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**ABSTRACT**

For the country to progress in an adequate manner, the maintenance of international relations has been regarded as an imperative area, the main reasons have been, advancement in technologies, scarcities of resources, and so forth. With the impact of globalization, there have been development of connections between India and other countries of the world. India is making an operative change from an exceptionally inward and oriented economy to a more worldwide integrated economy. As a result of new policies during the early 1990s, it has become one of the rapidly growing economies in the world. Despite some serious challenges, such as rural development, illiteracy, unemployment, energy security, poverty, infrastructure, regional disparities and internal security, there are strong suggestions that rapid progression will continue to exist. In the present existence, it is getting clear that along with the People’s Republic of China and Japan, India would be contributing a vital part in an evolving Asian economic architecture. However, it is also recognized that India’s part will be less operative if its economic relations within South Asia and with the Central Asian region continue to remain peripheral. In this case, India is required to work for an economic policy framework, in which countries like Pakistan, Afghanistan and the Central Asian republics view their promotion as well within the organization. The main purpose of this research paper is to look into the significance of the field of international relations from the Indian perspective. The main areas that have been highlighted are, significance of international relations, theories of international relations, international relations and the behavioural sciences, international objectives of a progressing country, and India and the Himalayan states.
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**Introduction**

International relations is normally looked upon as a distinct and separate academic discipline. In many colleges and universities, international relations is a complete course and students are willing to take this as their area of study. One can find a distinct curriculum and degree schemes, and professors and lecturers of international relations. However, in a vital sense, this separateness is considered to be false. On one hand, it seems instinctively simple to state that international relations is a separate unit. It is at the most basic level, the study of something that happens out there. International relations, is the study of relations between nations. When the term ‘nations’ is used, then commonly it is referred to the communications between the nation-states (Elias & Snutch, 2007).

Apart from development, the Indian economy is also getting more expanded and differentiated. In traditional times, western countries were main markets for Indian exports. In recent years, important variations have taken place. India’s trade relations with the United States of America (USA) and the European Union (EU) may have increased in absolute terms, but moderately speaking as a percentage of India’s total trade, trade with the EU and the USA has weakened in the last decade. In comparison, there has been a speedy incorporation of the Indian economy within Asia, which has been strengthened by India’s ‘Look East’ policy, which was initiated in the early 1990s. This is clearly obvious from the figures of India-China trade, i.e. average trade growth was 53% per year between 2003-04 and 2007-08, as well as India-Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) trade. Studies have shown that India’s qualitative and quantitative involvement and dealings with the Asian economies is far deeper than usually professed. India’s economic connection with the west Asian countries has been traditionally quite strong, and more so now due to energy imports, a 2.5m. Indian diaspora, and appropriate trade relations (Scott, 2011).

**Significance of International Relations**

After the First World War, which was from 1914-1918, international relations since, then emerged as an academic discipline. The losses that were suffered by the nations during the First World War, compelled the individuals to find ways and means to generate peace and harmony between the nations. The Second World War was from 1939-1945, this too led to loss of life and property and there was absence of peace between the nations, hence, this war too changed the ways in which international relations thinkers formed their perspectives about the world. The occurrence of wars and conflicts between the nations gave rise to interests of the individuals in the field of international relations; the primary concern was to create peace. Most of the areas in international relations are focused upon the anarchy, order and the state of nature; this is basically due to the absence of world government. There are individuals who have formed beliefs in human rights, and have formed this viewpoint, that the relationships between persons and the states is governed by social contracts. The economic concerns have also been regarded as the driving forces in the field of international relations. The expansion of globalization, buying and selling of goods have led to recognition of the significance of international relations (Cox & Campanaro, 2016).

International relations is a comprehensive area, it not just discusses about the war and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the nations, but there are many areas that are looked upon in the field of international relations, these are, status quo, appeasement, state of nature, anarchy, order, human nature, natural rights, social contract, legitimacy, justice, materialism, class conflict, imperialism, capitalism and capital. The significance of international relations is largely recognized when there is occurrence of wars, natural calamities or disasters; when a country suffers a loss, then if it has maintained appropriate relations with the other countries, then certainly they offer their help and assistance. The very first concern of international relations is to avoid the occurrence of conflicts and disputes, as they are stated to be the major causes that lead to impediments. The viewpoints of John Lock about social contract and the responsibilities of the rulers about their subjects have contributed to a number of theories that lead to the recognition of significance of international relations (Cox & Campanaro, 2016). The discipline of international relations has put major emphasis upon the concept of human rights, as in all the countries, it is vital that every individual should be given equal opportunities, without any kind of discrimination on the basis of class, caste, race, creed, religion, ethnicity and socio-economic background.

**Theories of International Relations**

The theories of international relations have been stated as follows: (Slaughter, n.d.).

