



G. S. IV – Ethics, Integrity and Aptitude

Ethical Issues in International Relations and Funding

visionias

Copyright © by Vision IAS

All rights are reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of Vision IAS

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| International Ethics: Meaning, Scope and Significance | 3 |
| Theoretical Approaches/Traditions/Paradigms/Schools of Thought | 5 |
| Realism | 5 |
| Liberalism | 6 |
| Cosmopolitanism | 7 |
| Critical Theory and International Ethics | 9 |
| <i>(Here we discuss only the relevance of these theories in IR)</i> | 9 |
| Feminist Ethics in World Politics | 9 |
| Ethics in Foreign Policy:..... | 10 |
| Immoral Inside Moral Outside..... | 11 |
| Ethics of Humanitarian Intervention..... | 13 |
| Ethical concerns in IR:..... | 14 |
| Terrorism..... | 14 |
| Torture and Human Rights..... | 15 |
| Responsibility to Protect | 16 |
| Global Commons | 16 |
| Doctrine of International Community..... | 17 |
| International Aid: Neo-Colonialism or Solidarity with the Poor?..... | 19 |
| International Aid: Defined and Explained | 20 |
| History of Foreign Aid..... | 21 |
| Arguments for Aid | 21 |
| Forms of Foreign Aid..... | 22 |
| From Neo-Colonialism to NGO-Colonialism?..... | 26 |
| Conclusion | 27 |
| Case Studies | 27 |
| Syria: Ethics of intervention | 27 |
| PRISM program of US and Spying on world governments: | 28 |

International Ethics: Meaning, Scope and Significance

Complicated by questions of empire, power, scarcity, freedom and honour, the *Athenians* justified their conquest of *Melos* and the slaughter and enslavement of its inhabitants on the grounds of necessity, stating that ‘the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept’. This conflict between *Athens* and *Sparta* depicted by *Thucydides* in the *History of the Peloponnesian War* presents an example of the dilemmas surrounding the role and demands of morality in international affairs.

The *Melian dialogue*, in particular, focuses on the central issue of whether justice or self-interest ought to guide relations between different political communities. Interestingly, the Athenian justification did not eschew morality *in toto* but defined it according to a natural relativism; the ‘standard of justice’, they claimed, ‘depends upon the equality of power to compel’.

In Aristotelian terms, the *Melians* advocated formal justice in international affairs, while the Athenians insisted upon proportional justice: different political communities are owed reasonably unequal treatment on the basis of their relative ‘power to compel’. In these terms it is only fair or right for the stronger to rule the weaker, and for the weaker to submit to the stronger. This poses one of the most fundamental questions of international ethics: should ‘strangers’ be treated according to the same ethical principles or standards that we apply to members of our own community?

Though the pervasiveness of ‘the moral problem in international relations’ has been apparent since time immemorial, the expression ‘international ethics’ came into use relatively late in the twentieth century. This happened when it became clear that the standoff of the first ‘great debate’ in IR – the intellectual struggle between so-called realists and idealists in the 1920s and 1930s over the nature of international politics and thus over the role of ethical principles therein – was not sufficient to meet the challenges confronting the world after the Second World War. Strictly speaking, it was also not possible to refer in a formal sense to a subject called ‘ethics and international relations’ prior to the modern formation of an international system composed of sovereign states.

Thus, the contemporary field of international ethics is preceded by a long history of moral and political thought, which explores the many ethical and philosophical issues arising from the attempt to sort out how people should live their lives in a reflective and responsible way. Central to this argument is the recognition of our social embeddedness, the fact that we are inescapably related to others and therefore that our moral beliefs and political decisions impact upon the lives and decisions of others. We can also find many important examples of normative thinking about the types of issues that permeate contemporary international affairs in the history of moral and political theory. In other words, thinking about the ethics of politics – and the politics of ethics – has been a characteristic feature of the negotiation of political life in pre-national as well as international contexts, and will continue to be so in the possibly post-national era.

Referring to the previous case of *Athens-Sparta* conflict once again, one can safely argue that the position adopted by the Athenian delegation to *Melos* typifies a form of relative partiality in the sense of insisting on a narrow scope of moral concern. On this view, it is not only permissible but even mandatory to favour one’s own community when it comes to making decisions about whom to aid and whom to harm. Ethical partiality resonates with ‘commonsense’ morality; of course, in as much as many people recognize the requirements we owe to those with whom we have personal relationships or special ties as normatively significant. Whether it be the relation of parent to child, spouse to spouse, friend to friend, or fellow citizen to fellow citizen, it is widely thought that one normally owes more by way of moral concern towards ‘one’s own’, but less to mere acquaintances and least of all to strangers.

Partiality in moral decision-making is a familiar though often controversial dimension of international ethics – particularly as consideration of which persons fall ‘inside’ or ‘outside’ the scope of moral concern came to be defined increasingly in terms of the territorially delimited boundaries of the nation-state. One prominent attempt to overcome the parochialism implied by moral partiality can be found in the cosmopolitan tradition. It embodies a wide scope of moral concern as it maintains that this scope should be universal, extending to all

human beings. According to this perspective, the common human capacities for reasoning provide the grounds for fellowship in a world community; if all humans as rational beings are equal, then all humans together form a single community. It is both desirable and possible for individuals to consider themselves citizens of their local communities as well as citizens of the world.

A further step in addressing these issues was taken by Immanuel Kant. The various formulations Kant's conception of international ethics express the universalizability of the principle that all human beings possess intrinsic worth or dignity. This principle, Kant argues, is valid for all persons anywhere, and provides a basis for justifying the universal obligation to respect the dignity of others via the institutional mediation of a system of individual rights. Kant's argument goes even further in that he regards the republican form of government as providing for the 'rightful condition' of justice. Morality or right, in other words, demands that states adopt a system of public law that provides one of the necessary conditions for the realization of individual rights. He sets out the architecture of international justice in terms of three overlapping components of public law: municipal or civil law (*ius civitatis*), international law or the law of nations (*ius gentium*), and cosmopolitan law (*ius cosmopoliticum*). Cosmopolitan law is intended to guarantee the right of 'hospitality', a 'universal right of humanity' to all individuals. He believed that developing an ethical international order on the principle of human dignity would lead us to the point 'where a violation of rights in *one* part of the world is felt *everywhere*'.

The power of Kant's vision has reached the point where almost everyone now recognizes human rights – or at least speaks the language of human rights – and the notion of universal human rights has become integral to, yet contested within, the theoretical and empirical development of international ethics. Another significant dimension of Kant's formulation of international rights points towards the central question of war and whether there are some relevant principles of normative ethics attached either to the justification or to the condemnation of war. For example, Kant's conception of a confederation of republican states that would make lasting peace possible not only challenges the realist belief in the enduring conditions of anarchy and insecurity, it also draws attention to the way that the behaviour of states at the international level is strongly influenced by properties of their domestic political structure (or 'regime type'). Kant therefore favoured a republican constitution because it both best protects the rights of individuals and provides a mechanism for keeping peace between states that are similarly structured.

Kant suggests that as states with a republican form of government become more numerous, international conflict will decrease. In linking the belligerent or pacific behaviour of states to their specific political institutions, decision-making procedures and culture (as reflected, for instance, in a commitment to tolerance, conflict resolution and public debate), rather than to the exigencies of an anarchical international system, Kant laid the intellectual foundation for the democratic peace thesis. The democratic peace thesis refers to two propositions. One is that 'mature' or stable democracies can be expected to keep the peace between themselves, but not necessarily with other non-democratic states, and the other is that democracies are more likely than other states to be more pacific in their relations overall, including with non-democracies. While there is substantial debate about the strength of the empirical evidence used to support the thesis, it also has been said that it 'comes as close as anything we have to an empirical law in international relations'.

The changing contours of the international political landscape and rapidly evolving technological developments have proved conducive to a rapid rise in 'new normative approaches' to international relations and world politics: decolonization led to the transformation of colonial territories into sovereign, independent states; human rights and norms proscribing genocide became institutionalized within the UN system and assorted international regimes; nuclear, chemical and biological weapons proliferated alongside the emergence of 'high-tech' warfare; states became increasingly interdependent economically and processes of globalization accelerated; social movements, interest groups and NGOs dramatically multiplied across more porous state borders; humanitarian crises or emergencies arising from drought, famine, armed conflict and forced migration led to calls for (and against) military intervention in distant lands; the gap between rich and poor both within and between states widened inexorably; democratic transitions from repressive regimes spread; and global environmental problems such as climate change, air and water pollution, and food and resource scarcity continued to mount.

Theoretical Approaches/Traditions/Paradigms/Schools of Thought

Normative theorizing at an international level reflects a wide range of competing yet cross-cutting approaches. This implies that it is important to resist treating theoretical traditions as running parallel into infinity; rather they influence and cross-fertilize one another. Some of these theoretical approaches include Realism, Liberalism, Marxism, Utilitarianism, Cosmopolitanism, and Social Contract among others.

