Couloumbis and Wolfe, observed, The Realists argue that the adoption of legalistic, moralistic and even ideological behaviour in politics tends to run contrary to the forces of nature and it results either in pacifism and defeatism on the one hand and a fierce exclusivist, and crusading spirit on the other". Kegley and Wittkopf also pointed out that "Much of the idealist programme for reform was never tried, and even less of it was ever achieved".

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

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What is the core idea of liberalism?
- Name two exponents of Liberalism.
- Who wrote the book The Twenty Years' Crisis?
- Who wrote the article entitled "The End of History'"
- Who wrote The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness?

2.2 REALISM

Realism, a long-standing approach to international relations, contrasts sharply with idealism, liberalism, and Marxism. Rooted in classical Greek thought and developed by thinkers like Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Rousseau, realism posits that power politics are a persistent feature of human civilization.

Emerging strongly after World War I in response to the war's causes and the failure of collective security, realism initially focused on preventing future conflicts. However, the challenges of the 1930s and 1940s led to a reevaluation. Post-war realism, influenced by Morgenthau, Carr, and Herz, emphasized the study of the international system as it is, rather than as it ought to be. This period also saw the rise of strategic studies and the exploration of nuclear deterrence.

Classical realism faced criticism from both behavioralists and those advocating for interdependence, political economy, and transnational relations. The English School also offered a different perspective, emphasizing international society and norms alongside power politics.

Hans Morgenthau, a leading figure in classical realism, argued that politics is a struggle for power but also acknowledged the role of ethics and morality. His work influenced the field significantly, but the rise of neo-realism in the 1980s, spearheaded by Kenneth Waltz, shifted the focus towards structural factors and away from human nature.

Classical realists emphasize the importance of order, stability, and balance of power. They view the international system as anarchic and states as self-interested actors. While they recognize the potential for cooperation, they primarily focus on the competitive nature of international relations. Modernization is seen as a complex process with both positive and negative consequences.

Neo-realism, on the other hand, prioritizes structural factors and the distribution of power in shaping state behavior. Waltz's concept of structural realism emphasizes the enduring nature of the international system and the constraints it imposes on states.

HANS MORGENTHAU AND THE CONCEPT OF REALISM

Hans Morgenthau was a pivotal figure in developing and popularizing classical realism, emphasizing the role of human nature, national interest defined in terms of power, and the limitations of morality in international politics.

Morgenthau's realism is characterized by:

- **Human nature:** He viewed humans as inherently selfish and power-seeking, a fundamental driver of political behavior.
- **Objective laws:** Morgenthau believed that politics is governed by objective laws rooted in human nature, allowing for the development of a rational theory.
- **Interest defined as power:** The pursuit of power is the primary motivating factor for states.
- **Moral relativism:** While morality is essential, it should not dictate foreign policy; national interest takes precedence.
- **Balance of power:** Maintaining equilibrium among states is crucial for preventing conflict.

Morgenthau's six principles outlined in *Politics Among Nations* provide a systematic framework for understanding his realist perspective:

1. Politics is governed by objective laws rooted in human nature.
2. Interest defined in terms of power is the key concept.
3. Interest is not identical to morality.
4. Political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action.
5. Political realism avoids the moralistic approach to international politics.
6. Political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a nation with moral laws that govern the universe.

CRITIQUES OF MORGENTHAU'S REALISM

While Morgenthau's realism remains influential, it has faced criticism. Some argue that his focus on human nature is overly deterministic and neglects the role of institutions and norms. Others contend that his emphasis on power overlooks the complexities of international cooperation and interdependence.

Despite these criticisms, Morgenthau's work continues to shape the discourse on international relations, providing a foundational framework for understanding the dynamics of power and conflict among states.

KENNETH WALTZ'S NEOREALISM

Neorealism, also known as structural realism, is a theoretical framework within international relations that emerged as a refinement of classical realism. Its most prominent proponent, Kenneth Waltz, sought to provide a more scientific and parsimonious explanation for international politics.

Core Tenets of Neorealism

- **Structure over human nature:** Unlike classical realism, neorealism shifts the focus from human nature to the structure of the international system as the primary determinant of state behavior.

- **Anarchy:** The absence of a global governing authority is the defining characteristic of the international system.
- **Self-help:** States operate in a self-help environment, primarily concerned with their own survival and security.
- **Distribution of power:** The distribution of capabilities among states is the key structural variable influencing international politics.
- **Balance of power:** States tend to balance against rising powers to prevent hegemony.

Waltz's Contributions

Kenneth Waltz's seminal work, *Theory of International Politics*, laid the foundation for neorealism. Key contributions include:

- **Systemic level of analysis:** Waltz introduced the concept of a third image or systemic level of analysis, arguing that the structure of the international system, rather than individual states or human nature, is the primary determinant of state behavior.
- **Distribution of power:** Waltz emphasized the distribution of capabilities among states as the key structural variable shaping international politics. He identified three types of systems: unipolar, bipolar, and multipolar.
- **Balancing behavior:** States tend to balance against rising powers to prevent hegemony, contributing to stability in the international system.
- **Parsimony:** Waltz sought to develop a parsimonious theory by focusing on the structure of the international system and avoiding unnecessary variables.

Implications of Neorealism

Neorealism has had a profound impact on the study of international relations. Its focus on structure and the distribution of power provides a framework for analyzing patterns of cooperation and conflict. However, it has also been criticized for its state-centric bias, its neglect of domestic politics, and its pessimistic outlook.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CLASSICAL REALISM AND NEO- REALISM

Classical realism and neorealism differ primarily in their focus. Classical realism centers on human nature, viewing states as unitary actors driven by national interest and power. It acknowledges morality but subordinates it to power politics. Neorealism, conversely, shifts the focus to the structure of the international system, emphasizing anarchy and the distribution of power as key determinants of state behavior. While both theories prioritize state-level analysis, neorealism adopts a more scientific and parsimonious approach, downplaying the role of human nature and morality in shaping international relations.

LET'S REWIND

Classical Realism, a prominent theory in International Relations, views states as the key players, solely focused on their own survival and self-interest. Pioneered by Hans Morgenthau, this school of thought emphasizes power as the core principle driving international politics, with states strategically maneuvering to acquire and maintain it. Classical Realists see parallels between domestic and international politics, believing that order in the international system hinges on the identities and limitations imposed by the international community. While acknowledging the importance of ethics and justice, they argue that these are often outweighed by the realities of power politics. Modernization poses a challenge, potentially leading to an overreliance on reason and a weakening of traditional norms that govern state behavior. In essence, Classical Realism provides a framework for understanding international politics through the lens of state self-interest, power dynamics, and the constraints of the international system.

Kenneth Waltz's Neo-Realism theory argues that the international system's anarchic structure, meaning the absence of a central world government, is the key to understanding how countries interact. In this environment lacking a higher authority, states, the main players, are constantly pressured to prioritize their own survival. Waltz emphasizes that states behave rationally within this system, with minimal internal differences influencing their actions due to the ever-present need for self-preservation. His theory is built on three levels of analysis. The first, called the Ordering Principle (Deep Structure), highlights the contrast between the anarchy of the international system and the hierarchical structure within domestic politics. This anarchy forces states to rely on themselves for security, leading to competition and a focus on acquiring power. The second level, Character of the Units, argues that states become functionally similar due to the "socializing" effect of anarchy. Regardless of internal characteristics, states are pressured to adopt similar survival strategies within the system. The third level, Distribution of Capabilities, acknowledges that while functionally similar, states differ in power. This creates a hierarchy within the system, with strong states exerting influence over weaker ones. Overall, Waltz's Neo-Realism offers a streamlined explanation of international politics, focusing on the anarchic system and the resulting power competition among states.

2.3 SYSTEMS THEORY

Systems theory emerged as a response to the growing interest in employing scientific methods to study social phenomena. It aimed to create a general framework for understanding various social disciplines, including international relations. Key figures in this approach include Easton, Kaplan, McClelland, Rosenau, and Boulding.

