

INTRODUCTION TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

B.A. (Programme) Political Science

SEMESTER-V

Discipline Specific Core Course (DSC)

MINOR PAPER

As per the UGCF - 2022 and National Education Policy 2020

FOR LIMITED CIRCULATION



**DEPARTMENT OF DISTANCE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
CAMPUS OF OPEN LEARNING, SCHOOL OF OPEN LEARNING
UNIVERSITY OF DELHI**



(For Limited Circulation)

Editorial Board

*Mr. Devendra Dilip Pai, Dr. Sukanshika Vatsa
Mr. Saripalli V. Ravikiran*

Content Writers

Shaitan Singh

Academic Coordinator

Deekshant Awasthi

E-mail: ddceprinting@col.du.ac.in
politicalscience@col.du.ac.in

Published by:

Department of Distance and Continuing Education
Campus of Open Learning, School of Open Learning,
University of Delhi, Delhi-110 007

Printed by:

School of Open Learning, University of Delhi



Reviewer

Dr. Shivu Kumar

- Corrections/Modifications/Suggestions proposed by Statutory Body, DU/ Stakeholder/s in the Self Learning Material (SLM) will be incorporated in the next edition. However, these corrections/modifications/suggestions will be uploaded on the website <https://sol.du.ac.in>. Any feedback or suggestions may be sent at the email- feedbackslm@col.du.ac.in



SYLLABUS

Introduction to International Relations

Syllabus	Mapping
Unit-I: Disciplinary history of IR 1.1 What is International Relations? 1.2 Debates: Idealism/Realism & Science/Classical Methods, Inter-paradigm Debate	Lesson 1: International Relations and Debates: Idealism/Realism & Science/ Classical Methods, Inter-Paradigm Debate (Pages 3-27)
Unit-II: Theories of IR 2.1 Realpolitik/Realism/Neo-realism 2.2 Liberalism/Neo-liberalism 2.3 Marxism/Neo-Marxism 2.4 Feminism	Lesson 2: Realpolitik/Realism/Neo-Realism, Liberalism/Neo-Liberalism, Marxism/Neo-Marxism, and Feminism (Pages 31-61)
Unit-III: Concepts & Issues 3.1 State and Sovereignty 3.2 War and Peace 3.3 Human Rights 3.4 Global Governance: Climate Change Negotiations	Lesson 3: State and Sovereignty (Pages 65-84); Lesson 4: War and Peace (Pages 85-105); Lesson 5: Human Rights (Pages 107-128); Lesson 6: Global Governance and Climate Change Negotiations (Pages 129-150)
Unit-IV: IR Beyond Eurocentrism 4.1 Non-western Perspectives 4.2 Indian Contributions to IR	Lesson 7: Non-Western Perspectives (Pages 153-172); Lesson 8: Indian Contributions to International Relations (Pages 173-186)



CONTENTS

Unit I: Disciplinary History of International Relations

Lesson 1	International Relations and Debates: Idealism/Realism & Science/Classical Methods, Inter-Paradigm Debate	3-27
----------	--	------

Unit II: Theories of International Relations

Lesson 2	Realpolitik/Realism/Neo-Realism, Liberalism/Neo-Liberalism, Marxism/Neo-Marxism, and Feminism	31-61
----------	---	-------

Unit III: Concepts & Issues

Lesson 3	State and Sovereignty	65-84
Lesson 4	War and Peace	85-105
Lesson 5	Human Rights	107-128
Lesson 6	Global Governance and Climate Change Negotiations	129-150

Unit IV: IR Beyond Eurocentrism

Lesson 7	Non-Western Perspectives	153-172
Lesson 8	Indian Contributions to International Relations	173-186

Unit I: Disciplinary History of International Relations

Lesson 1: International Relations and Debates: Idealism/Realism & Science/Classical Methods, Inter-paradigm Debate



LESSON 1

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND DEBATES: IDEALISM/REALISM & SCIENCE/CLASSICAL METHODS, INTER-PARADIGM DEBATE

Shaitan Singh

Assistant Professor
School of Open Learning
University of Delhi, Delhi

STRUCTURE

- 1.1 Learning Objectives
- 1.2 Introduction
- 1.3 What is International Relations?
 - 1.3.1 Definition and Meaning
 - 1.3.2 Historical background of International Relations as a discipline
 - 1.3.3 Evolution of International Relations
 - 1.3.4 Levels of Analysis in IR
- 1.4 Debates in International Relations
 - 1.4.1 Realism versus Idealism
 - 1.4.2 Traditionalism versus Behaviouralism
 - 1.4.3 Inter-paradigm Debate
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 Glossary
- 1.7 Answers to In-Text Questions
- 1.8 Self-Assessment Questions
- 1.9 References/Suggested Readings

1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to:

- Define key terms and concepts in international relations and trace their historical development.



NOTES

- Analyzing international relations issues using the levels-of-analysis framework.
- Synthesize the historical examples with contemporary issues in international relations and demonstrating an understanding of their interconnectedness.
- Understand the historical roots, evaluate theories, explore historical insights, and critically analyze their impact on modern global affairs.

1.2 INTRODUCTION

The intersection of international relations and history is as ancient as human civilization itself. From Thucydides' seminal work, "History of the Peloponnesian War," to modern-day geopolitical analyses, the study of historical events has served as a cornerstone for understanding international affairs. However, while intertwined, the disciplines of international relations and history maintain distinct identities, characterized by their approaches, methodologies and objectives. Throughout history, scholars have recognized the invaluable contributions of historical inquiry to the study of international relations. History provides a rich tapestry of examples, offering insights into the complexities of global interactions, from diplomacy to conflict resolution. Moreover, it serves as a laboratory for refining theoretical frameworks, allowing scholars to test and validate hypotheses against the backdrop of past events. Perhaps most importantly, a historical consciousness enables scholars to contextualize contemporary issues within the broader continuum of human experience, facilitating informed judgments and policy decisions. Despite its longstanding tradition within the field, the role of history in international relations has not been without controversy. In the latter half of the 20th century, diverging attitudes emerged within the academic community. While some approaches, such as the English school and world system analysis, embraced history as integral to their methodologies, others, notably postmodernism challenged its analytical utility. Postmodernists questioned the objectivity of historical narratives, casting doubt on the existence of universal truths and transhistorical knowledge. Nevertheless, the enduring relevance of history in the study of international relations persists. Realist scholars continue to draw upon historical precedent to inform their analyses, while critical-constructivist approaches emphasize the socio-historical context of global

**NOTES**

phenomena. Even within more liberal-idealistic frameworks, traces of historical inquiry remain evident, albeit to a lesser extent (Devetak et al. 2007).

This lesson explores the disciplinary history of international relations through the lens of its relationship with history and delves into the debates of international relations. It examines the evolution of attitudes towards historical inquiry within the field, tracing the shifting dynamics between past and present, idiographic and nomothetic approaches, and description and analysis. By delving into this discourse, we gain a deeper understanding of the complex interplay between historical understanding and contemporary international relations theory and practice. Although it explains how this field started in the early 20th century and how it has evolved over time. It mentions that while new ideas and theories have emerged to understand the changing world, the older ones still have relevance. In this lesson we will also discuss the shift from the traditional agenda to new issues in international relations, emphasizing that both are important to understand today's world. This lesson aims to explore these relationships between old and new theories and issues in international relations.