Realism

The central tenets that are associated with realism typically include the following claims: *that the sovereign state is the most important actor in international politics; that state behaviour can be explained rationally; that states are unitary actors; that there is a sharp distinction between domestic and international politics; that states pursue power in an anarchical self-help setting; and that the issues of war and peace are paramount.*

There will be more clarity regarding this position if we return to the instance of the Athens-Sparta conflict cited at the beginning of the document. Among the passages of the *History of the Peloponnesian War* that have particularly attracted the attention of realists, the Melian dialogue stands out. During the speech to the Melian governing body, the Athenian representatives advocated the time-honoured view that justice depends on quality of power and that among parties that are unequal, the strong does what he can and the weak endures what he must. In another dialogue the Athenians are reported by *Thucydides* to have justified their expansionist policy thus: 'We were forced to advance our dominion to what it is, out of the nature of the thing itself; as chiefly for fear, next for honour, and lastly for profit'

Others like *Niccolo Machiavelli* and *Thomas Hobbes* have taken the realist position further in works like *The Prince*, *The Discourses on the First Decade of Livy*, *The Art of War* and *Leviathan*. *Immanuel Kant* while interpreting Hobbes's concept of sovereignty accepts the Hobbesian principle that the function of the sovereign state is to provide protection in exchange for obedience, but he expands the list of rights that the state is supposed to protect.

Moreover, it would be simplistic to say that realists prefer or recommend an amoral politics of power and interest; rather they insist on the relevance, even centrality of, considerations of justice, decency and common good.

Prescriptive Realism:

Oppenheim's 1987 Argument (Practical Necessity):

- Morality implies choice – to say that a state *should* take Action A instead of Action B is to imply that it does indeed have a choice.
- Practical necessity makes morality irrelevant – Even if a state *has a choice* between Actions A and B, if it *faces extinction* if it pursues Action B, then it is practically necessary for it to pursue Action A
- National interest is necessary goal – States that fail to pursue the national interest get eaten by those that do critical step: does this happen?
- It is not rational to oppose something that is practically necessary, since no genuine choice exists.

When goal is compatible with national interest?

- Only one effective means available: Support redundant, opposition irrational.
 - Several effective means available: Morality comes into play.
- Some means more effective than others: irrational to oppose the more effective means and redundant to oppose the less effective means. (If something is necessary, then it must be pursued using the best means at hand.)

- o Several equally effective means available: Moral choice exists

Oppenheim's 2002 Argument: Primary Goods

- o National interest defined as a list of goods which are needed to pursue any other national goals
- o Since pursuing any goal means acquiring primary goods, states must pursue primary goods
- o Argument shifts to satisficing of primary goods, not maximizing them (because maximizing might cause undesirable side-effects)

Problems with Prescriptive Realism

- o Normative basis of self-interested rationality not defended. Selfish rationality assumed to be valuable for its own sake.
- o National Interest can be incoherent: Arrow's Theorem implies that if different people have different long-term interests, there may not be a policy that makes all better off than the alternative
- o Vagueness: National interest is defined as what is objectively best, rather than subjective preference

Liberalism

John Gray has summed up the four basic elements always found in the conventional definitions of liberalism, in the following words:

"Liberalism is individualist, in that it asserts the moral primacy of the person against the claims of any other social collectivity; egalitarian inasmuch as it confers on all humans the same moral status and denies the relevance to legal or political order of differences in moral worth among human beings; universalist, affirming the moral unity of the human species and according secondary importance to specific historical associations and cultural forms; and meliorist in its affirmation of the corrigibility and improvability of all social institutions and political arrangements".

It has been widely accepted that liberalism embodies a generalized philosophical acceptance of the principles of 'equality, liberty, individuality and rationality'; a social commitment to notions of 'liberal individualism'; a 'general concern with protecting each individual's ability to pursue his or her own conception of the good'; and politically, 'a strict distinction of state and civil society, as well as a commitment to the rule of law and parliamentarism'.

Further, liberalism, an ideology with a clear idea of the 'good', has inevitable cross-border ramifications. When the record of liberalism is applied to the international sphere and the perceived need to intervene to 'keep the peace', prop up a 'failed state' or deal with a 'humanitarian disaster', this statement comes to life even more strongly. Liberalism has been the most active player on the international stage of all other ideologies. Not even Soviet Marxism, and certainly not National Socialism, can be said to have had such a lasting and global impact. Liberalism has claimed the need for global solutions based on the language of rights and the search for the 'good'.

Kant is the liberal philosopher most associated with a society of states that would be based on republics, even a proto-world government based on liberal and 'cosmopolitan' principles. The way he and his brethren, saw such an international system would be one that would sweep aside the old obscurantism of religion and intolerance and bring us into a new era of emancipation and 'Perpetual Peace'. This is a cry that one has heard many times since, in Marxism, other forms of socialism and endlessly for all sorts of supporters and deniers of liberalism. The United Nations is a clear beneficiary of such thinking, for example.

But as a result of the mixing of liberal ideas, power and influence, even the most sacrosanct of liberal icons can now be assailed. Liberal states, and especially the hegemonic 'Anglo-Americans' have seen themselves pilloried for excessive zeal in their desire to spread their self-defined 'morality' or 'ethics' and democracy by force over

the last two hundred years. The latest version of this liberal ‘proselytizing’ can be found in the wrongly named ‘neoconservatism’ or, perhaps more rightly, ‘militant liberal Wilsonianism’ and actions against ‘Islamofascism’ in Afghanistan and Iraq. Maybe one reason for this zeal is that liberals put so much Kantian emphasis on ‘reason’ and a duty to find the ‘moral’ course to take that they forget that others do not reason or moralize in the same way as they do.

Cosmopolitanism

Recent years have seen a burgeoning interest in cosmopolitanism in the fields of political theory and international relations. Increasingly, arguments have been advanced that international politics should be seen in terms of universal principles that challenge the presumed moral supremacy of territorial boundaries and which favour instead the well-being of humanity generally. According to cosmopolitanism international politics should focus first on the interests, rights or welfare of persons wherever they may reside rather than on the interests of states as such.

What is cosmopolitanism? Though answers to this question vary, but we can define cosmopolitanism as the belief that all human beings have equal moral standing within and belong to a single world community. More specifically we can distinguish two fundamental strands of cosmopolitanism: moral cosmopolitanism and legal (or institutional) cosmopolitanism. Moral cosmopolitanism holds that all persons stand in certain moral relations with one another by virtue of the fact that they are all members of a universal community. All persons possess equal moral worth deserving of our respect, and certain obligations of justice with regard to other persons place constraints on our conduct. Legal cosmopolitanism contends that a global political order ought to be constructed, grounded on the equal legal rights and duties of all individuals. The emphasis here is on creating or transforming institutional schemes so as to provide concrete procedural and organizational mechanisms dedicated to securing and protecting the human rights of all persons.

Despite this basic distinction, moral and legal cosmopolitanism share a commitment to at least three fundamental tenets: (1) individualism, in that individual human beings are the ultimate units of concern; (2) universality, in that all human beings possess equal moral status; and (3) generality, in that persons are subjects of concern for everyone, that is, human status (or dignity) has global scope. Consequently moral and legal cosmopolitanism are compatible and may be combined in mutually complementary fashion so as to give weight to the ideal of ‘world citizenship’.

Cosmopolitanism is best understood as both an ethical and a political project. As an ethical project it seeks to establish the extent and content of, and justification for moral obligations concerning the well-being of every individual person. As a political project it is intimately connected with debates about the appropriate form of political community, schemes for legal institutions and procedures, and practices of humanitarian assistance on a global scale.

Cosmopolitanism in its modern form is the systematic articulation of three basic premises. The first is that individual human beings are the ultimate units of moral and political concern. Other entities such as collective groups may also be the subjects of our concern of course, but ultimately it is the individual person who deserves our most basic consideration as a moral being. The second premise, whose modern theoretical articulation is known as universalism, is that all human beings possess equal moral status. Not only are individual persons the ultimate unit of concern, but also no morally relevant distinctions can be made between persons as moral beings. All persons everywhere are equally entitled to the same human status. The third premise is that persons are subjects of concern for everyone; that is, human status has global scope. In other words no one can exempt themselves from their obligations to respect the equal moral status of all other human beings. These three thoughts yield the idea that we owe duties of justice to all the persons of the world, and thus that political morality and practice should focus most fundamentally on the interests or welfare of persons as such.

Recent years have witnessed a worldwide call for democratic reform of international organizations and greater inclusiveness in global governance, partly driven by the alternative globalization movement that has occupied public attention since the 1999 World Trade Organization (WTO) meeting in Seattle. Participation in the creation of government policy that some citizens enjoy in the internal affairs of their respective countries and the

accountability provided by democratic elections do not extend similarly to international affairs, leading to widespread concerns about what is referred to as the ‘democratic deficit’ of global governance. There is widespread agreement that the existing system of global governance is deficient in many fundamental respects, however there is less consensus as to whether a more legitimate system of governance is possible and as to what normative principles should have an effect on its institutional design.

The theory of cosmopolitan democracy outlines a project for multiple layers of democratized governance (from the local to the global) that, among other goals, attempts to resolve the shortcomings of global governance, in particular the perceived deficit of democratic legitimacy. Daniele Archibugi, an advocate of what he calls ‘cosmopolitan democracy’, explains:

“Above all, what distinguishes cosmopolitan democracy from other such projects is its attempt to create institutions which enable the voice of individuals to be heard in global affairs, irrespective of their resonance at home. Democracy as a form of global governance thus needs to be realized on three different, interconnected levels: within states, between states and at a world level”.

For cosmopolitan democrats, global civil society is a central feature of the emergent world society. Global civil society is thought to be an empirical reality on the basis of the tens of thousands of non-state actors engaged in transnational civic activism, including numerous high-profile human rights and environmental NGOs such as Amnesty International and Greenpeace, as well as individuals and activist groups involved in the alternative globalization movement. Global civil society plays several distinct roles and makes a variety of contributions to developing social and political expectations. Global civil society actors may participate in deliberative and consultative forums, such as international meetings designed to facilitate the formation of international legal regimes and conventions. These global civil society actors may be thought of as representing or defending the views and interests of world society, in contrast to the narrow interests of nation-states and corporations. It might also be argued that global civil society actors contribute a democratic or democratizing impulse to world politics, analogous to the role played by domestic civil society actors within specific countries. For cosmopolitan democrats, the political importance of the new forms of transnational activism and mobilization associated with global civil society is vital to understanding the emancipatory potentials of globalization.