Morton Kaplan is a prominent proponent of systems theory in international relations. He views the international system as a dynamic entity composed of interacting actors, including states and international organizations. Kaplan emphasizes the possibility of change within this system and identifies patterns and order in global politics. He proposes six models for international systems:

- **Balance of Power System:** Characterized by multiple states counterbalancing each other to prevent dominance.
- **Loose Bipolar System:** Dominated by two superpowers with competing blocs, but with the presence of non-aligned states and international organizations.
- **Tight Bipolar System:** A more intense version of the loose bipolar system, with reduced influence of non-aligned states and international organizations.
- **Universal System:** A global governance structure resembling a world federation.
- **Hierarchical System:** Dominated by a single superpower, either through conquest or voluntary submission.
- **Unit Veto System:** A system where states possess equal destructive capabilities, leading to deterrence and stability.

While systems theory offers a valuable framework for analyzing international politics, it has faced **criticisms**. Critics argue that it lacks predictive power and is difficult to test empirically. Additionally, Kaplan's specific models have been criticized for being overly simplistic and

unrealistic. Nevertheless, systems theory remains a significant contribution to the study of international relations, providing a broad perspective for understanding global interactions.

LET'S REWIND

Morton Kaplan, a leading figure in systems theory, proposed a dynamic framework for analyzing international politics. He viewed the international system, a network of interacting states and international organizations, as constantly evolving. Embedded within it is the nation-state system, where nation-states hold primary power but adapt their roles as the international system transforms. Kaplan further enriched the field by outlining six ideal-type systems: the Balance of Power System (1815-1914) maintaining order through equilibrium, the Cold War-era Loose Bipolar System with competing blocs, the tightened version of the latter, a hypothetical Universal System with a world government, a Hierarchical System with a single dominant power, and the Unit Veto System with precarious stability based on mutual destruction. Despite critiques regarding limited empirical testing and hypothetical models, Kaplan's work is valued for its contribution to a more scientific study of international relations, offering a valuable lens alongside other theoretical frameworks.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS
- Name the chief exponent of systems theory in international relations.
- What is the core idea of system theory?

LET'S SUM UP

In the realm of International Relations (IR), competing theoretical perspectives offer insights into how countries interact. Liberalism stresses cooperation and institutions like free trade to foster peace, believing humans are inherently rational and war avoidable. This stands in opposition to Realism, which emphasizes self-interest and power struggles as central to international politics. Classical Realism, championed by Hans Morgenthau, views states as the key players, solely focused on their own survival and wielding power strategically. It argues that order in the international system hinges on the identities and limitations imposed by the global community, acknowledging ethics but prioritizing the realities of power politics.

Neo-Realism, a branch of Realism, takes a different approach. Kenneth Waltz argues that the international system's anarchic structure, lacking a central world government, is the key factor shaping how countries interact. In this environment, states prioritize survival and act rationally to acquire power.

Finally, Morton Kaplan's Systems Theory proposes a dynamic framework. He views the international system, a network of interacting states and organizations, as constantly evolving. He also outlines six ideal-type systems, including the historical Balance of Power System and the hypothetical Universal System with a world government.

These IR theories provide distinct lenses for analyzing international politics. Liberalism promotes cooperation, Realism highlights power dynamics, and Systems Theory offers a framework for understanding how the system itself shapes interactions between states.

FURTHER READING

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

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

ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What is the core idea of liberalism?
- ➢ Liberalism in IR emphasizes cooperation and institutions as the path to peace, trusting human reason to prevail over conflict.

- Name two exponents of Liberalism
- ➢ Immanuel Kant, John Stuart Mill

- Who wrote the book The Twenty Years' Crisis?
- ➢ E.H. Carr

- Who wrote the article entitled "The End of History'"
- ➢ Francis Fukuyama

- Who wrote The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness?
- ➢ Reinhold Niebuhr

- Who is attributed as the father of realism in International Relations?

- Hans Morgenthau is considered as the father of realism in International Relations.

- Who wrote the book- Politics among Nations?

- ➢ Hans Morgenthau wrote the book.
- Name the chief exponent of systems theory in international relations.

- ➢ Morton Kaplan.
- • What is the core idea of system theory?
- ➢ The core idea of system theory is that it emphasizes the international system, a network of interacting states and organizations, as the primary factor shaping how countries interact. It highlights interdependence, constant evolution, and the system's influence on state behavior.

MODEL QUESTIONS/ ASSIGNMENT

1. Write an essay on Liberalism in international relations.
2. What do you mean by neo-liberalism? Elaborate with examples.
3. Write an essay on Realism in international relations.
4. What do you mean by neo-realism? Elaborate with examples of offensive & defensive realism.
5. Write an essay on Systems Theory in international relations with examples.

CHAPTER 3: BASIC CONCEPTS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

CHAPTER STRUCTURE:

Learning Outcome

Utility of Learning the Concepts

3.1 Balance of Power

3.2 Collective Security and Disarmament

3.3. National Interest and Ideology

Let's Sum Up

Further Reading

Answers to Check Your Progress

Model Questions/ Assignment

LEARNING OUTCOME

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

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

UTILITY OF LEARNING THE CONCEPTS

Imagine world politics as a dramatic play. Countries, the actors, pursue their self-interest (national interest) guided by core beliefs (ideology). To survive, they forge alliances (balance of power) or band together (collective security) against shared threats. Disarmament is ideal, but a work in progress. By learning these concepts you will be able to decode news and predicting actions based on a country's motivations. You'll be a more informed citizen, able to engage in meaningful discussions about global affairs and potential solutions.

3.1 BALANCE OF POWER

The Balance of Power is a core concept in realist International Relations. It suggests a system where countries try to prevent any single state from dominating by balancing its power with their own military might or alliances. Historically, Europe exemplified this system, with Britain acting as a balancing force. World Wars I and II transformed the regional balance of power into a global one, culminating in the Cold War's bipolar standoff between the US and the USSR. This dynamic restricted European countries' freedom in forming alliances and fuelled a tense arms race focused on nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union's collapse in 1991 shattered this bipolar system, leaving the future of the Balance of Power in international politics uncertain.

Nature of Balance of Power

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

METHODS OF BALANCE OF POWER:

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

- **Armament and Disarmament**: All nations, particularly very powerful nations, place great emphasis on armaments as the means for maintaining or securing a favourable position in power relations in the world. It is also used as a means to keep away a possible aggressor or enemy. However, armament race between two competitors or opponents can lead to a highly dangerous situation which can accidentally cause a war. In this way armament race can act as a danger to world peace and security. Consequently, disarmaments and Arms Control are regarded as better devices for maintaining and strengthening world peace and security. Like armament, disarmament can resolve a balance of power one can succeed in keeping its rival disarmed one preserves the balance

in one's favour. But in practice, disarmament as such has rarely been resorted to except in case of defeated powers on the conclusion of general war. For example, the effort on the part of the allied powers after the First World War was to keep Germany permanently weak.

- **Buffer States or Zones**: Another method of balance of power is to set up a buffer state between two rivals or opponents. Buffers, observes, V. V. Dyke, "are areas which are weak, which possess considerable strategic importance to two or more strong powers. Buffer is a small state created or maintained as a separating state for keeping two competing states physically separate each stronger power then tries to bring the buffer within its sphere of influence but regards it as important, if not, vital, that no other strong power be permitted to do so. The major function of a buffer is to keep the two powerful nations apart and thus minimize the chances of clash and hence to help the maintenance of balance".

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

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

- **Intervention**: Intervention is a dictatorial interference in the internal affairs of another state with a view to change or maintain a particular desired situation which is considered

to be harmful or useful to the competing opponents. Some times during a war between two states no attempt is made by other states to intervene. This is done for making the two warring states weaker. As such intervention and non-intervention are used as devices of balance of power.