1.3 WHAT IS INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS?

1.3.1 Definition and Meaning

International Relations (IR) is about how countries interact with each other on the subjects involving politics, economics, conflict, and security etc. It looks at how they get along or disagree, and how they work together on global issues. This includes studying things like conflicts between countries, how organizations like the UN and World Trade Organization help, and how businesses from different countries operate. It also looks at new challenges like climate change and terrorism. Understanding IR helps us see different ways the world could be organized, with the hope of making the world more peaceful and developed.

Here are some definitions of international relations by prominent philosophers who have contributed to the understanding of international relation:



NOTES

Hans Morgenthau is a prominent figure in the field of international relations theory. In his seminal work “Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace” (1948), Morgenthau defines international relations as “*the struggle for power among states in the international system.*” He emphasizes the importance of power dynamics and the pursuit of national interests in shaping the behaviour of states in the international realm.

Thomas Hobbes: He is known for his work “Leviathan”, where he described the state of nature as a war of all against all. His ideas about the social contract and the necessity of a strong central authority have had a significant impact on how we understand international relations.

Kenneth Waltz: He is known for his neorealist theory of international relations. In his book “Theory of International Politics” (1979), Waltz defines international relations as “*a field of political activity in which states are the crucial actors, but are not necessarily the only ones, and in which interactions between them take place within a framework of anarchy.*”

When news covers immediate events, international relations delve deeper, analyzing connections, causes, and broader contexts. It clarifies that international relations isn’t just about current events or individual countries’ politics but encompasses interactions among nations, states, and people. The concept of a “Great Divide” separates domestic politics, governed by central authority, from international relations, where no single authority exists, influencing how countries prioritize security over justice. Anarchy, meaning the absence of central rule, is fundamental in understanding international relations. Overall, the discipline seeks to explain, interpret, and provide normative analysis of global interactions, going beyond the surface of events to understand their deeper implications and complexities.

(Grieco, J. et al. 2015), wrote that international relations are not just theories in books; they’re a part of our everyday reality, influencing everything from the products we use and the wars we hear about. Consider your smartphone, perhaps an iPhone. While it’s designed by Apple in California, its components come from various corners of the globe. A South Korean company manufactures the processor, Japan provides the display module and touch screen, and a German-based company produces the camera module. All these parts are assembled in China by a company called Foxconn.

**NOTES**

This intricate process highlights the interconnectedness of nations through global trade. However, international relations aren't just about trade and cooperation. Tragic events like the September 11 attacks remind us of the darker side. The aftermath of such events often leads to conflicts and wars, shaping the geopolitical landscape for years to come. Yet, there are stories of hope amidst the chaos. Take the transformation of relations between France and Germany. Once bitter enemies, they now collaborate politically, economically, and militarily within the European Union, fostering peace and prosperity in the region. Understanding international relations involves grasping key concepts like actors (individual leaders, states, and non-state entities) and levels of analysis (individual, state, and international). These concepts help us make sense of complex interactions on the world stage.

1.3.2 Historical background of International Relations as a discipline

The historical background of International Relations (IR) as a discipline traces back to the aftermath of World War I, a period marked by unprecedented destructiveness and a surge in anti-war sentiment across Europe. The trauma of the war led to a widespread desire to prevent future conflicts, prompting the establishment of institutions like the League of Nations and the Permanent Court of International Justice. These initiatives reflected a shift towards a new diplomatic and legal order based on contractual international law and multilateralism, with the aim of promoting international cooperation and achieving peace and security. The discipline of IR emerged during this period of progressive institutionalization, guided by the purpose of developing theories aimed at preventing or eliminating war. Influential figures such as Sir Norman Angell and Woodrow Wilson advocated for a new diplomatic and legal order built on principles of collective security and open diplomacy, challenging traditional notions of power politics. However, this liberal perspective faced criticism from scholars like E.H. Carr, who argued for a more realistic approach that considered power dynamics in international relations.

The evolution of the discipline saw subsequent debates, including methodological quarrels between behaviouralism and traditionalism in the 1960s and 1970s, and later, the 'third great debate' between positivism and post-positivism. These debates reflected broader shifts in the study of IR towards critical theories that questioned traditional



NOTES

assumptions and power structures, emphasizing the role of social, cultural, and ideological influences in shaping international relations. In recent decades, the study of IR has expanded to incorporate new agendas such as globalization and global governance. These agendas highlight the growing influence of transnational actors, structures, and processes, challenging traditional state-centric perspectives. Issues like global economic institutions, humanitarianism, and the environment have become central to the study of IR, reflecting the interconnectedness of contemporary global politics. The emergence of the new agenda and the critical turn in IR suggest a re-evaluation of the traditional divide between domestic and international politics. As the boundaries between these realms blur, scholars are increasingly questioning established frameworks and exploring alternative perspectives that account for the complexities of modern global politics (Reus-Smit 2020).

When we look back to the early 20th century when universities began to formalize the study of global politics. The division of knowledge into disciplines within universities aids in organizing and facilitating learning. A discipline, in this context, encompasses a distinct focus, set of institutions, and traditions of thought. These components are crucial for the growth and development of a field of knowledge. However, it's important to note that the term "discipline" also implies bringing under control or maintaining order, which is achieved by focusing on specific subjects and avoiding distractions. The establishment of IR as a discipline involved delineating a subject matter while acknowledging the interconnectedness of various aspects such as politics, morality, law and economics. Despite inevitable disagreements on the scope of the discipline, there are dominant questions and topics that shape the field, reflecting the interests of scholars and students. Institutionalization played a pivotal role in the development of IR, with universities worldwide creating departments, schools, or centers dedicated to its study. The University of Wales established the first IR department in 1919, followed by institutions like the London School of Economics and Georgetown University. These academic settings provided platforms for both teaching and research, essential for the accumulation and transmission of knowledge. Moreover, disciplines like IR foster their own institutions, including academic journals, professional associations, and think tanks. These entities facilitate scholarly discourse, the exchange of ideas, and the refinement of arguments, contributing to the evolution of the discipline over time (Devetak et al. 2007).

**NOTES**

The intellectual foundations of IR extend beyond its formal institutionalization. Influential thinkers from ancient times to the modern era, such as Thucydides, Machiavelli and Grotius, laid the groundwork for understanding international relations. Their insights, though not explicitly focused on IR as a distinct discipline, contributed to discussions on power dynamics, diplomacy and governance, shaping subsequent scholarly inquiry. Various traditions of thought have influenced the study of IR, including realism, liberalism and Marxism. Realism, emphasizing power politics and an anarchic international system, contrasts with liberalism's optimism about progress through international cooperation and institutions. Additionally, Marxist perspectives highlight socioeconomic factors and class conflict in shaping global relations. The classification of these traditions is not fixed, and alternative schemes exist. Nonetheless, they provide analytical frameworks and conceptual tools for understanding IR phenomena. These traditions are not static but evolve over time, reflecting changing geopolitical realities and academic debates.