The cosmopolitan model of democracy seeks to expand the levels of participatory politics and means of accountability through an adaptive ‘system of diverse and overlapping power centres, shaped and delimited by democratic law’. The ‘cosmopolitan project’ is an attempt to connect the cosmopolitan vision to cosmopolitan institution building. Here, the first step towards making the cosmopolitan model of democracy real would be to develop the UN system to live up to its Charter, entailing, among other things, implementing ‘key elements of the UN Rights Conventions, enforcing the prohibition of the discretionary right to use force, and activating the collective security system envisaged in the Charter itself’. More generally the priority is to establish components of what is called ‘cosmopolitan democratic law’ which is ‘a democratic public law entrenched within and across borders’. The normative foundation of cosmopolitan democratic law is what Held refers to as the ‘principle of autonomy’. This principle requires that all individuals have the ability to participate in political decisions that directly impact upon them.

The impact of globalization means that the state model no longer suffices to safeguard the autonomy of each individual and, by implication, the functioning of democracy itself. If democracy is to function effectively there needs to be an entrenchment of democratic autonomy and institutions at all levels that impact on the civil, political and social rights of individuals. This entrenchment involves significant restructuring of the state system insofar as the state is not the only site of power affecting the citizen and therefore should not be the only democratically organized institution. Rather there are seven ‘sites of power’ – the body, welfare, culture, civic associations, economy, coercive relations and organized violence, and legal and regulatory institutions – within and across political communities that ‘mould and circumscribe’ people’s life chances and their ability to participate and ‘share in public decision-making’. It is imperative that these sites of power, in addition to the state itself, be democratically based, which would require the implementation of democratic procedures and institutions at a number of interconnected levels, from that of the workplace to that of global governance. As a result cosmopolitan democratic law entails a transnational, common political structure founded on the principle

of autonomy. This common political structure would incorporate not only existing international law (suitably revised) but also a system of cosmopolitan law which focuses on facilitating and consolidating individual autonomy and not simply interstate relations; both of which would parallel the growth of a global or transnational civil society capable of holding political authority to account and galvanizing social change.

Implications of Cosmopolitanism

- Negotiate international laws and follow them once negotiated – law is morally binding because we want others to follow it
- Two wrongs don't make a right – noncompliance by others does not end the moral force of law
- Do the right thing even when no law exists: Orend's example: Follow precepts of "Just War Theory" because goal should be a more just state of affairs (no aggression, no targeting civilians, seek a peace more just than the antebellum status quo)

Problems with Cosmopolitanism

- Objections to law-as-morality
 - New state dilemma – Why obey rules to which the state never consented?
 - Changing state dilemma – Stronger states want to revoke consent to rules that protect the weak
 - Legal indeterminacy – Law frequently contradicts itself
- Theory requires detachment from self – is this even possible?
 - Notion of states as moral actors – does responsibility lie with "peoples" or governments? Each wants to pass the buck.

Critical Theory and International Ethics

(Here we discuss only the relevance of these theories in IR)

'Critical theory' was first coined in 1937 by the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research or the 'Frankfurt School'. It represents a rich synthesis of social and liberal theory (Kant, Hegel, Marx and Weber) and today encompasses a wide range of contemporary radical perspectives.

Critical theory focuses on the possibilities of political transformation and the concrete practices of authoritarian structures. In recent years, it has evolved into a pliable and pluralistic approach in international relations theory, one that has allowed IR theorists to understand the transformative possibilities of globalization and global society. But such anticipated success also comes with a caveat: that more interest in critical theory will generate increasing pressure to develop a pragmatic, concrete set of parameters that can compete with other paradigmatic social theory approaches

Feminist Ethics in World Politics

Feminist international ethics has engaged in debates which characterize international ethics more broadly. Indeed, feminists, like other critical theorists in the field, have reacted strongly against the idea of 'ethics' as a systematic set of principles that can be applied to issues or dilemmas in international relations in order to render the latter, say, less driven by power and interests and more inclined to 'moral' behaviour. Many feminists within the field are committed to non-traditional or post-positivist methodologies, and are hence suspicious of the idea that any theory could be non-normative or value-free. Of course, from this perspective, it becomes very difficult to distinguish feminist international *ethics* from other kinds of feminist theory and research in the field. The

apparently normative nature of all feminist thought may be tied to the very nature of feminism, as both a set of ideas – alternative lenses through which to view the social world, and a set of practices – including a broad and diverse social movement aimed at challenging the oppression and exclusion generated by gendered rules, norms, institutions and structures.

Moreover, there has been dissent within feminism regarding ethics in the context of world politics. The different ‘waves’ of feminism, and the debates among them, are largely reproduced in most readings of feminist ethics. In particular, the tension between liberal feminists and ‘cultural’ feminists – often referred to as ‘first’ and ‘second’ wave feminists, becomes a debate in feminist international ethics between approaches emphasizing equality, rights and justice and those stressing difference and care. Moreover, so called ‘third wave’ feminists – post-colonial and, especially in the context of IR theory, postmodern feminists – seek to propel the debate in ethics beyond equality/justice and difference/care towards a recognition of multiple and shifting identity positions and power relations – particularly in terms of race in the context of neo-colonial relations of power in the global political economy. This third perspective is often set against the first and second, giving rise to the debate between the epistemological standpoint of ‘universal sisterhood’ and the inherently unstable subjectivities of difference.

International Ethics and Feminist Ethics

While critical theorists have propelled the debate on international ethics forward by challenging the ‘fact/value’ distinction, it has been argued by feminists that their neglect of the gender dimensions of injustice is a demonstrable weakness for the practical application of their theories. As a result, much feminist research in the field of international ethics has sought to build upon the insights of critical theory, but has foregrounded the role of gender as a constitutive feature of global power relations. Thus, feminist international ethics is engaged in investigating the role of gender in the construction and maintenance of dominant moral discourses, and the ‘particular patterns of costs and benefits associated with this’. In this way, feminist international ethics may be seen as part of a wider literature on feminist ethics more broadly, which seeks to ‘enter claims of and on behalf of women as full moral agents’; while there may be many ways of doing this, all approaches to feminist ethics must interrogate the root causes of this exclusion by asking ‘Where the moral terms set for our common life come from, and what authority, and whose experiences, do they represent?’

In addition, most feminists agree that feminist intellectual enquiry cannot be separated from the goals of feminism as a social and political movement. Thus the discussion of feminist ethics grows out of a commitment to feminism, and thus must start with two basic assumptions: (1) women and their values are of profound moral significance in and of themselves; and (2) social institutions and practices have encouraged discrimination against women and the suppression of their moral views. This suggests two further features of feminist ethics: first, that it cannot abstract away from the social processes and institutions in which claims about ethics are necessarily embedded by asserting that these are not the ‘stuff’ of moral theory; and second, that feminists engage in moral analysis not for its own sake, but because they are seeking to transform existing norms and social conditions. In the context of global politics, moreover, this entails an interrogation of gendered values, institutions and structures in contemporary global governance. However, IR feminists are not only interested in the ‘global’ level; on the contrary, they are concerned with the ways in which gender relations are woven together in a variety of different contexts and at a many different ‘levels’—including household, neighbourhoods, communities and states.

Ethics in Foreign Policy:

Today there is a consensus that the foreign policy of leading Western powers cannot be understood through considering nation states as egoistic actors pursuing narrow self-interest. Since the end of the Cold War, major states have increasingly stressed the importance of ethics and values in the shaping of international goals and have intervened internationally on the basis of ethical foreign policy concerns such as human rights and international justice.

Many commentators have understood this shift to 'value-led' or 'ethical' foreign policy through an 'outside/in' approach to the question, viewing this value shift as a response to international pressures of globalisation and the creation of new cosmopolitan constituencies and new national identities. However, one can also employ an 'inside/out' approach which suggests that the shift away from the articulation of national interests and the drive to defend ethical 'values' through international intervention can be understood as products of and responses to the crisis of national identity highlighted by the domestic political malaise at the heart of Western politics, often referred to in the US as an outcome of the 'Culture Wars', the response to the loss of coherent national values and shared goals resulting in 'the loss of respect for authorities and institutions'.

The interest here is not so much the cultural struggle itself, rather the consequences of this well documented concern that 'there is no common purpose or common faith'. The drive behind ethical foreign policy is located in the attempt to resolve the political crisis of Western national identity, reflecting the lack of a shared framework of meaning and sense of socio-political purpose connecting Western states and their citizens. The inability to establish a shared socio-political vision of what 'the nation' stands for the lack of a strong 'idea of the state' in Buzanian terms has meant that Western powers find it difficult to formulate a clear foreign policy or to legitimise the projection of power abroad in terms of national interest.

Immoral Inside Moral Outside

Today the key actor in international relations, the nation state, appears to have lost the capacity or will to pursue its self-interest defined in terms of power. Commentators from a variety of theoretical perspectives argue that the most developed nation states increasingly see themselves as having moral obligations to international society.