MERITS OF BALANCE OF POWER

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

DEMERITS OF BALANCE OF POWER

- Balance of Power cannot ensure peace. In fact, several wars were fought in the name of preservation of Balance of Power.
- Preponderance of one power can also secure peace.
- It has a narrow basis. It fails to give proper weight age to other socioeconomic, cultural and moral factors.
- Equality of number of states is a myth
- Nations are not free to break alliances at their will.
- It is uncertain.

RELEVANCE OF BALANCE OF POWER

In contemporary times, Balance of Power has lost much of its utility due to several changes in the international relations. The following changes in the international relations as well as in the

traditional balance of power system have adversely affected the role and relevance of Balance of Power as a device of power management in international politics.

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

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

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

4. **The End of the Era of Colonialism and Imperialism**: Another big change in the structure of balance of power has been the disappearance of imperialism and colonialism: It has limited the scope for the exercise of power by the European powers, who in the past always worked as the key players of the principle of Balance of Power.

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

6. **The Emergence of Global Actors**: The rise of the United Nations and several other international and regional actors in international relations has given a new looked to the

international relations of our times. The presence of the UN has made a big change in the structure and functioning of the international system. With a provision for collective security of international peace and security, the United Nations constitutes a better source of peace. Due to all these changes in international relations, Balance of Power has come to suffer a big decline. It has definitely lost much of its relevance.

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

LET'S REWIND:

The Balance of Power is a core concept in International Relations. It posits a system where countries try to maintain equilibrium by preventing any single state from dominating. This can be achieved through alliances or military build-up. Europe historically embodied this system, with Britain acting as a balancing force. World Wars I and II transformed it from a regional concept to a global one, ultimately leading to the Cold War's bipolar US-Soviet rivalry. This era restricted European agency in forming alliances and fueled a tense arms race centered on nuclear weapons. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 shattered this bipolar system, leaving the future of the Balance of Power in maintaining international order unclear.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What is the central idea of balance of power?

3.2 COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND DISARMAMENT

Collective security is an arrangement where nations agree to defend each other against aggression. This concept posits that an attack on one is considered an attack on all, prompting a joint response. Unlike alliances or defense pacts, collective security aims to include all states globally, addressing various threats. While the idea has historical roots, its practical implementation has faced challenges.

The notion of a collective security system dates back to the 17th century with Cardinal Richelieu's proposal. It gained further momentum with Immanuel Kant's concept of a "league of nations" promoting peace through cooperation rather than a world government. The Concert of Europe in the 19th century and the subsequent formation of the Inter-Parliamentary Union were early attempts to foster international cooperation.

However, the devastating First World War exposed the limitations of these efforts and led to the creation of the League of Nations. Inspired by the idea of collective security, the League aimed to prevent future conflicts through disarmament, open diplomacy, and international cooperation. Yet, its failure to deter aggression highlighted the challenges inherent in implementing collective security.

The concept was revisited after World War II with the establishment of the United Nations. While the UN Charter incorporated the principle of collective security, the Cold War era's division into blocs hindered its effective implementation. The idea of collective security remains a significant aspiration in international relations, though its realization continues to be complex and dependent on various factors.

Basic assumptions:

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

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

Prerequisites:

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

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

League of Nations:

The League of Nations, established after World War I as the first major effort at collective security, ultimately failed to prevent future conflicts. The League's shortcomings stemmed from several factors. The absence of the United States, a powerful nation, weakened its overall influence. Additionally, the League lacked strong enforcement mechanisms to deter aggression. Finally, member states often prioritized their own interests, as seen in the appeasement of Italy during the Abyssinia Crisis. These weaknesses ultimately rendered the League ineffective in responding to aggression and preventing the rise of totalitarian powers.

United Nations:

The UN, established to address the League of Nations' collective security failings, offers a more robust framework with peacekeeping missions and authorized military interventions. Yet, the system grapples with the veto power of permanent Security Council members, self-interest among member states, and the growing issue of civil wars. The UN's future as a collective security force depends on its adaptability and member states' dedication to unified action.

DISARMAMENT

Disarmament involves reducing, limiting, or eliminating weapons, often focusing on weapons of mass destruction like nuclear arms. The United Nations defines it as eliminating all such weapons while balancing conventional forces to ensure equal security for all nations.

Efforts to disarm date back to the late 19th century with the Hague Peace Conferences, which discussed disarmament and the establishment of an international court. The devastating consequences of World War I fueled a strong desire to prevent similar conflicts. The Treaty of Versailles imposed disarmament on Germany but failed to achieve broader reductions. The newly formed League of Nations aimed to promote disarmament but faced significant challenges.

The Washington Naval Treaty in the 1920s marked a notable success by limiting the size of major navies. However, subsequent attempts to reduce land and air forces through the League of Nations were hindered by disagreements and political tensions. The Kellogg-Briand Pact renounced war as an instrument of national policy but lacked enforcement mechanisms. Ultimately, the rise of Nazi Germany and the outbreak of World War II derailed disarmament efforts.

Methods of disarmament:

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

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

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

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

Motives of disarmament and arms control:

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

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

Nuclear Disarmament

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

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

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

Why is Nuclear Disarmament important?

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

Is Nuclear Disarmament possible?

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

Major treaties:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- *Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)*—signed 1996, not yet in force: The CTBT is an international treaty (currently with 181 state signatures and 148 state ratifications) that bans all nuclear explosions in all environments. While the treaty is not in

force, Russia has not tested a nuclear weapon since 1990 and the United States has not since 1992.[61]

- *New START Treaty*—signed 2010, into force in 2011: replaces SORT treaty, reduces deployed nuclear warheads by about half, will remain into force until 2026.

- *Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons*—signed 2017, entered into force on January 22, 2021: prohibits possession, manufacture, development, and testing of nuclear weapons, or assistance in such activities, by its parties.

LET'S REWIND:

In international relations, collective security strives for a world where nations collaborate to deter aggression and maintain peace. The League of Nations and the United Nations represent historical efforts to achieve this goal. However, challenges like inconsistent member commitment and imbalances in power have hampered their effectiveness. While the UN Security Council boasts stronger enforcement mechanisms compared to the League, its power can be curtailed by vetoes and member states prioritizing their own interests. Collective security might be adapting to address contemporary issues like civil wars, potentially requiring more robust peacekeeping forces or a more prominent diplomatic role for the UN.

Disarmament, the act of reducing or eliminating weapons, is a critical endeavor in preventing catastrophic conflicts, particularly those involving nuclear weapons. Despite its importance, historical attempts like the League of Nations and early treaties faced limitations due to weak enforcement mechanisms and national self-interest. Disarmament can be achieved through imposed measures on defeated nations, unilateral actions by individual countries, or multilateral agreements. Motivations for disarmament are multifaceted, ranging from concerns about international stability and cost savings to ethical considerations about the destructive potential of weapons. Nuclear disarmament specifically aims to lessen the risk of nuclear war and promote global peace, although some argue it could weaken deterrence. The journey towards disarmament is marked by key treaties like the NPT which limits nuclear proliferation, and the SALT/START agreements which aimed to curb the nuclear arms race. Ultimately, disarmament remains a complex but ongoing pursuit in the quest for a safer world.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- 'An attack on one is an attack on all' is a notion associated with which concept of international relations?
- What do you mean by disarmament?

3.3 NATIONAL INTEREST AND IDEOLOGY

National interest is a core concept guiding a nation's foreign policy. It represents the enduring goals a state pursues in its international relations. The concept has roots in antiquity, reflecting the inherent desire of groups to protect their identity and values against external threats.

National interest is multifaceted, encompassing a state's aspirations, guiding policy decisions, and justifying actions on the international stage. While cooperation and conflict are shaped by various factors, national interest remains a central consideration. States prioritize their own interests, often making concessions or forging alliances when they perceive direct or indirect benefits. For instance, granting Most Favored Nation status to China reflects economic and strategic interests.