In conclusion, the historical background of IR as a discipline reflects a continuous process of evolution and debate, shaped by historical events, changing political circumstances and shifting intellectual currents. From its origins in the aftermath of World War I to the contemporary challenges of globalization and global governance, the study of IR remains dynamic and multifaceted, continuously adapting to new realities and perspectives.

1.3.3 Evolution of International Relations

International Relations (IR) is a field of study that examines the interactions between states and other actors in the global arena. Its origins can be traced back thousands of years, but its evolution into a distinct academic discipline has been a complex journey marked by significant historical events and theoretical developments. The history of IR can be seen in layers, each contributing to its gradual emergence as a discipline. Ancient civilizations, such as the Sumerian city-states and Greek city-states, engaged in diplomatic relations and conflict resolution, laying the groundwork for future international interactions. However, it wasn't until the rise of the nation-state system in the 17th century that the modern concept of IR began to take shape.

The Peace Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 is often cited as a crucial moment in the development of IR. This treaty recognized the sovereignty of nation-states and



NOTES

established the principle of non-interference in each other's domestic affairs. Subsequent treaties, like the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, further solidified the concept of state sovereignty, paving the way for the modern international system. Despite these developments, the study of IR as a separate academic discipline did not fully emerge until the 20th century. Before World War I, IR was primarily the domain of historians, with a focus on descriptive accounts of diplomatic history. It wasn't until after the war that formal academic programs in IR began to appear, notably in the United Kingdom, United States and Switzerland. The interwar period saw the establishment of international legal organizations like the League of Nations, reflecting a growing interest in collective security and conflict resolution. However, the League's failure to prevent World War II highlighted the limitations of idealistic approaches to international politics. After World War II, IR underwent a paradigm shift towards more scientific and analytical methods. Scholars like Hans Morgenthau introduced Realism as a theory that emphasized power politics and national interest as the driving forces behind state behaviour.

This realist perspective contrasted with earlier idealistic views of international cooperation and peace. The 1970s witnessed the rise of Neo-Realism, spearheaded by Kenneth Waltz, who sought to provide a more systematic and scientific framework for understanding international politics. Neo-Realism focused on the anarchic nature of the international system and the role of states as rational actors seeking security in an uncertain world. Systems theory also gained prominence during this period, viewing the international system as a complex network of interconnected elements. This approach emphasized the importance of systemic structures in shaping state behaviour and interactions. While Realism and Neo-Realism dominated much of the discourse in IR, other theoretical frameworks emerged, such as Liberalism, Constructivism and Marxism. These theories offered alternative perspectives on issues like cooperation, conflict resolution and the role of non-state actors in international politics. The end of the Cold War in 1991 brought new challenges and opportunities for the study of IR. Globalization, technological advancements and the emergence of new security threats reshaped the international landscape, prompting scholars to reevaluate existing theories and adapt to changing realities.

After the Cold War ended, the way countries interacted changed, leading to new ideas about international politics. Critical theories like constructivism, feminism,

**NOTES**

and post-modernism emerged, asking questions about how things should be, not just how they are. This shift is called a “Paradigm shift.” These theories focused on solving problems rather than strict analysis. They aimed to make people think and question existing norms, rather than just accept them. Scholars like Andrew Linklater, Michael Foucault, and others developed these ideas. Some scholars believe people’s behaviour is shaped by their identity, which is influenced by society. They argue that institutions, like the state, are socially created. For example, feminists say gender roles are shaped by society, not biology. Critical theorists aim to free people from oppressive social practices. Postmodernists doubt big stories claiming to know the truth about everything. They believe truth is more complex and diverse. Globalization, a big change after 1991, made the world more connected economically and socially. Its supporters say it boosts trade, communication, and cultural exchange, creating a global community but critics argue it mostly benefits rich countries and capitalist that is deepening inequality. They worry about its impact on cultures and governance. These developments create a puzzle for understanding international relations. Critical theories talk about freedom, while globalization raises concerns about inequality. Both are important but don’t fully explain the complexity of global affairs. Scholars haven’t agreed on a single theory. So, while we have ideas, we’re still figuring out the whole picture.

1.3.4 Levels of Analysis in IR

When we look at what’s happening in world politics, we notice that a bunch of different things are going on. These things are connected in complicated ways, and they happen at different levels: the individual level (like people), the state or organization level (like countries or big groups), and the global level (like the whole world). What happens at the global level can affect what happens in countries and what people do, and what people and countries do can also affect the whole world. So, we call each of these levels a “level of analysis.” It’s like looking at different pieces of a puzzle to understand the big picture of what’s happening in the world. Each level gives us a different way of seeing why people and countries do certain things. To really get what’s going on in any situation, we need to think about what’s happening at each level. But sometimes, if we’re trying to explain something or come up with a plan, we might just focus on one level because it helps us understand the situation the best.



NOTES

The different levels are:

- *The Individual Level:* When researchers study things at the “individual level,” they’re looking at the traits and behaviours of people. For example, they might study how a leader’s personality affects their decisions, whether biases influence what they do, or even if people are naturally inclined to fight each other. Some experts used to think that leaders always make logical decisions. But that idea doesn’t always match reality. Leaders often have limited time and information. So instead of always making the best choice, they might just go with the first option that seems good enough. We call this “satisficing” or having “bounded rationality.” Basically, they’re just trying to get through things step by step, sometimes without a clear plan. As leaders work together in groups like cabinets or governments, it gets even trickier. They have to make decisions while dealing with disagreements, shifting alliances and different points of view. This can make it hard for them to stick to logical thinking.
- *The State Level:* At the state level, researchers look at governments, decision-making groups and agencies that shape the foreign policies of countries and other groups. They also study the societies these groups represent. For example, they might look at the United States government, the US State Department, or the United Nations Security Council. They pay attention to things like the type of government in a country, its beliefs, how wealthy and powerful is the militarily, its size in terms of land and people, and the social groups within it like religions or ethnicities. They ask questions like whether countries with democratic governments are more peaceful, if powerful countries behave differently from weak ones, whether having different ethnic or religious groups leads to more conflicts within a country, and whether leaders start wars with other countries to distract from problems at home. Because there are different kinds of groups involved, researchers also look at the smaller groups within countries, like political parties or interest groups, which are different from the country itself. And even within those smaller groups, there can be even smaller subgroups. Countries can also be part of



NOTES

bigger groups, like alliances or regions. For example, during the Cold War, people talked about the “Free World” (led by the US), the Soviet Bloc (led by the Soviet Union) and the nonaligned bloc (countries like India that didn’t join either side). Depending on what they’re studying, researchers might group countries by geography (like Asian or European), religion (like Muslim or Christian), or ideology (like socialist or capitalist). They do this to show similarities and differences among countries.