Realism – The international system is defined by the anarchy, which is the absence of central authority. States are sovereign and thus they are autonomous of each other; no inherent structure or a society can emerge or exist to order any kinds of relations between them. Realism can understand power in a variety of ways, i.e. militarily, economically and diplomatically and eventually it puts emphasis upon the distribution of powerful material capability as the determinant of international politics. Realists are of the viewpoint that survival is the major goal of every state and foreign invasion and occupation are regarded to be the problems that are experienced by the States.

Institutionalism – Institutionalism relies on micro-economic theory and game theory to reach a radically different conclusion, that co-operation between the countries is possible. Co-operation is regarded to be a coherent and a self-interested strategy that the countries pursue under different set of circumstances. Under this theory, the institutions are defined as the set of rules, norms, practices and the decision-making procedures that adequately design the expectations and overcome the uncertainties that weaken co-operation. Institutions are considered to be the main areas that largely contribute in increasing efficiency and they can also cause a reduction in the transaction costs of co-ordination by making provision of the centralized forum in which States are able to conduct meetings.

Liberalism - Liberalism makes for a more composite and a less organized body of theory as compared to Realism or Institutionalism. The basic vision of the principle is that the national characteristics of individual States matter for their international relations. This view contrasts in a sharp manner with both Realist and Institutionalist accounts, in which all States have fundamentally the same objectives and behaviours; at least internationally, the self-interested individuals following wealth or survival. Liberal theorists have often put emphasis upon the distinctive behaviour of liberal States, though more modern work has sought to extend the theory to a general domestic characteristics, based on the description of international relations.

Constructivism - Constructivism is not a theory, but rather an ontology. It is a set of hypothesis about the world and human motivation and agency. Its counterpart is not Realism, Institutionalism, or Liberalism, but rather Rationalism. By stimulating the rationalist outline that undergirds many theories of international relations, Constructivists produce constructivist alternatives in each of these families of theories. In the Constructivist account, the variables of interest to the scholars are the military power, trade relations, international institutions, or domestic preferences, these are not important, because they are objective circumstances about the world, but rather because they have certain societal significances.

The English School - The English School shares most of the Constructivism’s assessments of rationalist theories of international relations. It also puts emphasis upon the uniqueness of international society and social significances to the learning of world politics. Basically, however, it does not pursue to generate testable hypotheses about State behaviour as the other theories do. Instead, its objectives are more similar to those of a historian. Comprehensive opinion and well-formed understanding is preferred over the universal explanatory models. Hedley Bull, for instance, a leading English School scholar, discussed that international law was one of five central institutions arbitrating the influence of international anarchy and as an alternative producing an anarchical society.

Critical Approaches - The governing international relations theories and their fundamental positivist epistemology have been confronted with a variety of viewpoints. Scholars working in Marxist, feminist, post-colonial, and ecological fields, have all put forward analysis of international relations, explanations of state behaviour, colonialism, developing country approach to international law, feminism, and approach to international law. Most of these researches share an apprehension with the construction of power and the state, which theories like Realism or Institutionalism tend to get adequately established. For example, Marxist scholars observe the prominence on state to state relations as complicating the more fundamental dynamics of global class relations, as it has been stated in the theory of Marxism. Only by understanding the awareness and the behaviour of global capital, one is able to realize the impact of state behaviour.

**International Relations and the Behavioural Sciences**

Morgenthau’s edition contains many laws of politics that is to state the overviews that are held to relate on a universal and wider scale. This seems to involve authorization of the covering law model of explanation, whereby something is considered to have been explained when its event can be accounted for under some general law. Such theorizing is in keeping with the objective of practicality to make a scientific study of international relations. However, there are features of Morgenthau’s account which seem to destabilize this objective. In the first place, it is clear that states and statespersons do not have to observe the laws of politics, otherwise, what would be the point of making an attempt to influence them that they should? Second, and perhaps more important, the ways in which Morgenthau produced and initiated the laws seem broadly instinctive. A key text here is in the preface to the second edition of Politics among Nations, where Morgenthau quotes with supporting a sentence of Montesquieu to the effect that the reader should not judge the product of a lifetime’s reflection on the basis of contributing just a little time in reading (Brown & Ainley, 2004).

The objectives to science of Morgenthau and Carr have been noted, and any principle which entitlements to be based on how objects really are is noticeably open to those whose entitlement to have an improved hold of this realism. Positivism is the certainty, that the facts are out there to be discovered and that there is only one way to do this, only one form of consistent knowledge that is produced by the processes based on the natural sciences i.e reigned in both camps, and the differences were mainly of grace rather than substance. Indeed the most operative analysis of behaviouralism, until, that is, the post-positivist revolution of the late 1980s came from the so-called ‘post-behaviouralists’, scholars who accepted the goal of science, but who were serious of the behaviouralists for their indisposition to get involved with the pressing political issues of the day. The so-called ‘behavioural revolution’ did, however, produced a number of new ideas, and these, combined with changes in the real world, brought about moderately prominent transformations to the International Relations theory during the 1970s (Brown & Ainley, 2004). **International Objectives of a Progressing Country**

By the term objectives, it is referred to the fundamental targets, goals and interests that have continued to influence the Indian foreign policy across different political groups and political parties. For India, these objectives have been based upon a consensus of making sure the India’s development as a Great Power that is completely self-directed, prominent and valued in the global comity of nations. Most regularly, such objectives are based upon acquiring equality with other great and super powers such as the People’s Republic of China, Russia, which is formerly the USSR and the USA, and most characteristically it includes acquiring a permanent base on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). Taking into account such aspirations, these are also the anxieties of Indian effect being limited to South Asia, of India being used as a security in the international politics of other states, as was predominantly outward during the Cold War, and of dropping the strategic autonomy (Scott, 2011).