The concept gained prominence in the post-World War II era as states sought to navigate a complex and uncertain global environment. The failure of international institutions to prevent the war reinforced the primacy of national self-interest. States realized the need to prioritize their own security and well-being, often at the expense of broader international cooperation. This focus on national interest became synonymous with a degree of self-centeredness, as states prioritized their own survival and prosperity over the collective good.

National interest represents a state's core objectives and priorities in its foreign relations. While its specific components vary based on historical, geographical, and political factors, several key elements commonly emerge:

- **Security:** Protecting a nation's territorial integrity, political independence, and the well-being of its citizens is paramount. This includes defense against external threats and maintaining internal stability.
- **Economic prosperity:** Fostering economic growth, securing resources, expanding markets, and promoting trade are crucial for a nation's development and power.
- **Ideological goals:** Spreading a nation's political, cultural, or religious values can be a significant component of national interest, particularly for states with global ambitions.

- **Power and influence:** Enhancing a nation's standing in the international system through diplomacy, military strength, or economic power is often a priority.
- **Global leadership:** Some states aspire to play a leading role in global governance and address transnational challenges.

These components are interconnected and can shift in importance over time. A nation's national interest is a dynamic concept, shaped by both internal and external factors.

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

(A) Necessary or Vital Components:

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

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

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

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

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

These objectives have been listed by V.V. Dyke and his list includes: Prosperity, Peace, Ideology, Justice, Prestige, Aggrandisement and Power. Though each state defines these objectives in a manner which suits its interests in changing circumstances, yet these objectives can be described as common to almost all states. Thus, national interest which a nation seeks to secure can be generally categorized into these two parts.

Classification of National Interests:

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

1. The Primary Interests:

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

2. Secondary Interests:

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

3. Permanent Interests:

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

4. Variable Interests:

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

5. The General Interests:

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

6. Specific Interests:

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

METHODS FOR SECURING NATIONAL INTEREST

Nations employ various strategies to safeguard their national interests within the international arena. These methods include:

- **Diplomacy**

Diplomacy is a cornerstone of securing national interests. It involves negotiations, communication, and persuasion to achieve desired goals. Diplomats represent their nations, building relationships and advocating for their country's objectives. While effective, diplomacy's limitations become evident in complex or contentious issues.

- **Propaganda**

Propaganda aims to influence public opinion, both domestically and internationally, to support a nation's interests. It can be used to bolster national morale, discredit adversaries, or justify specific policies. Modern communication technology has amplified propaganda's reach and impact.

- **Economic Instruments**

Economic tools, such as trade, aid, and investment, can be leveraged to advance national interests. Economic interdependence can foster cooperation or create leverage, depending on the

relationship between nations. Economic sanctions can be used as a coercive measure to influence behavior.

- **Alliances and Treaties**

Formal agreements between nations can solidify shared interests and provide mutual support. Military alliances offer collective security, while economic agreements promote trade and cooperation. These arrangements can enhance a nation's power and influence.

- **Coercive Measures**

In certain circumstances, nations may resort to coercive measures, including threats, sanctions, or military force. These methods are generally employed as a last resort and often carry significant risks. The international community increasingly emphasizes peaceful conflict resolution and diplomacy over coercion.

It's essential to note that the choice of method depends on various factors, including the nature of the interest, the international context, and the power dynamics between nations. While nations prioritize their own interests, there's a growing recognition of the need to balance national objectives with global challenges such as climate change, human rights, and security.

LET'S REWIND:

National interest, the core concept in foreign policy, represents a nation's desire for security and well-being. It encompasses essential elements like territorial integrity, political identity, and cultural heritage, alongside more flexible goals like prestige and influence. These interests can be categorized by their importance (primary, secondary), duration (permanent, variable), or scope (general, specific). Diplomacy, economic tools, alliances, and even coercion are instruments used to secure these interests. While nations prioritize their own well-being, a growing focus on peaceful coexistence and shared global concerns like environmental protection and human rights necessitates considering the broader interests of the international community. Ideally, foreign policy should balance national interests with the interconnectedness of the world.

- Diplomacy is a universally accepted means for securing national interests. Is it true?
- What do you mean by ideology?

LET'S SUM UP

The chapter dealt with some core concepts of international relations. The Balance of Power, traditionally aiming to prevent a single dominant state, grapples with a more intricate world order following the Cold War's bipolarity. Collective security, championed by the UN, seeks cooperation to deter aggression, but struggles with issues like uneven member commitment. Disarmament, essential for preventing wars, is pursued through agreements despite obstacles like national self-interest. Finally, national interest, encompassing a nation's security and aspirations, guides foreign policy, but must increasingly acknowledge the global community's interconnectedness. Understanding these concepts is vital for navigating international relations and fostering a peaceful world order.

FURTHER READING

- John Baylis, J.Wirtz, C.Gray, Strategy in Contemporary World, OUP, UK, 2010
- John W. Young and John Kent, International Relations since 1945 A Global History, OUP, USA, 2004
- Paul R.Viotti and Mark V.Kauppi, International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity, 3/e, Pearson Education 2007

ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What is the central idea of balance of power?

➢ The central idea behind the Balance of Power theory is the pursuit of an **even distribution of power** among states in the international system. This theory suggests that countries act in their own best interest to **prevent any single nation from achieving dominance.**

- 'An attack on one is an attack on all' is a notion associated with which concept of international relations?

➢ It is a concept associated with collective security

- What do you mean by disarmament?

➢ Disarmament seeks a world free of weapons, particularly devastating ones, by reducing or eliminating them entirely, promoting peace and freeing up resources.

• Diplomacy is a universally accepted means for securing national interests. Is it true?

➢ Yes, it is true.

• What do you mean by ideology?

➢ An ideology is a compass guiding how society should function, shaped by a set of beliefs that explain the world around us.

MODEL QUESTIONS/ ASSIGNMENTS

1. Discuss the nature and different methods of Balance of Power.
2. Critically highlight the merits and demerits of Balance of Power.
3. Examine the relevance of Balance of Power in contemporary context.

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

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

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

7. How do you think National Interest influences Foreign Policy? Elaborate.
8. Write a detailed note on nuclear disarmament.

Chapter 4: World in 20ᵗʰ Century

Chapter Structure:

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

- Learn the Causes and consequences of First World War
- Know about the Causes and consequences of Second World War
- Understand the Phases and Impact of Cold War and the Post-Cold War Era

4.1 Introduction:

Imagine a world forever scarred by massive wars. Studying the causes and consequences of World Wars I and II, along with the phases and impact of the Cold War, equips us with a critical lens to understand the fragility of peace and the importance of international collaboration. By examining these historical events, we gain invaluable knowledge for navigating the complexities of the modern world and working towards a more peaceful future.

4.2 First World War: Causes And Consequences:

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

Causes of the First World War

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

The System of Secret Alliances: A complex web of alliances, initially intended to maintain peace, is identified as a critical factor in the outbreak of World War I. Following the Franco-Prussian War, Bismarck established a system of alliances to isolate France. While these alliances aimed to preserve the status quo, they ultimately backfired. Europe became divided into opposing armed camps: the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy) and the Triple Entente (France, Russia, Britain). This division fuelled an arms race and fostered an atmosphere of suspicion, where a localized conflict could quickly escalate into a major war. The departure of Bismarck and Germany's shift towards expansionism further strained relations, creating a tense "armed peace" ripe for war. This intricate network of alliances, intertwined with the rise of European imperialism, is seen as a significant cause of World War I.

Militarism: The escalation of militarism intertwined with the alliance system as another major cause of WWI. Following the Franco-Prussian War, a relentless arms race gripped Europe. Each nation, fearing its neighbours, felt compelled to continuously expand its military and naval might. This wasn't just about defense; the competition, particularly the Anglo-German naval rivalry, fuelled a climate of suspicion and a sense of war being inevitable. Military professionals, trained for conflict, likely saw the growing arsenals as a sign of an impending clash. This arms race, fuelled by alliances and national anxieties, significantly contributed to the outbreak of WWI.