- *The Global Levels:* When we talk about the global system in politics, we’re looking at how power, money, nationality and other important things are spread out across the entire world. It’s like looking at the big picture, seeing how all countries and groups interact with each other. People who study this stuff are interested in seeing patterns and behaviours happening everywhere, not just in one place. They believe that the way things work on a global scale can’t be fully understood by only looking at smaller parts of the world. They think that some things only happen because of how countries and groups interact with each other. For example, during the Cold War, many people thought the tension between the US and the Soviet Union would lead to a big war. But even though they didn’t get along and had different ideas, they never actually fought a big war. Some experts say that’s because both countries had nuclear weapons, so they were afraid of what would happen if they started a war. So, in a weird way, those weapons actually stopped a big war from happening.

Most experts focus on one level when they study politics, like looking at individual countries or looking at the whole world. But some experts, like Peter Gourevitch and Robert Putnam, look at how different levels affect each other. For example, Gourevitch talks about what happens between countries can affect what happens inside countries. So, basically, when we’re trying to understand how the world works, we can look at different levels, like individual actions, group actions and how the whole world works together. Each level helps us understand different things, and sometimes people disagree because they’re using different ideas to explain what’s going on (Grieco et al, 2014).



NOTES

1.4 DEBATES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

We're going to look at some important ideas that people use to understand global politics. These ideas have changed over time. People who study global politics like to think about its history in three main parts, each with its own big argument. The first part had a debate between two main ideas: realism and liberalism. People argued about things like who's important in global politics and if countries usually work together or not. They asked questions like: Are countries the only important players? Do they mostly worry about military stuff or other things like trade? Do countries tend to fight or cooperate? The second part was about how to come up with theories and do research. Some people thought theories should come from specific things we see, while others thought they should come from general ideas. They also argued about whether political scientists should use methods like natural scientists do. Then came the third part, called the 'Third Debate.' This time, people asked deeper questions about research and theories. One big question was: Can researchers really watch politics without being biased? This debate led to a new idea called constructivism, which is now as important as realism and liberalism. Some people in this debate used to be Marxists, and we'll talk a bit about what they thought too. Each of these ideas came from certain times in history. Realism came about as a reaction to overly hopeful thinking after World War I and II. It got even more popular during the Cold War. Liberalism started during the Enlightenment, when people believed science and reason could make life better. It got a boost after the American and French revolutions and during industrialization. It became popular again after World War I and the Cold War. Marxism was a response to the bad parts of industrialization, like terrible conditions for workers. It got more followers after the Russian Revolution in 1917 and during the Great Depression. The Third Debate happened after the Cold War, when some people doubted if social science could really solve big global problems like inequality, environmental damage, and violence.

**NOTES****1.4.1 Realism versus Idealism**

Realists and Idealists (liberals) have been engaged in a long-standing debate about the nature of global politics. Realists, often seen as emphasizing power politics, trace their ideas back to ancient India (Kautilya) and China and classical Western thinkers like Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Hobbes. They believe that power and security are the central elements of global politics. According to them, states are in constant competition for power, leading to a balance of power system where states try to maintain their security through alliances and armament. Realists view states as the primary actors in global politics and believe that internal factors like the type of government have little impact on foreign policy. They argue that the pursuit of power is deeply rooted in human nature, leading to a constant struggle for power.

Liberals, on the other hand, emerged in the 17th to 19th centuries in France, Britain, and the United States. Key figures include Voltaire, Kant and John Locke. Liberals believe in progress and the improvement of individuals' lives through knowledge, social reform, and democracy. They advocate for free trade, human rights, and international cooperation. There are two main branches of liberalism: noninterventionist and interventionist. Noninterventionist liberals believe that by setting an example of liberal values, like freedom and democracy, other countries will naturally adopt them. Interventionist liberals, however, believe in actively spreading liberal values, sometimes through force if necessary, to promote human rights and end atrocities.

In contrast to realists, liberals focus on individuals and see cooperation as essential for global stability. They support international organizations and regimes to facilitate cooperation among states and address global issues like trade and climate change. Realists tend to be pessimistic, believing war and conflict are inevitable, while liberals are optimistic, believing in progress and the possibility of eliminating war and poverty. Realism emphasizes state security and sovereignty, while liberalism focuses on human welfare and international cooperation (Mearsheimer 2005).

1.4.2 Traditionalism versus Behaviouralism

The debate between traditionalism and behaviouralism (scientific approaches) in the study of global politics emerged in the 1960s, centering on research methodology.



NOTES

Traditional scholars, rooted in disciplines like history, philosophy and international law, approached the study of global politics through a qualitative lens. They delved into case studies, examining specific events and policies to understand their underlying causes and implications. These traditionalists often combined empirical evidence with normative claims, incorporating their views on what is morally right or wrong into their analyses. Post-World War II, a new wave of scholars emerged, advocating for a more scientific approach to the study of global politics, known as behaviouralists, these scholars drew inspiration from the methods of natural sciences, such as physics and chemistry. They argued that rather than focusing on historical narratives or normative judgments, political scientists should adopt a more objective and empirical stance, studying how people actually behave in political contexts. One of the key differences between traditionalists and behaviouralists lies in their treatment of empirical and normative aspects of research. Traditionalists integrated empirical evidence with normative claims, believing that understanding the “facts” of global politics required considering moral and ethical dimensions. In contrast, behaviouralists insisted on a strict separation between empirical observations and normative judgments, asserting that mixing the two could lead to confusion and bias in analysis.

Behaviouralists emphasized the importance of identifying patterns and regularities in human behaviour through systematic observation and analysis. They conducted case studies to uncover recurring behaviours and then generalized their findings to formulate predictive theories about global politics. By focusing on patterns and regularities, behaviouralists believed they could develop theories that could explain and predict political phenomena across different contexts. To test their hypotheses, behaviouralists turned to quantification and statistical analysis, tools borrowed from the natural sciences. They collected large amounts of data and used statistical methods to identify correlations and patterns in political behaviour. This quantitative approach allowed them to determine whether observed relationships between variables were statistically significant or merely coincidental (Mansbach et al. 2008).

However, traditionalists raised several critiques of the behaviouralist approach. They argued that human behaviour is inherently complex and influenced by a wide range of cultural, historical, and social factors. Traditionalists believed that reducing

**NOTES**

political phenomena to quantifiable variables oversimplified reality and failed to capture the richness and complexity of human behaviour. Moreover, traditionalists emphasized the importance of context in understanding political events and behaviours. They argued that isolating individual factors for analysis, as behaviouralists often did, overlooked the interconnectedness of different aspects of global politics. Traditionalists advocated for a holistic approach that considered the broader historical, cultural, and social contexts in which political phenomena occur.

Another point of contention between traditionalists and behaviouralists was the role of subjective factors in political analysis. Traditionalists criticized behaviouralists for focusing solely on observable and quantifiable aspects of politics while neglecting subjective factors like ideas, beliefs, and emotions. They argued that these subjective factors play a crucial role in shaping political behaviour and outcomes and should not be overlooked. Despite these criticisms, behaviouralism gained prominence in the study of global politics, particularly in Western academia. Behavioural scholars dominated research institutions and received significant funding for their work. However, traditional scholarship did not disappear entirely, and opposition to behaviouralism remained strong, especially in Europe.