The key theoretical framework for understanding the international sphere, that of state interest, not only central to realism but also to the rational choice perspective of neoliberal frameworks of international co-operation, appears to have lost its explanatory power. Rather than states and national interests shaping the direction of policy it appears that there is a new agenda set by non-state actors, whether it is the normative values and transnational concerns of the 'principled-issue' campaigners of global civil society or the threats to security from terrorist networks such as Al-Qaeda.

The Constructivist approach rejects the 'outside/in' approach of understanding national interests as structured through the logic of anarchy, suggesting that national interests and identities are contingent and socially constructed. Nevertheless, these interests are still constructed in the international sphere itself, even if states do have the potential to make and to act on alternative identity 'choices'. While the domestic political framework and institutional structures play an important role it is generally held to be a secondary one. It is transnationally operating non-state actors which are the active agents of change, diffusing 'principled ideas' and 'international norms' related to human rights and transnational justice. It is in response to this changed international context that states are generally understood to have been driven to reshape or redefine their national identities. The largely instrumental use of 'principled ideas' during the Cold War is held to have given way to the institutionalization of new practices in the international sphere, sustained by the pressure of transnational human rights networks 'from above' and supported by civil society pressure 'from below'.

Liberal internationalists argue that power is not exercised in the old way. Influential US liberal theorist Joseph Nye, for example, argues that the traditional distinction 'between a foreign policy based on values and a foreign policy based on interests' should be rejected. Nye writes that the challenges of the 'global information age' have required the redefinition of national interest.

The Responsibility to Protect report, from the high-level International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, asserts the consensus view that nation states are not forced 'by systemic or structural factors' to pursue narrow interests, but are free to make moral choices. It appears that critical theorists like Andrew Linklater and Ken Booth have successfully pre-empted developments in international relations theorising with their focus on a 'bolder moral standpoint' and desire to move away 'from accumulating knowledge about

'relations between states' (what might be called the 'dismal science' of Cold War international relations) to thinking about ethics on a global scale'.

This view of the end of traditional national interests has attained a broad consensus from radical postmodernists and left-leaning academics to senior British diplomats. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, for example, argue that Vietnam was the last attempt the US made to play an imperial role, pursuing its national interests 'with all the violence, brutality and barbarity befitting any European imperialist power'. But the defeat in Vietnam marked a passage to a new regime of genuine internationalism. For these radical critics, the 1991 Gulf War illustrated that the US had now become 'the only power able to manage international justice, *not as a function of its own national motives but in the name of global right*' .

Sussex professor, Martin Shaw, argues that rather than the imperialism of national interest, the projection of Western power since the Cold War has been 'post-imperial' a moral response to crises provoked by non-Western powers which still seek to pursue territorial claims and the narrow interests of power.

Leading European Union and British government policy-advisor Robert Cooper writes that we now live in a 'postmodern world, *raison d'état* and the amorality of Machiavelli's theories of statecraft, which defined international relations in the modern era, have been replaced by a moral consciousness'. If there is a 'national' interest that is seen as respectable today it is the 'national interest in being, and being seen to be, a good international citizen & regularly willing to pitch into international tasks for motives that appear to be relatively selfless'.

In the face of the current consensus that national interests and national identities do not operate in the old way to shape international policy-making, one response has been to defend a traditional 'realist' or rationalist approach. However, today it would appear that the few defenders of national interests or narrow rational instrumentality as a guide to understanding the international sphere are marginal critics from the Left. Alex Callinicos, for example, argues that the US is still an imperialist power pursuing national interests and that international co-operation stems from the need to contain and structure the conflict and competition inherent in international capital. Peter Gowan similarly asserts that behind the drive for economic globalisation lies traditional US imperialism.

For Noam Chomsky: "the new interventionism" is replaying an old record. It is an updated variant of traditional practices that were impeded in a bipolar world system that allowed some space for nonalignment& with the Soviet deterrent gone, the Cold War victors are more free to exercise their will under the cloak of good intentions but in pursuit of interests that have a very familiar ring outside the realm of enlightenment.

The majority of commentators adopting a liberal or constructivist framework today tend to reproduce the 'outside/in' approach of structural realism in attributing the shift away from national interests to changes in the international sphere. In place of the external structure of anarchy imposing a uniformity of decision-making it is asserted that the external development of 'principled-issue' constituencies and a globalised cosmopolitan consciousness compels nation states to adapt to a new international environment.

Kant's essay on *Perpetual Peace*, considers the impact of domestic political institutions and national identity in shaping the projection of power internationally.

Ethical concerns, such as the human rights of others, seemed to provide a moral framework which could project a sphere of agreement and consensus and point beyond the cultural relativism and pessimism of 'postmodern' times. The moral dualism of 'us' as upholders of human rights and 'them' as perpetrators of human wrongs has been the leitmotif of the post-Cold War shift to ethical foreign policy-making.

Ethics of Humanitarian Intervention

The concept of humanitarian intervention could not win long-term international legitimacy because it failed to convince the majority of the world's governments, who feared that their sovereignty was threatened, and provoked resistance from European allies concerned that their international standing would be undermined by US unilateralism. The view that human rights could 'trump' sovereignty was resisted by the majority of non-Western states, concerned about their own sovereign rights.

The war over Kosovo revealed that the UN Security Council was split, with Russia and China resisting, but more telling was the fact that the US and Britain were reluctant to take the issue to the UN General Assembly for fear that the necessary majority, under the 'Uniting for Peace' procedure, would not be forthcoming. While the US could build 'coalitions of the willing' in support of a particular intervention, the principle of humanitarian intervention itself could not win wider acceptance. There was no international consensus on any new international framework or amendment to the UN Charter restrictions on the use of force because both Western and non-Western states recognised that the blurring of domestic and international responsibilities could be fundamentally destabilising.

The doctrine of humanitarian intervention enabled the US to project its power internationally, but did not operate as a source of meaning. The dualism of 'human rights and human wrongs' had a strong negative pole but no positive substance. The prevention of conflict and the protection of victims of human rights abuses became an end in itself rather than part of a broader political or ideological project.

The project of exercising power abroad through 'humanitarian intervention' was shot through with contradictions. As Rieff suggests, the project of 'ethical' foreign policy was a fallacy; it was impossible to develop a coherent political strategy based purely on prevention. No matter how many countries were intervened against, there could be no victory or lasting success. The logic of a consistent ethical foreign policy would be an untenable 'war without end' and the breakdown of the mechanisms holding together international society. The ideal of preventing human rights abuse or conflict, like preventing domestic crime, cannot be achieved by policing and punishment.

While the US and British establishments talked a good 'war against terrorism', they found it much more difficult to fight one. The war in Afghanistan illustrated the problem. Because the 'war against terrorism' was driven largely by a desire to reap domestic rewards through a show of strength there was a lack of political and military strategy on the ground. The aims of the war were not clear, and like the Kosovo war, appeared to shift with every new media deadline. Initially the aim was to capture bin Laden, then to remove the Taliban regime, but despite the fire power, the daisy-cutters and the cluster bombs there was little sense of achievement.

Constructivist and liberal commentators argue that nation states can no longer pursue national interests because of the pressures of international civil society, which has forced morality and cosmopolitan ethics on to the agenda and in doing so has transformed the national identity of states. However, rather than focusing analysis from the 'outside/in', explaining Western government policy-making as a response to new international pressures from non-state actors, it seems highly likely that the projection of national interests in the international sphere has been undermined by domestic rather than international change.

There is a general consensus that western government policy-makers have, in the last decade, explicitly taken on board normative and ethical concerns, shifting away from a 'realist' approach in which a more narrowly conceived national interest was the basis of policymaking. This policy shift has meant that the declarations of 'ethical foreign policy' emanating from the governments of leading world powers are often uncritically taken at face value and assumed to be 'simply the right thing to do'. The drive to act in the interests of others, rather than in purely national interests, can be seen in the justifications for a host of new policy initiatives including major international involvement in Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, former Yugoslavia, East Timor and Sierra Leone in recent years.

For many commentators, the new, ethical nature of international foreign policy was given clearest expression in the international community's support for military intervention in the 1999 Kosovo war of Afghanistan' (Bush

2001). The US defence secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, argued that the military action was in line with previous US-led interventions in Kuwait, Northern Iraq, Somalia, Bosnia and Kosovo 'for the purpose of denying hostile regimes the opportunity to oppress their own people and other people', adding that: 'We stand with those Afghans who are being repressed by a regime that abuses the very people it purports to lead' (Rumsfeld 2001)

To explain the importance of interventionist 'ethical' foreign policy in the 1990s, two broad approaches often stand out.

- The first approach is a gradualist one, which argues that the shift to prioritising the interests of those in other countries is part of a slow evolution of universal human rights concerns since 1945.
- The second approach argues that there has been a radical break in recent years and explains this through a focus on qualitative changes in international society.

Ethical concerns in IR:

Ethical issues involved at international landscape are as tabulated:

| Issue | Ethical Issue |
|---|--|
| Terrorism | Deprivation; clash of civilizations; identity; moral superiority; tolerance; injustice, Inequality. |
| Climate Change | Exploitation of resources; luxury vs survival; differentiated responsibility; Sustainable development. |
| Poverty | Socio-economic inequalities, insensitivity. |
| Financial Instability | Greed |
| Disarmament | Morality of nuclear weapons, non-violence |
| Organised crime, drugs, human trafficking | Greed, utter insensibility |
| Competition over resources | Selfishness, greed |

Terrorism

It is suggested that most of the global threats we face today are rooted in the deeper issues of ethics and values in international politics. These threats concern the well being of an individual whose identity is rooted in different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. The solutions to today's global security problems have to take into account an individual's cultural and socio-economic background.