Nationalism: Nationalism surged across Europe like a tidal wave, acting as another major catalyst for WWI. The successes of Italian and German unification, drawing inspiration from the French Revolution, instilled a potent and aggressive form of nationalism. This fervent national pride intensified rivalries between countries, particularly France and Germany, who engaged in a spirited military and naval race. Furthermore, Austria-Hungary grappled with internal pressures from restive nationalities within its empire. The Balkans, a region simmering with unresolved national aspirations, became a tinderbox ready to explode. This unchecked nationalism, fuelling competition and suspicion, significantly contributed to the tense atmosphere that ultimately led to the outbreak of WWI.

Urge to Imperialism: another major cause of WWI was imperialism. The Industrial Revolution's booming production demanded new markets and raw materials to feed its hungry factories, while overflowing coffers craved foreign investment opportunities. This ignited a

fierce scramble for colonies in Africa, China, and beyond, with European powers vying for exclusive control over economic resources and political influence. Latecomers like Germany and Italy intensified the competition, particularly for access to vital resources and trade routes. Although economic needs were undeniable, powerful groups within nations could push for colonial expansion regardless of immediate circumstances. Beyond pure economics, explorers seeking fame, missionaries spreading their faith, and a surge in national pride all fuelled imperialistic ambitions. This intense competition for resources and territories inevitably created friction between European powers, significantly contributing to the pre-war atmosphere of tension and rivalry that ultimately paved the way for WWI.

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

The Immediate Cause: A surge of nationalism, particularly among Slavic populations, threatened to tear apart the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Austria-Hungary viewed Serbia, a small but energetic nation, as a destabilizing force and a pawn of the Entente powers. The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand by a Serbian nationalist served as the immediate trigger. Austria-Hungary's harsh ultimatum to Serbia, only partially accepted, sparked a chain reaction of alliance obligations, transforming a regional conflict into a full-blown war between the two major power blocs. This event, later described by British Foreign Secretary Edward Grey as the extinguishing of Europe's lights, plunged the continent into a devastating conflict.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

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

Loss of Human Lives: During the war considerable destruction was done in terms of men and material. Millions of lives were lost with Russia, Germany, France, Austria, and Britain bearing the brunt of the casualties. This staggering loss of life, primarily young men, drastically altered population demographics and created significant social challenges in the aftermath of the war.

Social and Economic Changes: The war, in all the countries, had the effect of accelerating the emancipation of women wherever the movement had started before 1914. Women over 30 were granted parliamentary vote in Britain in 1918. It happened because the war required a national effort and in modem warfare civilian morale and industrial production had become as important as fighting by the armed forces themselves. Women participated in all activities and worked on factories, shops, offices and voluntary services, hospitals and schools. They worked hand in hand with men and so won their claim of equality with them. It became easier now for them to find work in industry and business, as traditional impediments were removed. Even the barriers of class and wealth were weakened to quite a great extent by the "fellowship of the trenches". Social ethics changed quite significantly and the 'war profiteers' became a special subject of scorn and hatred.

However, the war's true cost went beyond lives. Debt crippled economies, the US and Japan rose as industrial rivals, and protectionism surged. Rebuilding shattered societies and industries became a monumental task, marking a stark transition from the pre-war world.

Democratic Ideals: Despite all its devastating consequences the war brought democratic ideals and institutions to peoples who had not been acquainted with them before. The war had been declared 'to make the world safe for democracy'. So obviously, the newly independent states were keen to set up democratic institutions. Germany's Weimar Republic stood as a prime example, modelled after established democracies. However, these efforts often proved fragile. The social structures remained largely unaltered, lacking the historical foundation for democratic practices. The inexperience with self-government further hampered these fledgling democracies. Even in European colonies, the ideals of self-determination fuelled by the war ignited a yearning for independence. Despite the challenges, WWI did leave a mark on the global political landscape by introducing democratic ideas to new parts of the world.

The Conference of Paris, 1919:

The Paris Conference of 1919 was a large gathering aimed at settling peace after World War I. It was more representative than previous conferences, but its timing and location were influenced by political considerations. The composition also had limitations, with Germany and other defeated countries excluded. The conference was ultimately a compromise between idealism and realism, failing to achieve lasting peace.

The New Balance of Power: The Great War's legacy wasn't confined to battlefields. It shattered empires, fundamentally altering Eastern Europe's landscape. Germany, defeated, suffered harsh military restrictions and territorial losses. The Austro-Hungarian Empire dissolved entirely, fracturing into new nations like Yugoslavia and Poland. The Ottoman Empire crumbled too, igniting Turkish nationalism under Mustafa Kemal. This redrawing of borders, intended to address ethnicities and security, sowed new seeds of conflict. Arab nationalism flourished, the creation of Israel caused friction, and minority rights became a critical issue. Notably, this reshaping was driven by the anxieties surrounding the spread of communism from Russia.

The New International machinery: The League of Nations, envisioned by Woodrow Wilson, arose from the ashes of World War I to prevent future conflicts. It aimed to be a forum for peaceful negotiations instead of alliances and secret diplomacy. While idealistic, the League's effectiveness was hobbled from the start. The US never joined, and major European powers like Germany and Russia were excluded. This left the League as a supporter of the existing peace

treaties, rather than a truly neutral arbiter. Furthermore, the League lacked any real military muscle to enforce its decisions. Despite some successes in resolving minor disputes, it couldn't handle conflicts involving major countries. Though it ultimately failed to prevent World War II, the League did pave the way for the United Nations by establishing the International Court of Justice and the International Labour Organisation.

LET'S REWIND:

World War I, a devastating conflict ignited by a complex web of alliances, militarism, nationalism, and imperialist drives, shattered the pre-war world order. The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Austria-Hungary sparked a chain reaction that plunged major powers into a brutal global war. The war's consequences were devastating. Millions perished, economies crumbled, and social structures transformed. The Treaty of Versailles intended to secure peace, burdened Germany with harsh penalties, sowing the seeds of future conflict. Though democratic ideals emerged in some regions, the war's true cost extended far beyond lives lost. Rebuilding shattered societies became a monumental task, marking a turning point in global history. The League of Nations, envisioned to prevent future wars, proved ineffective due to its limitations. Despite some successes, it couldn't address conflicts involving major powers. However, the League laid the groundwork for the United Nations by establishing key institutions. World War I's destructive impact left a lasting legacy of social, political, and economic upheaval, forever altering the 20th century.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- When did the United Nations Form? What was the name of its predecessor?
- What was the basic reason of formation of those organizations?

4.2 SECOND WORLD WAR: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

World War II began in 1939 with German aggression on Poland on 1st September. Earlier, two erstwhile enemies namely Germany and the Soviet Union had signed a non-aggression pact making way for Polish partition between two of them. All efforts to reach an understanding between the Soviet Union on the one hand and Britain and France on the other hand proved fruitless. International Relations were still characterized by the same evil practices that had led to the outbreak of the First World War – aggression for territorial expansion and secret pacts among European great powers. In fact, secret negotiations were being simultaneously carried on

between the Soviet Union and Germany and between Britain and Germany. Britain and France took the Soviet Union for granted and did not bother to conclude a military alliance with the latter. This paved the way for Soviet German non-aggression pact and the German attack on Poland.

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

Causes and Outbreak of Second World War

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

Treaty of Versailles: The Treaty of Versailles, envisioned as a pathway to lasting peace after World War I, instead sowed the seeds of future conflict. Designed by the victorious Allies without German participation, the treaty was perceived as vindictive and humiliating. Germany shouldered immense burdens: it was solely blamed for the war's destruction, lost territory to various nations, faced severe restrictions on its military, and was crippled by enormous financial reparations. These harsh terms, especially the war guilt clause and the reparations, fostered deep

resentment within Germany. This resentment is considered a significant factor by many historians in the rise of Adolf Hitler and the eruption of World War II.