Over time, tolerance and mutual respect between advocates of traditional and scientific approaches grew. Scholars recognized the value of both perspectives and began to incorporate elements of each into their research. While behaviouralism brought rigor and precision to the study of global politics, traditionalism reminded scholars of the importance of context, complexity and subjective factors in understanding political phenomena. Ultimately, the debate between traditionalism and scientific approaches continues to shape the field of political science, with scholars drawing on both traditions to enrich their understanding of global politics.

1.4.3 Inter-paradigm Debate

The inter-paradigm debate, also known as the third debate, represents a pivotal discourse within the field of international relations (IR) that emerged in the late 1960s and continued through the 1970s. This debate marked a significant departure from earlier discussions in the discipline and fundamentally transformed how scholars



NOTES

conceptualize and analyze international relations. In this detailed exploration, we will delve into the origins, key themes, participants and implications of the inter-paradigm debate in IR.

- **Origins and Context:** The inter-paradigm debate arose against the backdrop of shifting global dynamics and scholarly critiques of the dominant realist paradigm in IR. The post-World War II era witnessed the consolidation of realism as the dominant theoretical framework, characterized by its state-centric view, emphasis on power politics and focus on interstate relations. However, by the 1960s, scholars began to challenge the adequacy of realism in explaining the complexities of the international system.
- **Key Themes and Critiques:** Central to the inter-paradigm debate were critiques of the realist paradigm for its limitations and blind spots. Scholars argued that realism's exclusive focus on states neglected the growing importance of non-state actors and transnational processes in shaping international relations. Additionally, realism's emphasis on power politics and security dynamics overlooked other dimensions of international interactions, such as economic interdependence, cultural exchange and global governance. The challengers in the inter-paradigm debate presented alternative conceptualizations of the international system that emphasized factors such as regional integration, transnationalism, interdependence and the role of non-state actors. These alternative perspectives sought to provide a more nuanced understanding of international relations that accounted for the diverse array of actors and processes operating beyond the traditional state-centric framework.
- **Participants and Perspectives:** The inter-paradigm debate involved a range of theoretical perspectives and schools of thought, challenging the monopoly of realism in IR scholarship. While realism remained influential, particularly among policymakers and practitioners, alternative paradigms gained prominence and recognition within the discipline. One significant challenger to realism was liberalism, which encompassed various strands such as pluralism, interdependence theory, and world society theory. Liberal perspectives offered critiques of realism's state-centric bias and advocated for a more inclusive

**NOTES**

approach that considered the role of international institutions, norms and transnational networks in shaping global affairs. Another key participant in the inter-paradigm debate was Marxism, which provided a radical critique of the capitalist world order and offered alternative perspectives on imperialism, global capitalism and class struggle. While Marxism was not as well-established within IR as realism or liberalism, it contributed to the diversification of theoretical approaches and challenged mainstream assumptions about international relations.

- **Implications and Legacy:** The inter-paradigm debate had far-reaching implications for the study and practice of international relations. It marked a shift towards pluralism and the recognition of multiple competing perspectives within the discipline. Rather than seeking a definitive resolution or consensus, the debate highlighted the value of diversity in theoretical approaches and the limitations of any single paradigm to fully capture the complexity of international relations. Moreover, the inter-paradigm debate stimulated critical reflection and self-awareness within the discipline, prompting scholars to question foundational assumptions and engage in interdisciplinary dialogue. It fostered greater openness to alternative viewpoints and methodologies, leading to a more dynamic and interdisciplinary approach to studying international relations (Waever 1996).

Conclusion

This lesson highlights the dynamic evolution of the field of international relations (IR) and its complex relationship with history. It emphasizes how the study of IR has evolved from its origins in the aftermath of World War I to encompass a diverse array of theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches. Despite the emergence of new paradigms and debates, the lesson underscores the enduring relevance of historical inquiry in understanding contemporary international affairs. Through the exploration of key debates, such as realism versus idealism, traditionalism versus behaviouralism and the inter-paradigm debate, the lesson illustrates the multifaceted nature of IR scholarship. It highlights how scholars have grappled with fundamental questions about power, governance and conflict resolution, while also navigating broader shifts in global politics and academia. Furthermore, the lesson underscores the interconnectedness of past



NOTES

and present in shaping our understanding of international relations. It acknowledges the contributions of historical analysis in providing valuable insights into the complexities of global interactions, from diplomatic negotiations to structural changes in the international system.

In-Text Questions

Multiple Choice Questions (1-5)

1. Which event is often considered a key moment in the development of the modern international system?
A) Treaty of Versailles B) Peace Treaty of Westphalia
C) World War II D) Cold War
2. Which theory in IR emphasizes power politics and national interest?
A) Idealism B) Realism
C) Constructivism D) Liberalism
3. Who is known for the neorealist theory of international relations?
A) Hans Morgenthau B) Thomas Hobbes
C) Kenneth Waltz D) E.H. Carr
4. Who is considered a prominent figure in the field of international relations theory, particularly known for the concept of “Politics Among Nations”?
A) Kenneth Waltz B) Thomas Hobbes
C) Hans Morgenthau D) John Locke
5. The concept of the “Great Divide” in international relations refers to:
A) The separation of domestic politics from international relations
B) The division between realists and liberals
C) The differentiation between state and non-state actors
D) The contrast between developed and developing countries



NOTES

Fill in the Blanks Questions (6-9)

6. The Peace Treaty of _____ in 1648 is a key moment in the development of the modern international system.
7. _____ is the study of interactions between countries, focusing on politics, economics, security, and more.
8. The concept of _____ in IR refers to the absence of a central authority governing state interactions.
9. The principle of _____, recognized by the Treaty of Westphalia, established the concept of non-interference in the domestic affairs of nation-states.

1.5 SUMMARY

- International Relations (IR) is about how countries interact with each other on the subjects involving politics, economics, conflict, and security etc.
- Hans Morgenthau is a prominent figure in the field of international relations theory. In his seminal work ‘Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace’ (1948), Morgenthau defines international relations as “the struggle for power among states in the international system.”
- Thomas Hobbes is known for his work “Leviathan,” where he described the state of nature as a war of all against all.
- The concept of a “Great Divide” separates domestic politics, governed by central authority, from international relations, where no single authority exists, influencing how countries prioritize security over justice.
- Anarchy, meaning the absence of central rule, is fundamental in understanding international relations.