(Examples can be taken: Islamic Fundamentalism; France Burqa Ban or other current events on religion based conflicts such as Uighurs in China or Muslims in Myanmar etc)

The following suggestions can be considered to handle the fundamentalism based on conservative ethical values:

1. Adopt a multicultural approach
2. Extract universal ethics from the world's religions; traditional knowledge; folk culture and see whether a common minimum can be evolved.

3. Promote inter-faith dialogue; dialogue among civilizations.
4. Emphasize secular but spiritual values like peace, truth, tolerance, honesty, non-violence, charity, justice, harmony, parsimony, mutual respect, philanthropy, right conduct, human rights, compassion, self-restraint, rectitude, forbearance etc.
5. Inculcate the above values in the youth through family values.
6. Bring the study of world religions and spirituality in social sciences, particularly, international relations theory, politics and economics.
7. Encourage multi-disciplinary research to promote mutual understanding.

The issue of ethics and values in international relations should be debated in international organizations such as UN fora extensively. The UN should set up a fund to raise awareness.

Torture and Human Rights

Human rights developed during the early Modern period, alongside the European secularization of **Judeo-Christian ethics**. The most commonly held view is that concept of **human rights evolved in the West** and earlier cultures had important ethical concepts but they generally lacked a concept of human rights. International law is designed to promote and protect human rights at the **international, regional and domestic levels**.

The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (**United Nations Convention against Torture**) is an international human rights instrument, under the review of the United Nations that aims to prevent torture and cruel, inhuman degrading treatment or punishment around the world. The Convention requires states to take effective measures to prevent torture within their borders, and forbids states to transport people to any country where there is reason to believe they will be tortured.

In practice, many human rights are difficult to enforce legally, due to the absence of consensus on the application of certain rights, the lack of relevant national legislation or of bodies empowered to take legal action to enforce them.

(Examples of current situation in Syria; nationwide arrests of activists in China; US drone strikes in Pakistan etc can be used.)

Monitoring, implementation and enforcement

- There is currently no international court to administer international human rights law, but quasi-judicial bodies exist under some UN treaties. The International Criminal Court (ICC) has jurisdiction over the crime of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. The European Court of Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights enforce regional human rights law.
- The United Nations human rights bodies do have some quasi-legal enforcement mechanisms. These include the treaty bodies attached to the seven currently active treaties, and the United Nations Human Rights Council complaints procedures, with Universal Periodic Review and **United Nations Special Rapporteur (known as the 1235 and 1503 mechanisms respectively)**.
- The enforcement of international human rights law is the responsibility of the nation state; it is the primary responsibility of the State to make the human rights of its citizens a reality.

In over 110 countries, national human rights institutions (NHRIs) have been set up to protect, promote or monitor human rights with jurisdiction in a given country. Although not all NHRIs are compliant with the **Paris Principles**, the number and effect of these institutions is increasing.

The Paris Principles were defined at the first International Workshop on National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in Paris from in 1991, and adopted by UN Human Rights Commission Resolution 1992/54 of 1992 and General Assembly Resolution 48/134 of 1993. The Paris Principles list a number of responsibilities for national institutions.

Responsibility to Protect

The responsibility to protect (R2P) is a United Nations initiative established in 2005. It consists of an emerging intended norm, or set of principles, based on the claim that sovereignty is not a right, but a responsibility. R2P focuses on preventing and halting four crimes: **genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing**, which it places under the generic umbrella term of mass atrocity crimes. The R2P **has three "pillars"**:

1. A state has a responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing.
2. The international community has a responsibility to assist the state to fulfill its primary responsibility.
3. If the state manifestly fails to protect its citizens from the four above mass atrocities and peaceful measures have failed, the international community has the responsibility to intervene through coercive measures such as economic sanctions. Military intervention is considered the last resort.

In the international community R2P is a norm, **not a law**, however it is grounded in international law. R2P provides a framework for using tools that already exist, i.e. mediation, early warning mechanisms, economic sanctioning, and chapter VII powers, to prevent mass atrocities. Civil society organizations, States, regional organizations, and international institutions all have a role to play in the R2P process. The authority to employ the last resort and intervene militarily rests solely with **United Nations Security Council**.

(Current examples to explain: Libya; Syria and failed states in Africa etc.)

Criticism

1. One of the main concerns surrounding R2P is that it **infringes upon national sovereignty**. This concern is rebutted by the Secretary General Ban Ki-moon in the report implementing the Responsibility to Protect.
2. According to the first pillar of R2P, the state has the responsibility to protect its populations from mass atrocities and ethnic cleansing, and according to the second pillar the international community has the responsibility to help states fulfill their responsibility.
3. Advocates of R2P claim that the only occasions where the international community will intervene in a state without its consent is when the state is either allowing mass atrocities to occur, or is committing them, in which case the state is no longer upholding its responsibilities as a sovereign. In this sense, R2P can be understood as **reinforcing sovereignty**.
4. However it is not clear who makes this decision on behalf of the 'international community'.

Global Commons

Global commons is a term typically used to describe international, supranational, and **global resource domains** in which common-pool resources are found. Global commons include the **earth's shared natural resources**, such as the deep oceans, the atmosphere, outer space and the Northern and Southern Polar Regions, the Antarctic in particular. Cyberspace may also meet the definition of a global commons.

Management of the global commons

Management of the global commons requires **pluralistic legal entities**, usually international and supranational, public and private, structured to match the diversity of interests and the type of resource to be managed, and stringent enough with adequate incentives to ensure compliance through gamut of international laws.

For example, in case of global warming several, environmental protocols have been established as **international law**. An intergovernmental document intended as legally binding with a primary stated purpose of preventing or managing human impacts on natural resources.

(Examples to be explained: Resources in the seabed-Polymetallic Nodules etc.; global warming; outer space; oil and gas reserves in Antarctica.)

Challenges in the management of global commons:

- The key challenge of the global commons is the design of governance structures and management systems capable of addressing the complexity of multiple public and private interests, subject to often unpredictable changes, ranging from the local to the global level.
- There are several key differences in management of resources in the global commons from those of the commons, in general. There are obvious **differences in scale** of both the resources and the number of users at the local versus the global level.
- There are **differences in the shared culture and expectations** of resource users; more localized commons users tend to be more homogeneous and global users more heterogeneous. This contributes to differences in the possibility and time it takes for new learning about resource usage to occur at the different levels.
- Moreover, global resource pools are less likely to be relatively stable and the dynamics are less easily understood. Many of the global commons are non-renewable on human time scales. Thus, resource degradation is more likely to be the result of **unintended consequences that are unforeseen**, not immediately observable, or not easily understood.

Doctrine of International Community

Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair propounded doctrine of international community in a speech in Chicago in 1999 as an intervention of the world leaders, international organizations and community in general in the intriguing world affairs.

At the instance of NATO's attack on Serbia over Kosovo, he wondered whether international law should not be developed to avoid situations where a regime can systematically brutalize and oppress its people and there is nothing anyone can do, when dialogue, diplomacy and even sanctions fail, unless it comes within the definition of a humanitarian catastrophe.

Six principles for a doctrine of international community and its institutions:

1. reform of the system of international financial regulation;
2. a new push on free trade in the WTO;
3. a reconsideration of the workings of the UN;
4. a critical examination of NATO;
5. greater cooperation on meeting the targets of Kyoto;
6. scrutiny into the issue of third world debt.

Examples:

- Nato's attack on Serbia over Kosovo in 1999 established the rule of a humanitarian intervention. It followed the worldwide guilt felt at the failure by the UN, or anyone else, to intervene in Rwanda.
- Killing of Saddam

Five rules for intervention of international community outlined by the former British PM were:

- be sure of your case,
- exhaust all other options first,
- ask if military operations can be "sensibly" undertaken,
- prepare for the long-term
- identify if your interests are involved.

Just War Theory

The just war theory is a largely **Christian philosophy** that attempts to reconcile three things:

- taking human life is seriously wrong;
- states have a duty to defend their citizens,
- defend justice protecting innocent human life and defending important moral values sometimes requires willingness to use force and violence

The theory specifies conditions for judging if it is just to go to war, and conditions for how the war should be fought. Although it was extensively developed by Christian theologians, it can be used by people of every faith and none.

Purpose

The aim of Just War Theory is to provide a guide to the right way for states to act in potential conflict situations. It only applies to states, and not to individuals (although an individual can use the theory to help them decide whether it is morally right to take part in a particular war). Just War Theory provides a useful framework for individuals and political groups to use for their discussions of possible wars.

The theory is not intended to justify wars but to prevent them, by showing that going to war except in certain limited circumstances is wrong, and thus motivate states to find other ways of resolving conflicts.

Origins

The principles of a Just War originated with classical Greek and Roman philosophers like **Plato** and **Cicero** and were added to by Christian theologians like **Augustine** and **Thomas Aquinas**.

Elements: There are three parts to Just War theory, both with Latin names:

- **Jus ad bellum:** the conditions under which the use of military force is justified.
- **Jus in bello:** how to conduct a war in an ethical manner.
- **Jus post bellum** concerns justice after a war, including peace treaties, reconstruction, war crimes trials, and war reparations.

A war is only a Just War if it is both justified, and carried out in the right way. Some wars fought for noble causes have been rendered unjust because of the way in which they were fought. Just wars that violate Just Wars principles effectively constitute a branch of **Realism**.

Global Justice

Global justice is an issue in political philosophy arising from the concern that **the world at large is unjust**. The broader philosophical context of the global justice debate, in both its contemporary and historical forms, is **the issue of impartiality**.