Failure of Collective Security System: Collective security system was a noteworthy ideal the world leaders had pledged at the end of the First World War. Providing security collectively to the victim of international aggression was its aim. The Covenant of the League of Nations provided that in case of aggression, members of the League, by their collective action, would compel the aggressor to withdraw. This collective action could either be in the form of economic sanctions against the aggressor, or military support to the victim of aggression or both.

During the inter-war years, it was, however, proved that the League was an ineffective. While it condemned aggressions like Japan's takeover of Manchuria and Italy's invasion of Abyssinia, the League lacked teeth. Its sanctions were unenforced and military action unthinkable, especially against permanent members like Japan and Italy. This impotence emboldened Germany's treaty violations and ultimately failed to prevent World War II.

Failure of Disarmament: It was agreed at the Paris Peace Conference that world peace could be ensured only if nations reduced their armaments to a point consistent with their domestic safety or defense. That means all the weapons of offensive nature were to be destroyed. The task of preparing a plan for the reduction of armaments was entrusted to the League of Nations. However, due to divergent views of nations that mattered, it could not identify offensive weapons. France prioritized security over arms reduction, while Germany chafed under disarmament imposed by the Treaty of Versailles. The League of Nations' conferences couldn't overcome these divides, leading to an arms race and ultimately, World War II.

World Economic Crisis: World economic crisis began in 1929 with sudden stoppage of loans by the American financial houses to the European countries throwing the world into a deep economic crisis. Countries like Germany were hit especially hard. Millions lost their jobs, and Germany couldn't afford to pay back loans they'd taken out. This economic misery opened the door for Adolf Hitler to take control of Germany. The crisis also forced England to change its money system. This economic mess, along with the rise of Fascism in Germany, Italy, and Japan, all led to the outbreak of World War II.

Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis: In the lead-up to World War II, Germany, Italy, and Japan joined forces as the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis. This alliance wasn't interested in peace - they craved expansion and weren't afraid to use violence. They bullied smaller countries and openly celebrated war. England and France watched with growing alarm as these fascist powers grew bolder. They tried to form a united front with the Soviet Union to counter this threat, but it fell apart. Feeling left out, the Soviets surprised everyone by signing a non-aggression pact with Germany. This unexpected agreement paved the way for Germany's invasion of Poland, which sparked World War II. Though the Soviets also invaded Poland, England and France declared war on Germany, officially starting the global conflict.

The Problem of National Minorities: The redrawing of Europe's map after WWI left pockets of minorities within new nation-states. While US President Wilson championed self-determination, strategic concerns trumped this ideal. This resulted in German minorities living uneasily in Poland and Czechoslovakia, and similar situations elsewhere. The post-war treaties included minority protections, but these fell short. Hitler exploited these grievances, using the plight of minorities as a justification for invading Czechoslovakia and Poland, making the minority issues a significant factor leading to WWII.

Appeasement by Britain and France: After WWI, Britain initially balanced power by backing Germany against a strong France. Hitler's rise and alliance with Mussolini, however, shifted British priorities. Fearing fascism more than communism, Britain and France adopted appeasement, hoping to maintain peace by making concessions to the dictators. This included weak responses to Italian aggression in Ethiopia and German expansion in Austria and Albania. This policy of appeasement is widely seen as a major cause of WWII, as it emboldened Hitler and Mussolini and failed to deter their aggression.

German Attack on Poland: The apparent and immediate cause of the war was the German attack on Poland on September 1, 1939. Earlier, when all attempts at an Anglo-French alliance with the Soviet Union had failed, Hitler entered a non-aggression pact with Stalin. This was most unexpected, as, for several years, only hatred had existed between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. They signed the pact promising not to fight each other, but really it was a plan to split Poland in two. This secret deal, called the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, kicked off World War II when Germany invaded Poland on September 1st, 1939. Britain and France declared war on

Germany to help Poland, but Poland was quickly defeated and divided between Germany and the Soviet Union.

Beginning of the War: Poland, as we have seen above, became the immediate cause of the War. In a move that sent shockwaves through Europe, Germany pressured Poland to surrender territory in March 1939. Britain and France, determined not to repeat the appeasement of Hitler at Munich, pledged to defend Poland if attacked. However, Hitler wasn't interested in appeasement this time. He attempted to trick Britain by proposing fake negotiations with Poland. This ploy failed, and with a weak excuse, Germany launched a full-scale invasion of Poland on September 1st, 1939. Britain and France responded by declaring war on Germany, but Poland was swiftly overwhelmed. The invasion even prompted the Soviet Union to join the attack on September 18th. This series of events marked the explosive beginning of World War II.

USA and USSR become Allies: Initially on the sidelines, both the US and USSR were reluctantly pulled into World War II by 1941. The US, bound by neutrality laws, eventually aided Britain and China with weapons through the Lend-Lease Act. Meanwhile, trusting a deceptive pact with Hitler, Stalin was caught off guard by the German invasion in June 1941. This betrayal forced the USSR to join the Allies. The US followed suit in December 1941 after the surprise attack on Pearl Harbour by Japan. Fuelled by these events, World War II escalated into a true global conflict.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

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

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

Birth of UN: One of the momentous results of the War was the birth of the United Nations. Although the League of Nations failed to deliver, mankind did not altogether lose its hope of

making the world a safer and happier place to live in. The UN Charter enshrines the hopes and ideals of mankind on the basis of which countries can work together to maintain lasting peace. However, the establishment of the UN was agreed much before the end of the Second World War under the Atlantic Charter.

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

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

LET'S REWIND:

The outbreak of World War II in 1939 wasn't simply a sudden event. Amalgamation of causes were there drawn mainly from the unresolved issues from World War I. The Treaty of Versailles, meant to punish Germany, sowed deep resentment that fueled Adolf Hitler's rise to power. The League of Nations, intended to maintain peace, proved ineffective in stopping aggression and disarmament efforts stalled. The global economic depression of the 1930s further destabilized the world order. In this tense atmosphere, fascist powers like Italy, Germany, and Japan formed the aggressive Axis alliance. Britain and France's policy of appeasement towards these dictators emboldened them. The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, a secret deal between Germany and the Soviet Union to divide Poland, gave Hitler the green

---

light to invade. This triggered a chain reaction, with Britain and France declaring war on Germany. The surprise attack on Pearl Harbor by Japan eventually drew the US into the conflict, making World War II a truly global war.

The war's consequences were devastating. Millions perished in the fighting, and entire cities lay in ruins. The old world order crumbled, with established powers like Britain and France giving way to new superpowers: the United States and the Soviet Union. This rivalry would ignite the Cold War, a tense standoff that dominated the latter half of the 20th century. The war also spurred decolonization movements, as European nations, weakened by the conflict, struggled to hold onto their vast empires. The United Nations, established in the war's aftermath, aimed to prevent such a global catastrophe from ever happening again. However, the deep divisions sown by the war would continue to shape international relations for decades to come.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What was the immediate cause of World War II?
- What was the time period of World War II?

4.3 COLD WAR: ORIGIN, CAUSES AND IMPACT

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

Meaning of Cold War

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

In the process, tens of millions of people suffered in very different ways, including violent death, persecution and disappearance. Economic development was disrupted and in cases denied resulting in the misery and hunger for millions of poor people in different parts of the world. Millions suffered and hundreds of thousands were killed in 'communist' and 'anti-communist' rebellions, uprisings, repression, civil wars and interventions throughout Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean besides East Europe, Balkans and other parts of the world. Despite having these sufferings on record, interestingly, we continue to call this 45-year war as the Cold War! And interestingly, not once American and Soviet armies fought face to face in a battlefield. All this definitely calls for little thinking on the dimensions of its meaning. When one refers to this war as the Cold War, the aim is to convey that it was fought under an ideological cover. The war saw intense competition between two mutually hostile political ideologies and worldviews. These were 'capitalism' and 'socialism'. Both these terms have wide ranging expressions of two different variants of socio-economic, political and cultural organizations. In plain terms, therefore, capitalism stood up for liberal democracy and free market economy whereas socialism sought to champion state ownership, workers' rights and egalitarian system. The United States provided leadership to the capitalist world and the Soviet Union.