NOTES

- Understanding international relations involves grasping key concepts like actors (individual leaders, states, and non-state entities) and levels of analysis (individual, state, and international).
- Influential figures such as Sir Norman Angell and Woodrow Wilson advocated for a new diplomatic and legal order built on principles of collective security and open diplomacy, challenging traditional notions of power politics.
- The evolution of the discipline saw subsequent debates, including methodological quarrels between behaviouralism and traditionalism in the 1960s and 1970s, and later, the ‘third great debate’ between positivism and post-positivism.
- Issues like global economic institutions, humanitarianism, and the environment have become central to the study of IR, reflecting the interconnectedness of contemporary global politics.
- The division of knowledge into disciplines within universities aids in organizing and facilitating learning.
- It’s important to note that the term “discipline” also implies bringing under control or maintaining order, which is achieved by focusing on specific subjects and avoiding distractions.
- Institutionalization played a pivotal role in the development of IR, with universities worldwide creating departments, schools, or centers dedicated to its study.
- The University of Wales established the first IR department in 1919, followed by institutions like the London School of Economics and Georgetown University.
- Influential thinkers from ancient times to the modern era, such as Thucydides, Machiavelli and Grotius, laid the groundwork for understanding international relations.
- Realism, emphasizing power politics and an anarchic international system, contrasts with liberalism’s optimism about progress through international cooperation and institutions.
- International Relations (IR) is a field of study that examines the interactions between states and other actors in the global arena.



NOTES

- The Peace Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 is often cited as a crucial moment in the development of IR. This treaty recognized the sovereignty of nation-states and established the principle of non-interference in each other's domestic affairs.
- The interwar period saw the establishment of international legal organizations like the League of Nations, reflecting a growing interest in collective security and conflict resolution.
- Scholars like Hans Morgenthau introduced Realism as a theory that emphasized power politics and national interest as the driving forces behind state behaviour.
- The 1970s witnessed the rise of Neo-Realism, spearheaded by Kenneth Waltz, who sought to provide a more systematic and scientific framework for understanding international politics.
- Globalization, technological advancements and the emergence of new security threats reshaped the international landscape, prompting scholars to reevaluate existing theories and adapt to changing realities.
- At the state level, researchers look at governments, decision-making groups and agencies that shape the foreign policies of countries and other groups. They also study the societies these groups represent.
- Liberalism started during the Enlightenment, when people believed science and reason could make life better. It got a boost after the American and French revolutions and during industrialization.
- Realists view states as the primary actors in global politics and believe that internal factors like the type of government have little impact on foreign policy.
- Noninterventionist liberals believe that by setting an example of liberal values, like freedom and democracy, other countries will naturally adopt them. Interventionist liberals, however, believe in actively spreading liberal values, sometimes through force if necessary, to promote human rights and end atrocities.
- Traditionalists integrated empirical evidence with normative claims, believing that understanding the “facts” of global politics required considering moral and ethical dimensions. In contrast, behaviouralists insisted on a strict separation between empirical observations and normative judgments, asserting that mixing the two could lead to confusion and bias in analysis.



NOTES

- The inter-paradigm debate, also known as the third debate, represents a pivotal discourse within the field of international relations (IR) that emerged in the late 1960s and continued through the 1970s.
- One significant challenger to realism was liberalism, which encompassed various strands such as pluralism, interdependence theory, and world society theory.

1.6 GLOSSARY

- **International Relations (IR):** It is the study of interactions between countries, focusing on politics, economics, security, and more.
- **Realism:** It is a theory in IR emphasizing power politics and national interest as central to understanding state behaviour.
- **Idealism:** It is a theory advocating for international cooperation and moral considerations in global politics.
- **Levels of Analysis:** These are frameworks used to study IR, including individual, state, and global levels.
- **Anarchy:** In IR, it is the concept that there is no overarching authority governing state interactions.
- **Liberalism:** It is a theory in IR that emphasizes the role of international institutions, cooperation, and rule of law in achieving global peace and security.
- **Constructivism:** It is an IR theory focusing on the social construction of international relations, emphasizing the impact of ideas, beliefs, and identities.
- **Sovereignty:** The principle that states have supreme authority within their territorial boundaries and are equal in international law.
- **Balance of Power:** A concept in IR where national security is maintained through an equilibrium of power among rival states or alliances.
- **Diplomacy:** The practice of managing international relations through dialogue, negotiation, and other peaceful means.



NOTES

- **International Law:** A set of rules and principles that govern the behaviour of states and other international actors in their relations with one another.
- **Nation-State:** A political entity characterized by a defined territory, stable population, government, and recognition by other states.
- **Globalization:** The process of increasing interconnectedness and interdependence among countries, often driven by trade, technology, and communication.
- **Cold War:** A period of geopolitical tension between the United States and the Soviet Union, characterized by ideological conflict and a nuclear arms race.
- **Collective Security:** A system in which states agree to respond collectively to threats against peace and security, often through international organizations like the United Nations.
- **Imperialism:** The policy of extending a country's power and influence through colonization, use of military force, or other means.

1.7 ANSWERS TO IN-TEXT QUESTIONS

1. B: Peace Treaty of Westphalia
2. B: Realism
3. C: Kenneth Waltz
4. C: Hans Morgenthau
5. A: The separation of domestic politics from international relations
6. Westphalia
7. International Relations
8. Anarchy
9. Sovereignty



NOTES

1.8 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Compare and contrast the perspectives of realism and idealism in international relations theory.
2. Evaluate the significance of the inter-paradigm debate in international relations, and its implications for the field.
3. How do traditionalists and behaviouralists differ in their approaches to studying global politics, and what are the strengths and weaknesses of each approach?
4. Explain the ‘Levels of Analysis’ framework in IR. How do individual, state, and global levels help in understanding international issues? Provide examples for each level.
5. Discuss the historical development of International Relations (IR) as a discipline. How did it emerge, and what key events and debates shaped its evolution?

1.9 REFERENCES/SUGGESTED READINGS

- Devetak, R., Burke, A., & George, J. *An Introduction to International Relations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007, Introduction, pp. 1-18.
- Grieco, J., Ikenberry, J., & Mastanduno, M. *Introduction to International Relations: Enduring Questions and Contemporary Perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2014, Chapter one, pp. 2-30.
- Mansbach, R. W., & Taylor, K. L. *Introduction to Global Politics*. Routledge, New York, 2008, Chapter two, pp. 1-32.
- Mearsheimer, J. “E.H. Carr vs Idealism: The Battle Rages On”, *International Relations*, 19(2), 2005, pp. 139-153.



NOTES

- Mingst, A. K., & Snyder, J. L. *Woodrow Wilson: The Fourteen Points*, in *Essential Readings in World Politics* (6th ed.). W.W. Norton and Company, US, 2017, pp. 32-34.
- Reus-Smit, C. *A Very Short Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford University Press, 2020, Chapter one, pp. 7-27.
- Dunne, T., Kurki, M., & Smith, S. (Eds.). *International Relations Theories, Discipline and Diversity* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press, UK, 2013, Chapter one, pp. 1-13.
- Waever, O. The rise and fall of the inter-paradigm debate. In S. Smith, K. Booth, & M. Zalewski (Eds.), *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996, pp. 149-185.
- Weber, C. *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge, London, 2005, Chapter one, pp. 1-12.