In order to achieve global justice, **eight minimum criteria** must be met. These are: 1) dialogue, 2) effective and representative multilateral institutions, 3) representative decision-making structures, 4) fair treatment, 5) empathy, 6) accountability, 7) transparency, and 8) adherence to international law.

Global justice is **the paramount to global security**, because injustice can lead to feelings of anger, humiliation, and alienation, which can undermine human dignity. Humans are primarily driven by emotional self-interest and those protecting humans' emotional needs are fundamental to human well-being and human dignity. When people feel that they have been the victim of unjust decisions, they may try and seek justice by less conventional means such as violence. This, in turn, can promote insecurity. Therefore, justice and not just military power, is essential to maintaining global security.

Calls for greater global justice are thus likely to continue from disadvantaged societies because they often feel that they are unjustly subjected to the rules set by more powerful players. However, dominant states that benefit from the current status quo are unlikely to want to alter established institutions or governance structures.

Diplomacy must be based on openness to hearing and acknowledging the concerns and positions of others. Empathy and an acknowledgement of the grievances and past pains of others are crucial, as is giving all stakeholders a voice in the decision-making process. All states, no matter how powerful, must be bound by international law and its obligations.

Central questions

- concerning the **scope of justice**,
- justice in the **distribution of wealth** and other goods,
- the **institutions responsible for justice**, are central to the problem of global justice.

Arguments over Global Justice

- Realists argue that states that pursue utopian moral visions through intervention and humanitarian aid, instead of minding their own strategic interests, do their subjects harm and destabilize the international system.
- Particularists object to the destruction of traditional cultures by cultural colonialism, whether under the guise of economic liberalism or defence of human rights.
- Nationalists deplore the fact that so many people are stateless or live under inefficient and tyrannical regimes.
- Advocates of the society of states are concerned about rogue states and about the imperial ambitions of the powerful.
- Cosmopolitans believe that the contemporary world badly fails to live up to their standards, and that doing so would require considerable changes in the actions of wealthy individuals and states.
- It might, for instance, require them to transfer most of their wealth to the poor. It might require the building of international institutions able to limit, or even replace, the self-interested action of powerful states and corporations. It might require each of international community to do much more than most now do.

International Aid: Neo-Colonialism or Solidarity with the Poor?

Of all the aspects of international politics nothing has aroused more controversy than foreign aid. It has been a much abused technique for exerting influence in international politics. In some cases, it has paid great dividends. In others, it goes in waste. Whether it may go in waste, it does have its impact at least upon the recipient nations. There is as such a great controversy about the role of foreign aid in international politics.

Politically, it is a substitute of Imperialism and is, therefore, looked upon by the non-aligned as an expression of neo-Colonialism (colonialism exercised in a new way). Philosophically, it is prompted by humanitarian considerations which the rich nations have for the poor ones economically, it is simply an investment of surplus capital in the under-developed countries to gain more returns.

From whatever angle it may be looked upon, foreign aid is a very important instrument of promoting foreign policy objectives. Dwight D. Eisenhower described foreign aid as the least understood function of the Government. Late U.S.A. President John F. Kennedy stated that he would gladly discontinue foreign aid if he could. But he found he could not. The purposes of foreign aid are very contradictory. Much of the confusion about foreign aid has arisen because of its purposes.

Life boat case study for ethical funding: If we divide the world crudely into rich nations and poor nations, two thirds of them are desperately poor, and only one third comparatively rich, with the United States the wealthiest of all. Metaphorically each rich nation can be seen as a lifeboat full of comparatively rich people. In the ocean outside each lifeboat swim the poor of the world, who would like to get in, or at least to share some of the wealth. What should the lifeboat passengers do?

First, we must recognize the limited capacity of any lifeboat. For example, a nation's land has a limited capacity to support a population and as the current energy crisis has shown us, in some ways we have already exceeded the carrying capacity of our land. So here we sit, say 50 people in our lifeboat. To be generous, let us assume it has room for 10 more, making a total capacity of 60. Suppose the 50 of us in the lifeboat see 100 others swimming in the water outside, begging for admission to our boat or for handouts. We have several options: we may be tempted to try to live by the Christian ideal of being "our brother's keeper," or by the Marxist ideal of "to each according to his needs." Since the needs of all in the water are the same, and since they can all be seen as our "brothers," we could take them all into our boat, making a total of 150 in a boat designed for 60. The boat swamps; everyone drowns. Complete justice, complete catastrophe. Since the boat has an unused excess capacity of 10 more passengers, we could admit just 10 more to it. But which 10 do we let in? How do we choose? Do we pick the best 10, the neediest 10, "first come, first served"? And what do we say to the 90 we exclude? If we do let an extra 10 into our lifeboat, we will have lost our "safety factor," an engineering principle of critical importance. For example, if we don't leave room for excess capacity as a safety factor in our country's agriculture, a new plant disease or a bad change in the weather could have disastrous consequences.

Suppose we decide to preserve our small safety factor and admit no more to the lifeboat. Our survival is then possible, although we shall have to be constantly on guard against boarding parties. While this last solution clearly offers the only means of our survival, it is morally abhorrent to many people. Some say they feel guilty about their good luck. My reply is simple: "Get out and yield your place to others." This may solve the problem of the guilt-ridden person's conscience, but it does not change the ethics of the lifeboat. The needy person to whom the guilt-ridden person yields his place will not himself feel guilty about his good luck. If he did, he would not climb aboard. The net result of conscience-stricken people giving up their unjustly held seats is the elimination of that sort of conscience from the lifeboat.

International Aid: Defined and Explained

Before we proceed further it will be worthwhile to explain what international or foreign aid means. Foreign aid means transfer of money, goods or technical knowledge, from the developed to the under-developed countries. It is because of these purposes that it has been criticized the most. It is considered to be a modern form of Imperialism and an expression of neo-Colonialism. In fact, the bases advanced for giving foreign aid are clothed in humanitarian words.

The importance of foreign aid grew after the end of the Second World War when America and Soviet Union emerged as the two superpowers. The difference in their socio-economic systems led them to win over a majority of the countries of the world to their side. Foreign aid came to be used as an instrument for strengthening the respective bloc. It was used not only as defensive strategy but also as an offensive one. The end of colonial rule created a strategic and economic vacuum which could not be filled in except by economic and military help from outside. A colonial power like Belgium planned its withdrawal from Congo in a manner that nothing was left in that country in the form of national assets to survive, reconstruct and develop itself. The newly independent countries were really in need of foreign aid for development and stability. The origin of non-alignment lies in this factor. In this way, foreign aid gained importance after the Second World War in two ways. Firstly, it was genuinely needed by the newly independent nations for political development and stability. Secondly, the two super-powers tried to use foreign aid as an instrument to involve the newly independent countries on their side. It is the second objective which makes foreign aid assume the form of neo-Colonialism.

History of Foreign Aid

Foreign aid has been used in international politics for a long time as an instrument of foreign policy. It has been used as an instrument by a nation to secure political advantage. In the eighteenth century, it was offered as a bribe to get certain job performed. It was given in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by Britain to other countries to help them maintain armies.

There has always been economic interdependence between the various countries. But this interdependence has increased very much during the modern age. It would be no exaggeration to hold that the whole world has become one world.

Anything happening in a country has its effect on other countries of the world. That is why it is said that poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere else. It explains why the countries aim at the realization of international social justice. For the realization of such an international social justice the under-developed countries need assistance from the developed countries.

It would be worthwhile to remember here that aid programmes are beneficial both for the donors and the recipients. It helps the recipients because money, equipment, skill and knowledge received as aid helps in establishing modern economy, political stability and military security.

It helps the donors in gaining some political or commercial advantage. It is another thing that this advantage may come in the distant future. Sometimes the donors attach certain strings (conditions) to aid.

Even if no strings are added, foreign aid helps in establishing friendly relations. It is that both the United States and the Soviet Union were trying to win friends by offering foreign aid to the non-aligned countries.

Great Britain was the first country in the world to formulate a programme of foreign aid for economic development. It made programme of Colonial Development and Welfare "in early 1930's. This programme was intended as political development and economic development of colonies.

It was aimed against Fascist and Nazi propaganda. It is only during the last century, particularly after the Second World War, that foreign aid programmes have been used extensively, systematically and rather aggressively.

It was only after Second World War that the United States started a programme of foreign aid. This was the European Recovery Programme to enable the European countries to reconstruct their economies destroyed during the War.

This cost the United States nearly 33 billion dollars. It was done to contain the Communist appeal. This foreign aid programme was later on extended to the developing countries as well.

Arguments for Aid

Indeed, the idea behind foreign aid is always national interest of the donor. It has..still been justified on the following grounds—

(1) Economic Argument:

Foreign aid is given by a developed nation to a developing country from the economic point of view. The developed country always stands in need of raw-materials which are produced in the developing countries.

If the United States gives aid to developing countries, it is itself in the economic interest of the United States. By giving foreign aid, the raw- materials in the developing countries grew in abundance, which in return strengthen American economy.

(2) Instrument in gaining Allies:

The second argument says that foreign aid helps in gaining allies in a world divided into intra-bloc competition. It is just with this end in view that both the United States and the Soviet Union competed with each other in giving foreign aid. It helped the donor country in enlisting the support of the recipient country.

(3) Instrument for political stability and military strength:

Foreign aid helps in achieving political stability and military strength. It would be no exaggeration to say that in areas like Taiwan, South Korea, the American involvement increased to the extent that it assumed more or less direct responsibility for building up military effectiveness.