This intense ideological competitiveness gave rise to bloc rivalry. Bloc rivalry was a signpost of the 45-year Cold War. When the Soviets, for example, initiated the Molotov Plan in 1947 for its Eastern European allies to aid them and rebuild their ailing economies, the Americans responded with the multi-billion-dollar Marshall Plan (or, the European Recovery Programme) in 1948 for the post World War II sick economies of the Western Europe. The Marshall Plan was in force only for four years, the Molotov Plan remained till the last breath of the USSR with a new name

since 1949 known as the Council for Mutual Economic Assistant (COMECON). Similarly, when the American side of the war founded an intergovernmental military alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949, the Soviet side had rivaled them with signing the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (the Warsaw Pact) in 1955. These ideological underpinnings and bloc rivalry impressed the observers of the war to qualify it as 'Cold' as it did not involve direct military confrontations between the warring camps. This has led many to characterize the Cold War as 'nonmilitary' conflict. More nuanced meanings, however, of the Cold War sits between its ideological cover and the so-called non-military conflict. Some described Cold War a collection of 'low-intensity' conflicts. Of course, the two sides fought several 'proxy' wars in Africa, Asia and Latin America – which was yet another feature of the Cold War.

ORIGIN OF THE COLD WAR

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

Geopolitical: Some historians trace the origins of the Cold War to the Soviet socialist revolution of 1917 and the European military intervention in Russia in 1918 to scuttle the first socialist state in the world. Other scholars see the origins of the Cold War to the military pacts and their violations between the European great powers immediately prior to and in the course of the Second World War. But the Cold War is widely believed to have begun in 1945; this was the time when the Soviets and the Americans had started seeing themselves as two most powerful nations in the West. This perception was at the core that also nurtured the expansionist aspirations that were believed as incompatible among the Soviets and the Americans in terms of their own power and capability. The view that understands the Cold War from the angle of power, capability, expansionist aspirations etc is called the 'geopolitical explanation' to the origin of the Cold War. This is also a post-World War II view to the origin of the Cold War. It assumes that at the end of the war in 1945, the United States and the Soviet Union were the only two superpowers along with important powers like the United Kingdom and France – which had militarily weakened. It is said that though the Americans and the Soviets had allied in the World War II to defeat the Axis Powers, there was lack of trust between the two. Moreover, both were

aspiring to achieve dominance in Europe and their aspirations were matched by their power and capability.

Ideological: The 'geopolitical explanation', however, does not tell the reasons for the lack of trust between the United States and the Soviet Union. This gap is filled by the 'ideological explanation' that goes back to the Russian Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. The Bolshevik Revolution was inspired by communism – the ideology espoused by the 19th century philosopher, Karl Marx. Success of a workers' revolution in Russia under the leadership of the Vladimir Lenin was looked at with suspicion and hostility by the capitalist classes in Europe and the US. Foremost, the success of the socialist revolution sent a powerful and historically important message to the workers, peasantry and all other exploited classes and subjugated and colonized people. The message was: it is possible to overthrow capitalism and its attendant colonialism and imperialism and liberate the exploited and oppressed classes and people. Soviet revolution greatly inspired people in the colonies including in India; many began talking of liberating their nations from the colonial rule and establish an egalitarian socialist order. Likewise, Soviet revolution galvanized the workers in Europe especially in Germany, Britain, France and Italy where the communist and socialist parties became politically active and radical in anticipation of a worker's revolution. Communist and socialist parties were formed in the 1920s in several Latin America countries, and in the European colonies in Asia and Africa; for instance, Communist Party of India was formed in 1925 to organize the peasantry and the working class. The imperial powers of Europe and the US looked at this with great hostility. Secondly, the Soviet Revolution offered a different paradigm of looking at international system and building a new international system that would be based on the solidarity and cooperation among liberated peoples of the world. Russia was part of the Allied forces during the First World War but withdrew from the War after the Revolution and abandoned all secret military pacts and understandings for territorial expansion which it had signed with Britain and other European powers. Promoting new norms of IR was not acceptable to great powers which were used to war, military alliances, spheres of influence and overseas colonies. As Soviet Union withdrew from the First World War, European imperial powers requested the US to military intervene in Russia. Russian revolution had aroused great enthusiasm and hope among colonial people. This was dangerous and unacceptable for colonial masters. American expeditionary forces and those of other Allied countries thus intervened in Soviet Union in 1918; the intervention lasted several

years. An ideological justification was given for this Allied military intervention. It was said that the Bolshevik Revolution was antagonistic to the "values of freedom" that the Americans claimed their own and that the Russian Revolution was a danger to freedom and democracy everywhere. Socialism was dubbed as totalitarianism which negated democracy and human rights.

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

CAUSES OF COLD WAR

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

- At first, the difference between Soviet Russia and USA led to the Cold War. The United States of America could not tolerate the Communist ideology of Soviet Russia. On the other hand, Russia could not accept the dominance of United States of America upon the other European Countries.

- Secondly, the Race of Armament between the two super powers served another cause for the Cold War. After the Second World War, Soviet Russia had increased its military

strength which was a threat to the Western Countries. So, America started to manufacture the Atom bomb, Hydrogen bomb and other deadly weapons. The other European Countries also participated in this race. So, the whole world was divided into two power blocs and paved the way for the Cold War.

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

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

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

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

PHASES OF COLD WAR

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

- **1ˢᵗ Phase (1946-1949)**: At the conclusion of the Second World War, the Soviet Union formed Eastern bloc by occupying the Eastern European countries like Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Eastern Germany and so on and afterwards, converted these countries into its satellite states by establishing communism and destroying democracy from 1946 to 1949. On the contrary, in March 1947, President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, unveiled the policy of containment also called "Truman Doctrine" to provide political, military and economic assistance to all democratic nations under the threat of communism or to fight communism. As per this policy, the US allocated $400 million to Greece and Turkey to stop the infiltration of communism. Besides, the US declared "Marshall Plan" on 5ᵗʰ June 1947. It was an American initiative to reconstruct Europe, after the end of World War II. The United States provided around $12 billion in economic support to help rebuild European Countries to prevent the spread of communism. Pakistan and India, the two important countries for the US and Soviet Union got independence in August 1947. Pakistan was not reluctant to support democracy against communism while India followed the policy of neutrality towards the two conflicting super powers. Soviet's leaders looked upon the United States with Suspicion after these developments. The US also had a nuclear bomb and could easily defeat the USSR, but it was not in mood to start the third World War. The Cold war turned furious during this phase.

- **2ⁿᵈ Phase (1949-1953)**: The US established a military alliance with the European countries and Canada by signing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on 4ᵗʰ April 1949 to check the influence of communism. The treaty provided collective defence to its members in response to an attack from external party. The sole aim of the alliance was to prevent the further infiltration of the USSR in Europe. In August 1949, the USSR tested its first nuclear bomb at Semipalatinsk and successfully balanced its power with the US and made the Cold War more complicated. In the same year, a new communist country, China, appeared on the map of the world, creating further problems for the US. Washington did not recognize People's Republic of China. As a result, Beijing was drifted towards the Soviet's bloc as evident in its support for North Korea. In the Korean War, which lasted from 1950 to 1953, the US jumped to support the

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

- **3rd Phase (1953-1957)**: Two new US-sponsored treaties emerged in this phase namely South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), signed in September 1954 and Middle East Defence Organization (MEDO) in 1955 to prevent communism from gaining ground in these regions. Within a short span of time, America gave military assistance to 43 countries and formed 3300 military bases around the USSR. Moscow, in the response to NATO and SEATO, concluded "Warsaw Pact" with the Eastern European countries on 14th May 1955. It was a collective defence treaty like NATO.