Unit II: Theories of International Relations

Lesson 2: Realpolitik/Realism/Neo-Realism, Liberalism/Neo-Liberalism, Marxism/Neo-Marxism, and Feminism



NOTES

LESSON 2

REALPOLITIK/REALISM/NEO-REALISM, LIBERALISM/NEO-LIBERALISM, MARXISM/ NEO-MARXISM, AND FEMINISM

Shaitan Singh

Assistant Professor
School of Open Learning
University of Delhi, Delhi

STRUCTURE

- 2.1 Learning Objectives
- 2.2 Introduction
- 2.3 Theories of International Relations
- 2.4 Understanding Realism
 - 2.4.1 Realpolitik and Kautilya
 - 2.4.2 Classical Realism
 - 2.4.3 Neo Realism (Structural Realism)
- 2.5 Understanding Liberalism
 - 2.5.1 Basic Assumptions of Liberalism
 - 2.5.2 Classical Liberalism
 - 2.5.3 Neo-Liberalism
- 2.6 Understanding Marxism
 - 2.6.1 Classical Marxism
 - 2.6.2 Neo-Marxism
 - 2.6.3 The World System and Marxism
- 2.7 Understanding Feminism
 - 2.7.1 Feminism and International Relations
 - 2.7.2 Criticism
- 2.8 Summary
- 2.9 Glossary
- 2.10 Answers to In-Text Questions
- 2.11 Self-Assessment Questions
- 2.12 References/Suggested Readings



NOTES

2.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to:

- Understand the principles of Realism and its application in international politics.
- Analyze the evolution of Liberalism and its implications for global governance.
- Explore the intersection of Marxism with International Relations theory.
- Examine the gendered dimensions of International Relations through Feminist perspectives.
- Compare and contrast diverse theoretical frameworks in International Relations for comprehensive analysis.

2.2 INTRODUCTION

In the ever-evolving landscape of International Relations (IR), theories serve as indispensable tools for interpreting the complexities of global dynamics. While the realm of theory may initially appear daunting or detached from real-world politics, its significance becomes evident as one delves deeper into the discourse. Theoretical frameworks not only shape our understanding of international affairs but also provide crucial perspectives for discerning the implications of diplomatic and military actions on a global scale. This lesson embarks on a journey through some of the foundational theories in International Relations, beginning with Realism, a paradigm that has left an indelible mark on both academic scholarship and practical policymaking. From the classical insights of thinkers like Hans J. Morgenthau to the structural analyses of Kenneth Waltz, Realism offers a lens to comprehend the relentless pursuit of power and the competitive nature of state interactions. However, the narrative of International Relations is not confined to the realist paradigm alone. Liberalism emerges as a contrasting perspective, emphasizing cooperation, self-restraint, and the potential for progress in a world fraught with power struggles and conflicts. From the intellectual



NOTES

roots of classical liberalism to the nuanced insights of neo-liberalism, this lesson explores the optimism inherent in liberal thought and its implications for global governance.

Beyond the traditional dichotomy of Realism and Liberalism, this lesson delves into alternative perspectives that challenge conventional wisdom. Marxism, with its emphasis on class struggle and economic determinism, offers a holistic framework for analyzing the interconnectedness of social, economic and political factors in global dynamics. Likewise, World System Theory and Feminist International Relations introduce critical perspectives that illuminate the systemic inequalities and power dynamics inherent in international politics. As we navigate through these diverse theoretical landscapes, it becomes apparent that theories of International Relations are not static doctrines but dynamic frameworks that evolve in response to historical events, changing power structures and emerging challenges. By engaging with these theories, we equip ourselves with the analytical tools necessary to navigate the complexities of the global arena and make informed judgments in an ever-changing world.

2.3 THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In the realm of International Relations (IR), the significance of theory often sparks apprehension among students. Some view it as daunting, others as irrelevant to the complexities of real-world politics. However, as the discourse evolves, it becomes evident that theorizing is an indispensable tool for interpreting and contextualizing global events. Theory, whether explicit or implicit, shapes our understanding of international affairs, imbuing them with meaning and perspective. Observing the intricacies of international relations necessitates theoretical frameworks. When faced with events like the advocacy for war in Iraq and Afghanistan by prominent leaders, such actions elicit varied interpretations. Are they prudent measures for global security or catalysts for further conflict and instability? Such questions underscore the nuanced nature of foreign policy decisions, emphasizing the importance of theoretical lenses in discerning their implications. Amidst the complexities, making informed judgments is imperative for members of the international community. However, it's crucial to acknowledge that



NOTES

these judgments aren't grounded in absolute truths but are informed by theoretical constructs. Our understanding of global affairs is inherently shaped by the theoretical paradigms we espouse, underscoring the dynamic interplay between theory and practice. As students of international relations, it's incumbent upon us to navigate the strengths and limitations of theoretical perspectives. Recognizing the fluidity of knowledge in a rapidly changing world, we must critically engage with diverse theoretical frameworks. This engagement extends beyond traditional paradigms of 'man, the state, and war,' encompassing contemporary issues such as globalization, terrorism and environmental sustainability.

Delving into the evolution of IR theory unveils enduring debates surrounding ontology, epistemology and the quest for a scientific understanding of international relations. Ontology delves into the fundamental elements of the world, while epistemology explores how we acquire knowledge about these elements. The search for a scientific basis in IR, exemplified by debates between positivists and anti-positivists, reflects the enduring quest for objective understanding amid the complexities of global politics. However, the pursuit of scientific objectivity is fraught with challenges, particularly in light of the paradigm shifts from Newtonian physics to quantum mechanics. The recognition of unobservable phenomena underscores the inherent limitations of positivist approaches in capturing the multifaceted realities of international relations. While acknowledging the existence of objective truths, it's imperative to recognize the interpretive dimensions inherent in scientific inquiry. Mainstream IR theory, characterized by the dominance of realism and liberalism, has historically shaped scholarly discourse. Realism, epitomized by Morgenthau's emphasis on power politics, offers insights into the anarchical nature of the international system. Conversely, liberalism highlights the potential for cooperation and institutionalism in mitigating conflicts. However, the Cold War era witnessed a narrowing of perspectives, with US-centric narratives overshadowing alternative viewpoints.

Critiques of mainstream theories have proliferated in response to their perceived inadequacies in addressing contemporary challenges. The emergence of neorealism and neoliberalism, while offering systemic explanations, has faced scrutiny for their narrow ontological assumptions and epistemological orientations. The quest for critical diversity in IR theory underscores the need to transcend conventional paradigms and embrace pluralistic perspectives.



2.4 UNDERSTANDING REALISM

Realism is a theory that greatly influences both the practice of world politics and the academic study of International Relations (IR). It asserts that states' diplomatic and military actions historically align with principles later identified as realism. Realism posits that human behaviour, driven by motives like fear, honour, and profit, demonstrates the universal pursuit of power, which is essential for political communities' survival and perpetuation. Realism emerged prominently after World War II, critiquing the idealistic approach of the interwar period. Idealism, according to realists, neglected power dynamics, overestimated shared interests among nations, and was overly optimistic about peaceful dispute resolutions. The outbreak of World War II confirmed realism's critique of idealism.

Realism emphasizes power politics and the competitive nature of international relations among nations. It views power as a timeless and central aspect of international politics, advocating for a focus on national interests over abstract universal values. Realism gained traction during rising tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States post-World War II, as it offered a pragmatic approach to policymaking, emphasizing state survival in a hostile environment. Key figures associated with realism include Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Rousseau, who recognized the continuous struggle for power in international politics. They argued that states, driven by self-interest and survival instincts, engage in power-seeking behaviour to ensure their security. Realists are skeptical of universal moral principles, advocating for a dual moral standard where states prioritize self-interest over traditional morality in their external relations.