As both India’s political and economic power continues to rise within the international system, this aspiration will continue to rage and influence its achievements and standing as a rising power. While comprehensively observed as thoughtful of the large physical landmass, having a sixth of the world’s population, and a widespread and assorted civilizational heritage, some changes in strategies concerning how India’s rise as a Great Power will be accomplished are ostensible. These differences primarily occur between the widely perceived idealism of the leaders of India (Scott, 2011). India in the present existence has grown and is maintaining cordial relations with the other countries of the world as well.

**India and the Himalayan States**

The Himalayan kingdoms of Nepal and Bhutan and the Indian state of Sikkim have employed an imperative place in India’s foreign policy scheme. The significance of these Himalayan states for India can be envisioned from two different angles: a) the strategic importance of these Himalayan areas for India’s national security; and b) the place of these Himalayan areas in India’s own role awareness in international politics. The Himalayas have become the southern border of the People’s Republic of China, but they do not inhabit such an important place in the Chinese lifestyle and culture as they do in India. The Himalayan kingdoms of Nepal, Bhutan and the previous kingdom, which is now the Indian state of Sikkim were measured as an essential part of the Indian regional system. As such, these three units are right in the middle of India’s whole Himalayan frontiers, and its northern boundary margins, the Himalayan regions have contributed an important part in the maintenance of international relations of the country with the outside world. The foreign policy of the British rulers in India has also been directed towards securing the alliance, integrity and neutralization of the borderlands and the minor states that are covering the Himalayan land approaches of the Indian empire (Scott, 2011).

The political-military government modifiable to the three regions is a significant constituent in the complete association of powers between India and China. India’s starting point in looking at and dealing with these two areas is known as geography, and the supposed role that this area contributes in continuing the reliability of India’s defensive barrier within the Himalayan ranges, in other words, geopolitical. From the Indian viewpoint, China’s method and approach is difficult to recognize. China has taken for itself the largest defence, the vast area of Tibet, terminating Tibet’s culture in the process and disregarding the determined Indian disapprovals. India desires for itself a much reduced defence in the three Himalayan regions of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim, and does not seek to modify the outdated cultures of these areas. Devising a combined hold over Tibet, China now seeks to erode India’s special position in the Himalayas. The last 60 years of Indian foreign policy have seen India lose its privileged status in much of the Himalayan sphere. Although India has incorporated Sikkim, and Nepal has already moved from the country’s hold (Scott, 2011).

**Discussion**

In India, over half of the country’s population does not have access to electricity or any other form of commercial energy, availability and access to energy is considered to be an important aspect for sustained economic growth by the government. The country can be energy secure, when there will be application of energy in all the areas, irrespective of their ability to contribute to the costs as well as in meeting their efficient demand for safe, useful and appropriate energy in order to satisfy their various needs and requirements at competitive costs at all the times. The energy security can be increased by, diversifying both energy combination and sources of energy imports; completely following the overseas acquisitions of energy assets; and introducing of policy reforms to interest foreign investment, as well as making improvements in domestic production, distribution and consumption. This example of energy highlights the fact that when a country is undergoing a scarcity of some resource, then certainly appropriate terms and international relations would largely contribute in the allocation of that resource.

Bilateral nuclear agreements with France, USA, Russia and Canada as well as consistent agreements with the countries of Eurasia, Africa and Latin America could be seen from this perspective. India has established appropriate relations with the other countries of the world and hence, they are willing to offer assistance to the country even during the occurrence of natural calamities and disasters. India is also exploring the possibility of importing gas through the pipelines from Turkmenistan, Iran, Myanmar and Bangladesh. The main theories of international relations are Realism, Institutionalism, Liberalism and Constructivism, besides these, there is the English School and critical approaches.

At the stage of economic modernization, India is adapting to economic globalization and to the emerging Asian and global balance of power. The augmented economic performance of the country has created an impact upon its foreign policy in general and with its involvement with Asia and with the great powers. It is actively involved in the pursuing of the regional trade agreements and also there has been initiation of policy reforms to begin the border trade. There have been initiation of actions and commitments that have strengthened India’s relations with countries, such as USA, Russia, China and Iran. In conclusion, it can be stated that the establishment of appropriate international relations have always proven to be beneficial for the country in leading to its progress.
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