- **4th Phase (1957-1962)**: In 1960, the U-2 plane incident escalated the tensions between Washington and Moscow. The US flew U-2 spy planes from Peshawar airbase to collect intelligence information. In May 1, 1960, the Soviet Air Defence Forces shot down the plane and captured its pilot. The Soviet Union constructed Berlin wall in 1961 to divide Eastern Germany from the Western Germany and effectively control the movement of immigrants. It was called the "Symbol of Cold War." The Cuban Missile Crisis was witnessed in this phase. In response to the deployment of the missile in Turkey and Italy by the US in the proximity to the USSR, the Soviets, with the support of the Cuban premier, Fidel Castro, started to construct the missile launch facilities in Cuba, 140km away from Florida. The activities of missiles deployment were confirmed by the US when U-2 spy plane produced clear photos of the facilities. President John F. Kennedy ordered naval blockade to prevent missiles from reaching Cuba. Afterwards, an agreement was signed, under which, the US agreed to not invade Cuba and to dismantle its missiles present in Turkey. The USSR, on the other hand, discontinued its missile program in Cuba. The Cuban missile crisis lasted 13 days from October 16-28, 1962.

- **5th Phase (1962-1969)**: In the wake up of "Cuban Missile Crisis", there was an urgent need to take measures to prevent the nuclear war between the two conflicting super powers. As a result, a "Hot Line" was established in 1963 between the US and USSR to facilitate the communication in emergency and prevent the nuclear war owing to miscalculation. The Hot Line was a direct communication facility to be used in emergency only. To reduce nuclear weapons, the partial test ban treaty (PTBT) also called Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) was concluded in 1963. It is officially known as a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water except underground. The governments of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and the United States signed it in Moscow on August 5, 1963. Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was also concluded in 1968 to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and its technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and to achieve the goal of nuclear disarmament. This phase is a period of nuclear cooperation.

- **6th Phase (1969-1978)**: This phase is marked as Détente meaning the easing of hostility between the United States and the Soviet Union. Richard Nixon became the president of the US in 1969 and he followed the friendly policy towards the USSR to put an end to the cold war. He was the first president to visit China after World War II. He also visited Soviet Union in 1972. His visit to the Soviet Union was a historical achievement because he signed Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty or SALT I with his Russian counterpart Brezhnev to limit the number of ballistic missiles each country could hold. In 1970, the USSR signed treaty with West Germany and agreed to not use force against her. This greatly contributed in reduction of tensions in Europe. After Nixon's tenure ended, Jimmy Carter assumed the duties of presidency in the United States and continued the policy of Détente. His attempts were directed to negotiate further reduction in nuclear missiles. Although Carter's efforts were honest, his attempts to put further limits on nuclear ammunition by signing SALT II in 1979 were hampered because the Congress refused to pass the SALT-II treaty. The basic reason cited for the rejection of SALT II by the Congress was the invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet Union in 1979.

- **7th Phase (1979-1991)**: This phase proved disastrous for the USSR and resulted in its disintegration. The Détente ended in 1979 when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. President Zia of Pakistan offered to act as a conduit to support Afghan Mujahedeen by providing them weapons and training to fight the Soviets. The US, finally, agreed to the President Zia and sent containers full of weapons and bags full of dollars to defeat the Soviets with the help of the Afghan Mujahedeen and Pakistan. Initially, the policy makers back in Washington did not believe that these rebels would defeat the Soviets. However, the result of war turned out to be surprising for them. According to CIA estimation, by 1983, the total war expenditure of the Soviets was 8 to 10 times higher than the total money US congress spent on Mujahidin. According to CIA director William Casey, who briefed President Reagan in 1984, Mujahedin had killed or wounded 17,000 Soviet soldiers and control 60 percent of the countryside. The war had cost the Soviet's government about $12 billion. This damage had been purchased by US taxpayers for $200 million plus another $200 million contributed by Saudi Arabia. As a result, the Soviet Union decided to withdraw from Afghanistan in 1987. In 1991, it was disintegrated owing to its economic bankruptcy caused by the Afghan's war. It lost all its satellite states and new Central Asian countries also got independence from the USSR. The cold war finally ended and the US became the unchallenged super-power of the world.

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

RESULT OF COLD WAR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

War is a violent incident. Yet the Cold War, fought between the blocs led by the United States and the Soviet Union between 1945 and 1990 was called the Cold War because of its dimensions that included ideological cover, bloc rivalry, non-military confrontation, arms race, space race etc. The two sides fought many 'proxy' wars in different parts of the world through their allied regimes and political groups. Calling the Cold War, a collection of "low-intensity" conflicts seems to come closer to its real nature. Prevalence of those conflicts and their origin over a

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

LET'S REWIND:

The Cold War was a decades-long power struggle between the US and the Soviet Union following World War II. Unlike traditional wars, it wasn't fought directly by the superpowers themselves. Instead, they indirectly clashed through ideology, economics, and influence in other countries. This era was marked by the formation of rival alliances, the stockpiling of weapons, and numerous proxy wars fought around the globe. The Cold War can be broadly divided into three phases. The first phase (1946-1949) involved the Soviet Union solidifying its control over Eastern Europe, while the US countered with programs like the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. The second phase (1949-1953) witnessed the creation of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, along with the Korean War. The third phase (1953-1991) was a rollercoaster of tensions, including the Vietnam War, the Cuban Missile Crisis, a brief period of relaxed tensions (détente), the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and ultimately, the USSR's collapse in 1991, marking the end of the Cold War.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- What are the goals of Perestroika and Glasnost?

LET'S SUM UP:

World War I, ignited by alliances and nationalism, devastated the world. Millions died, empires crumbled, and harsh treaties like Versailles planted seeds for future conflict. The League of Nations, meant to preserve peace, failed, but laid the groundwork for the UN. The war's social, political, and economic impact forever changed the 20th century.

World War II erupted from a mixture of reasons. The harsh Treaty of Versailles on Germany coupled with the rise of fascist dictators like Hitler and Mussolini, fueled aggression. Appeasement by Western powers emboldened them further. The war's consequences were devastating - immense casualties, shattered economies, and the dawn of the nuclear age. It also reshaped the world order, with the rise of superpowers and the dismantling of colonial empires.

The Cold War, a decades-long ideological struggle between the US and Soviet Union, was fought indirectly through alliances, proxy wars, and weapon buildups.

FURTHER READING

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

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

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

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

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

ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

- When did the United Nations Form? What was the name of its predecessor?

➤ The United Nations officially formed on October 24, 1945. Its predecessor was the League of Nations**.**

- What was the basic reason of formation of those organizations?

- ➢ Both the League of Nations and the United Nations were formed with the primary goal of preventing future wars and maintaining international peace.

- • What was the immediate cause of World War II?

- ➢ The immediate cause of World War II was the German invasion of Poland on September 1st, 1939. This act of aggression triggered a chain reaction. Britain and France, who had pledged to defend Poland, declared war on Germany in response.

- • What was the time period of World War II?

- ➢ September 1st, 1939 to September 2nd, 1945.

- • What are the goals of Perestroika and Glasnost?

- ➢ Perestroika and Glasnost were two reform policies implemented by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in the late 1980s. These policies aimed to revitalize the stagnant Soviet economy and society, and are credited with contributing to the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union. Perestroika (Russian for "restructuring") focused on economic reform. Glasnost (Russian for "openness") focused on political reform.

MODEL QUESTIONS/ ASSIGNMENT

---

1. What are the causes of First World War? Explain in detail.
2. Discuss the consequences of First World War in detail.
3. Discuss the causes of outbreak of Second World War in detail.
4. What are the major consequences of Second World War? Explain in detail.
5. What do you mean by Cold War in International Relations? Discuss the major factors of its origin.
6. Discuss the different phases of Cold War in detail.
7. Write an essay on the impacts of Cold War.
8. Can we avoid war? What is your opinion?