Foreign Aid is essentially Neo-Colonialism:

Whatever argument might be advanced in support of foreign aid, it is essentially aimed at neo-Colonialism. It is Imperialism adapted to the modern circumstances. It is used to change policies and even Governments so that the recipient country should always play a second fiddle to the donor country.

Opinion has differed on the implications of foreign aid. There are scholars who regard aid as a relatively disinterested attempt to assist the poor countries in development. On the other hand, there are others who regard foreign aid as an instrument for the furtherance of national interest. It is worthwhile to note here that aid is always clothed in humanitarian arguments, at least the donor country professes to give it that angle.

The public opinion polls and the American Congress debates are always guided by humanitarian arguments. But it cannot be denied that it is always given to further the interests and political objectives of the donor country. Foreign aid is usually cut off as a punishment. For instance, foreign aid to India by the United States was cancelled during the days of Bangladesh crisis.

So it can be said that foreign aid is an instrument used for rewarding, threatening or punishing. It is basically used in wielding influence over the recipient country. It serves a long-term objective also in the sense that the donor country exploits the raw-materials of the recipient countries. It should, however, be remembered that the recipient countries are at present in a position to keep away the strings attached to foreign aid. This has been possible due to the fact that the number of the donor countries has increased. They are competing with one another in giving aid. The recipient countries can thus receive aid which has no strings attached to it.

Forms of Foreign Aid

Different writers have given different forms of foreign aid. Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau has given six forms of foreign aid. They are humanitarian foreign aid, subsistence aid, military aid, bribery, prestige aid and economic development aid.

Chester Bowles classifies foreign aid in terms of countries: nations requesting aid because of mal-distribution of wealth; nations with inadequate G.N.P. willing to mobilise their own resources; nations lacking the competence; organisation and will to use aid; and nations whose situation is not clear.

However, for our purpose, we shall classify foreign aid as under:

- (1) Military aid;
- (2) Technical assistance;
- (3) Capital grants ; and
- (4) Loans.

1. Military aid

It is the oldest form of foreign aid. It helps in gaining allies. Both Great Britain and France supplied money and material in gaining allies in the European countries. The recipient countries provided men. The Soviet Union and the United States allocated considerable amounts of money for military aid. The only objective of this kind of aid is to strengthen the military capability of their respective allies.

It is a way to reduce burden of stationing one's own military in another country. This kind of aid makes the recipient completely dependent on the donors for the supply of modern equipments, ammunitions, replacement and maintenance of the equipment supplied.

This enables the donors to exercise almost complete control over the military movements of recipient countries. This policy of arming certain countries by a particular great power against the other country takes the form of cold war. There have been certain areas such as West Asia and Indo-China where this cold war turned into hot war many a time between the countries of region concerned.

In these wars, the smaller countries fight on behalf of the great powers. If North Vietnam was supported and given military assistance by the Communist powers, South Vietnam was supported by the American bloc. In this way, local conflicts arising out of indigenous causes turn into hot bed of super rivalry.

The most interesting fact about military aid is that the supplier country can direct the course of a local conflict by simply replenishing or withholding supply and spare parts, or worse still by threatening to switch her affections to the other side.

Most of the wars now going on in the Third World fought by increased sophisticated weapons can be intensified or brought to a halt at the will of the supplier. If and when the great powers feel that they need a rest from the tensions of such proxy wars, they can do so by reducing the volume of supplies.

In this way, the recipient countries have to dance to the tune of the advanced supplier countries. This means a serious encroachment upon their autonomy.

2. Technical assistance:

It is the least expensive among the aid programmes with big benefits. One American writer says: "Relatively inexpensive, technical assistance programmes allow personnel from industrialised countries to attack such practical problems such as fishery development, control of malaria, the construction of roads, educational advancement and so forth, and do so on more of personal level than is generally true with regards to economic development assistance."

It is also a fact that "technical assistance efforts have been a very small portion of total foreign-aid activities since the Second World War."

It aims at providing technical know-how instead of equipment and funds. Experts and specialists from advanced countries go out to render technical advice on different projects such as malaria control, agricultural mechanisation, public management, teaching programme, family planning and population control, habitat programmes, medical and sanitary facilities, development of indigenous resources etc. None can deny that the 'Point Four Programme' and the 'Peace Corps' initiated by the United States for development in the field of administration, agriculture, horticulture and education had nothing to do with the political-economic considerations.

Still, the critics point out that such programmes were aimed at introducing a particular kind of culture in these countries. With regard to the eradication of malaria programmes, it is argued that this was initiated with a view to spending the huge stocks of DDT which were lying in the stores of the advanced countries.

The motives for technical aid became more clear when the developing countries began to ask for it with a view to modernising themselves. But it is a pity that technology sold to them is the technology which the developed countries have since discarded.

After the Second World War, the imperialist powers were faced with a large number of industries that had become unproductive and obsolete. They needed to be scrapped. It is this scrap (Kabad Khana) which is being sold to the developing countries at a high price. It has served the industrialised nations by providing them with the capital raised out of the sale of that technology.

Moreover, the transfer of technology has been limited to a few areas that benefit only the imperialist countries. These include :

- (1) Industries consuming too much energy.
- (2) Industries that pollute atmosphere.
- (3) Mining and extractive industries to get raw-materials for use in the imperialist country,
- (4) Agricultural production industries to get edibles.
- (5) Experimental technology that needs a large scale of trials for development such as electronics, communications, chemicals, drugs and pharmaceuticals.
- (6) Industries which need a large number of labour forces.

Moreover, instead of developing educational and scientific facilities within the developing countries, the imperialist countries encourage higher education in science and other fields in their respective countries.

The trainees from the developing countries, instead of being trained in the area of need of their respective country, are trained in areas for which facilities exist in that country or which serve the needs of the imperialist powers.

The people so trained in Western culture, outlook and aspiration become ineffective in the under developed country. They become alienated from their own country and prefer to settle in the countries where they got training. This results in what we term 'Brain- Drain."

3. Capital grant:

Capital grant means aid given by way of gifts. This kind of aid is not paid back. The European Recovery Programmes and Mutual Security Programmes included a large amount of such no repayable donations. According to Robert Wendzei, "The American policy-makers sought to assist because it was presumed to lead, in turn, namely democratic Government, the development of capitalist economic system and a more open society on the part of the recipient. It was also believed that economic development would lead to stability in the system of the recipient and a peaceful foreign policy. It would avoid them being dependent on foreign powers for security and survival."

It was in pursuance of these objectives that the United States preferred outright transfer of capital goods donations and grants without expecting any repayment. After fifties, most of the new nations opted for non-alignment. The U.S.A. did not want to give grants to those non-committed to U.S. policy. It started giving such grants through international agencies such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The Bank was also dominated by the imperialist countries. It was not of any help to the developing countries because of low rate of economic growth and high level of unemployment in these countries.

4. Loans:

Loans are given to be repaid over a long period of time for the development schemes to be run in the developing countries. But these loans also involve exploitation. Loan is given for a particular project approved by the donor countries. They give loan for those projects only which will be useful to them in the long-run. It means development will be made in the direction fixed by the donor country. So, there is no exaggeration in holding

that such aid "comes at a wrong time, goes to a wrong sector and is provided for specified interested purpose." The loans received by the developing countries, instead of being any help, become a burden upon them. It becomes difficult for them to repay the loans. Not to say of loans, it becomes difficult even to pay the interest. Sometimes a loan is taken just to pay the interest due to be paid on the previous amounts of loans received.

Political Objectives of Foreign Aid As we have discussed earlier, foreign aid is essentially a part of neo-Colonialism exercised by the capitalist countries. Let us then discuss the political objectives of foreign aid. These are:

- Creation of political stability in the recipient State.
- To change domestic and foreign policy of recipient country,
- Reward for becoming an alliance partner, and
- Help the recipient to achieve its objectives.

(a) Creation of Political Stability in the Recipient State:

Foreign aid is sometimes given to secure political stability in the recipient country. Political stability is achieved through the

- creation of modern military force,
- extension of military help to put down internal riots and disorders and the established authority, and
- raising of prestige of the local regime and military elites. The aid given by the USA, USSR, France and Great Britain to their allies and some of the developing countries served this purpose.

United States extended help to Guatemala and other Latin American countries, South Korea, and other countries, and the Soviet aid to East European countries have been given for this purpose. The aid given to Pakistan by the United States and to Egypt by the Soviet Union was aimed at elevating the prestige of the regime. India also helps Nepal with this end in view. Suppression of local disorders has also been one of the major purposes of foreign aid. Military intervention in Afghanistan, in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and in Hungary in 1956 by the Soviet Union and in Lebanon in 1958 by the United States are such examples.

(b) To change domestic and foreign policy of Recipient Country:

Aid is also used to influence the domestic and external policy of the recipient country. American aid to Pakistan has been enhanced on many occasions because Pakistan followed American dictates in every sphere.

On the other hand, American aid to India was slashed after the Third Plan period as India did not agree to cut down expenditure on public sector. Aid to India was suddenly stopped when India did not follow US instructions in the Indo-Pak War of 1971.

(c) Reward for becoming an Alliance Partner:

Promises of military and economic aid are given to gain allies in the international field. We find that Pakistan has been receiving both the kinds of aid from the United States because she entered into military alliances with the later. Military hardware that was refused to India even against payment, was given to Pakistan free of cost by the USA.

(d) Helps the Recipient to achieve its objectives:

Foreign aid is sometimes given to help the recipient to achieve its objectives. Soviet Russia gave military help to Indonesia with a view to helping her to settle problems with Malaysia by demonstration of sheer threat of force.

It is for this very reason that the U.S.A. extended help to Israel and to Egypt also after the Camp David Agreement of 1976.

From Neo-Colonialism to NGO-Colonialism?

Throughout Africa and the rest of the developing world thousands of Non-Governmental Organizations are engaged in assisting the impoverished, the downtrodden, and the unfortunate. While their specific objectives might vary, their broad goal is to simply “help.” Medicines San Frontiers provides medical care, Save the Children is focused on, well, saving children and the International Rescue Committee is focused on refugee work. Hundreds more are building schools, assisting with agriculture, clean water, good governance, the environment, and the latest trend, gender issues.

Add to the list of these private organizations are a host of United Nations sponsored endeavors – the UN Development Program, the World Food Program, and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. Governments are involved as well – US Agency for International Development (US AID) and the British Department for International Development (DFID.) The largest, and oldest player in the field is of course the World Bank and its various regional subsidiaries.

Over the past sixty-three years western governments alone have spent \$1.2 trillion seeking economic growth in the developing world. Private NGO's have contributed billions of dollars more. So the question must be asked – has it done any good? Certainly, at the individual human level refugees have been fed and housed, starvation averted, children vaccinated and rape victims counseled. But at a macro level the answer is a resounding no. The net effect of the trillions of dollars and billions of man hours spent helping Africa and the rest of the developing world prosper has been negligible and possibly negative. The road to poverty appears to be paved with aid dollars. No country in the developing world which has received any significant amount of aid has reformed its public policies, or launched itself into sustained economic growth. Taken as a group, it can be argued that a country's economic development is inversely proportional to the amount of aid it receives.

The first reason is that foreign aid, whether in the form of World Bank financing or direct action through various NGOs on the ground, alleviates the host nation of responsibility for that function, whether it be a humanitarian crisis, vaccinating children, building schools, economic development or saving the endangered mountain gorilla or primeval forest. The presence of so many aid workers in a region thus removes the onus of good governance from the people in charge. It is no longer their problem – and thus they become less accountable to the people they are theoretically supposed to serve.

The second reason is that the presence of so many NGO's and UN personnel coupled with their vast budgets creates distorting effects on the economy. The large influx of rich westerners with their fat expat salaries and hardship pay creates an artificial boom economy in the region leading to inflation throughout all sectors of the economy. Food prices rise, rents rise, consumer goods become more expensive. For the local small business owner recruiting and retaining qualified personnel becomes more expensive as the NGO's pay scale doesn't reflect the local reality.

While some would argue that the influx of cash is good for the economy – it's in fact an artificial cash injection which creates a dependency of the host government on the NGO community – a form of NGO colonialism. The artificial economic boom thus relieves any pressure the host government would have had to reform regressive economic policies. Host governments no longer have to reform their stagnant state run economies or liberalize trade or create a competitive business environment; which are painful in the short run but key to long term economic growth. This in turn means governments don't have to address other issues like endemic corruption or the mismanagement of public funds.

All of the economic reforms do come with a cost – a political cost. Reforming state owned companies means layoffs of redundant workers and the end of cronyism. Liberalizing trade means the end of corruption and protection of a few powerful businessmen. Indeed, good economic policy can be threatening to ones political career. If there are large amounts of artificial cash swimming around the country then the exigency to act disappears – and everyone is the worse off for it.

In the end, governments become dependent on the presence and actions of the NGO's in order to maintain the status quo – the lack of political reform, poor public policy and poor economic choices. The NGO's, for all their

good intentions, become complicit in this; at best, shrouding the truth in a bright eyed and bushy-tailed naïveté, and at worse, proselytizing their moral superiority to the world.

But there is a much darker side to this as well. In order to operate and to perpetuate their activities NGO's are dependent upon a continuing stream of donations. In countries in crisis or emerging from crisis, NGO's have a financial incentive to exaggerate the need for aid – which in turn leads them to exaggerate the conditions in the areas in which they operate. The NGO community at large will overestimate deaths from starvation, numbers of refugees, or those killed by conflict. The best example is the work by the International Refugee Committee in its latest study of those killed by the conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo's volatile eastern region. On a recent survey, the IRC estimated 5.4 million people have been killed as a result of the conflict. This is a staggering figure – on par with the Holocaust. The IRC's analysis is fundamentally flawed however in that they have concluded that virtually all deaths in the region are a result of the conflict – as opposed to simply living in impoverished conditions in sub-Saharan Africa. The IRC fails to demonstrate any credible correlation between these deaths and the conflict itself. It's as if one did an accounting of all deaths in the United States since 2001 and then claimed these were the direct result of the war on terror. Statistical integrity and small details are beside the point, however – the headline grabbing figure of 5.4 million deaths is much better for donations.

What the staffers at the IRC and other NGO's don't realize is that these distortions of the truth, while excellent fundraising mechanisms, are in fact detrimental to the cause they wish to serve. By making outlandish statements and barraging media outlets with horror stories, they are in fact hindering direct foreign investment into the region, investment which would otherwise bring stability, economic growth, jobs and higher standards of living to those people. All of this, is of course, lost on the legions of young, well meaning westerners running around the developing world trying to do their best to help humankind.

Conclusion

It is thus very clear that aid is always given with strings (on certain conditions). It is always the donor country that exploits the advantage received out of that aid. It is rather immaterial whether the donor is a socialist or a capitalist country. It is the recipient country which stands to lose. Comparatively, however, the aid from a capitalist country is more disadvantageous in terms of consequences. It is seen that the recipient finds it hard to come out of the clutches of the Western donor. The recipients continue to be exploited as ever. It is thus an instrument of domination. Political strings serve as levers of control that restrict the freedom of action of the recipient. It is why the countries of the Third World have been put in relationship of neo-Colonialism by the advanced countries.

Case Studies

Syria: Ethics of intervention

US Claim: The United States has an ethical obligation to intervene in the humanitarian crisis plaguing Syria. This obligation is not born from seeking to "spread" western principles of governance, but rather to ensure the sustainability of civilization itself.

In 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) spoke to the concept of universal and inalienable rights that forge the foundation of our human existence. Over the past few years, the Syrian government has demonstrated that it stands in stark contradiction to those very rights to which they claimed to ascribe as signatories to the UDHR.

The use of chemical attacks by the Syrian government against their own citizens cannot be responded to with silence by world leaders, but rather demands a response that is equal to the gravity of the crime against

humanity itself. If we accept silence as a viable response to the crisis in Syria -- as the British Parliament has done then we are guilty of standing idly by while the lives of innocent people are horrifically taken.

The world cannot accept another Rwanda. We cannot merely accept staff meetings and promises of ongoing talks as such merely prolongs the suffering of the innocent. Further, as we have seen in the case of Rwanda, failure to respond to a humanitarian crisis of such a grave nature will only lead to regret in the aftermath of the crisis. This was witnessed by spectators in 1998 when President Clinton visited Rwanda. During his visit, he expressed guilt and admitted "failure" for the absence of the United States in the wake of the 500,000-1,000,000 Rwandans who had been murdered in the 1994 genocide. If there is something we learned from that crisis and failure of diplomacy it is that *ex post facto* admissions of guilt and regret achieve little more than a media splash. What we are in need of is courageous leadership to demand a two-pronged intervention built on a military strike to destabilize the regime of Bashar al-Assad that is followed by an allied effort to sustain peace and security in a post-Assad Syria.

World's response: With respect to Syria, there is no direct threat to the United States. On the second and third count, it is not clear how war will fix things. It is easy to believe that the US armed forces could disable the Syrian military, but does that mean that Syria will be a safe from tyranny? Unclear. Does that mean that peace loving democrats will come to power? Unclear. Could there be a situation where we make bad people even more powerful? Like we did in Afghanistan (the first time), or in Afghanistan (the second time)? Or in the many other nations they've intervened in like Haiti or Lebanon, where bad people later came to power? Unclear. Does that mean that there won't be a subsequent government that would threaten our allies? Unclear.

In other words, civilized people have long recognized that the Syrian state is repressive and evil. And their recent behavior supports this view. But that's way different than saying that intervention will very likely lead to a better situation, or that the benefit we create will outweigh the violent death of innocent bystanders. Syria is burning, but there is no magic solution, especially the one dropped from a high altitude aircraft.

PRISM program of US and Spying on world governments:

How to make surveillance both ethical and effective:

1. There must be sufficient sustainable cause
2. There must be integrity of motive
3. The methods used must be proportionate.
4. There must be right and lawful authority
5. There must be a reasonable prospect of success
6. Recourse to secret intelligence must be a last resort

References:

1. [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1747-7093](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1747-7093)
2. http://www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/downloads/file/1593/ethics_of_surveillance_conference_programme
3. <http://culturedigitally.org/2013/06/in-context-digital-surveillance-ethics-and-prism/>
4. http://baldi.diplomacy.edu/toscano/toscano_ethics.pdf
- The Ashgate Research Companion to Ethics and International Relations
5. Bandyopadhyaya, J. 1993. A General Theory of International Relations. South Asia Books.
6. Nye, J. S. 1999. Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History. Longman Publishing.
7. Cox, R. W., ed. 1997. The New Realism: Perspectives on Multilateralism and World Order. St. Martin's Press.
8. Wallerstein, I. M. 1991. Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World System. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
9. Chomsky, N. 1996. World Orders Old and New. New York NY: Columbia University Press.
10. Huntington, S. P. 1998. Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. Touchstone Books.

Copyright © by Vision IAS

All rights are reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of Vision IAS