Realism identifies the state as the fundamental actor in international politics, emphasizing its pursuit of power and self-preservation. It views the international system as anarchic, lacking a central authority to mediate conflicts among sovereign states. Realists believe that human nature, combined with the anarchic structure of international politics, leads to a state of perpetual competition and conflict among states (Baylis and Smith 2001).



NOTES

2.4.1 Realpolitik and Kautilya

Kautilya, an ancient Indian scholar and statesman, laid the foundation for the concept of Realpolitik and realism through his seminal work, the Arthashastra, written in 300 BCE. In this text, Kautilya emphasized power as the central element in statecraft, significantly shaping the theoretical framework of international relations. While Western perspectives often dominate the discourse on international politics, Kautilya's indigenous Indian thinking provides a holistic and principled approach to power dynamics and security, distinct from western theories such as those of Machiavelli and Hobbes. Kautilya's Realpolitik, as depicted in the Arthashastra, acknowledges the importance of power in international relations but does not divorce it from morality. Unlike western realists who often portray power as devoid of ethical considerations, Kautilya perceives power as a means for peace, stability and the common good. He advocates for a pragmatic approach to statecraft, where power is wielded with restraint and legitimacy, focusing on internal regulation, good governance, and moral conduct. In contrast to Western realists who prioritize external security and military prowess, Kautilya emphasizes the significance of internal stability and economic prosperity in ensuring state security. He underscores the role of good governance, wherein the king's primary duty is to protect and promote the welfare of his subjects. Kautilya's concept of dharma, or righteous conduct, extends beyond mere normative principles to encompass practical statecraft aimed at maximizing the happiness and prosperity of the people.

Kautilya's realism, while sharing similarities with Western counterparts, also exhibits unique characteristics. He recognizes the constructed nature of international anarchy, wherein states play a crucial role in shaping their own security environment through identity construction and strategic interactions. Kautilya's emphasis on economic cooperation, diplomacy and alliances reflects a nuanced understanding of power dynamics, combining elements of both realism and constructivism. The Arthashastra provides a comprehensive framework for understanding national power, security and strategy, encompassing military, political and economic dimensions. Kautilya's categorization of wars into open, concealed, and silent warfare illustrates his strategic acumen and the importance of flexibility in statecraft. He advocates for diplomacy as a subtle form of warfare, employing secrecy, espionage, and alliances to achieve national objectives (Nirmal Jindal 2020).



NOTES

In Kautilya's vision, a strong state is not only defined by its military might but also by its ability to govern effectively, foster internal stability and cultivate alliances. He recognizes the instrumental role of diplomacy in advancing state interests and navigating complex international dynamics. Kautilya's approach to statecraft, grounded in pragmatism, morality and strategic calculation, continues to offer valuable insights for contemporary international politics, particularly in addressing the challenges faced by countries of the Global South (Jindal, 2020).

2.4.2 Classical Realism

Classical realism, particularly in the context of twentieth-century scholarship, emerges as a response to the tumultuous political landscape shaped by World War II and its aftermath. Scholars like Hans J. Morgenthau played a pivotal role in defining and refining the principles of realism, especially within the American academic sphere. This period saw a convergence of thinkers who were influenced by historical events and philosophical underpinnings, sought to articulate a worldview rooted in an understanding of power dynamics and state behaviour. At its core, classical realism, as elucidated by Morgenthau and his contemporaries, posits that international politics is fundamentally a struggle for power. Morgenthau, drawing upon insights from human nature, asserts that the pursuit of power is innate to individuals and by extension, to states. This pursuit manifests in various forms: maintaining power (status quo), expanding power (imperialism) and showcasing power (prestige). In this framework, the concept of interest is intricately linked with power, with the primary interest of any state being the preservation of its own existence. Central to the realist perspective is the notion of the national interest, which encompasses not only survival but also strategic pursuits aligned with a state's power capabilities. Contrary to misconceptions, Morgenthau argues that the national interest is not divorced from morality; rather, it encompasses a moral dimension that can only be realized through the exercise of power. However, he cautions against the application of universal moral principles in statecraft, emphasizing instead the pragmatic alignment of national interests with the realities of power dynamics.

Realists emphasize the importance of a balance of power to safeguard the autonomy and sovereignty of states. This equilibrium mechanism, exemplified by alliances such as NATO and the Warsaw Pact during the Cold War, aims to prevent the



NOTES

dominance of any single state or coalition. Drawing from historical precedents, realists assert that in the absence of a global authority, states are compelled to prioritize self-preservation and navigate the anarchical nature of international relations. The intellectual lineage of classical realism traces back to ancient and early modern thinkers such as Thucydides and Machiavelli. Thucydides, through his analysis of the Peloponnesian War, underscored the role of power dynamics and conflict in shaping international relations. Similarly, Machiavelli's pragmatic approach to statecraft, as articulated in "The Prince," challenged idealistic notions of politics and highlighted the centrality of power and necessity. Machiavelli's insights into the autonomy of politics and the amorality of power resonate with later realist theorists like Morgenthau. Building upon Machiavelli's foundation, Morgenthau emphasizes the empirical study of history and the recognition of power as a driving force in international affairs. This pragmatic approach to politics, rooted in an understanding of human nature and historical realities, forms the bedrock of classical realism. Furthermore, classical realists draw from philosophical concepts such as the state of nature, as expounded by Hobbes, to explain the anarchical nature of international relations. According to this view, the absence of a global authority results in a perpetual state of war or the constant threat thereof. States, therefore, are compelled to prioritize self-interest and security in the absence of overarching governance structures.

2.4.3 Neo Realism (Structural Realism)

Neo-realism, also known as structural realism, emerged as a dominant theory in international politics following the publication of Kenneth Waltz's "Theory of International Politics" in 1979. Positioned against the backdrop of the Cold War, Waltz's work presented a compelling argument attributing the dynamics of international relations not to human nature but to the structure of the international system itself. At its core, neo-realism posits that the structure of the international system, characterized by the absence of a centralized authority above sovereign states, fundamentally shapes the behaviour of states. This structure is defined by three key elements: organizing principles, differentiation of units, and the distribution of capabilities. Waltz delineates between two organizing principles: anarchy, which characterizes the decentralized nature of international politics, and hierarchy, which underpins domestic order within states.



NOTES

In the realm of international politics, sovereign states are considered functionally similar units, rendering unit-level variations such as regime type inconsequential. Instead, neo-realists argue that the distribution of capabilities among states is paramount in understanding outcomes such as war, peace, alliance formation and the balance of power.

According to neo-realists, the relative distribution of power in the international system serves as the primary determinant of state behaviour. States, especially great powers, are perpetually concerned about the capabilities of other states, as the potential use of force by any state threatens the security of all. While states may pursue power as a means to security, Waltz emphasizes that their ultimate concern is for security rather than power maximization. This distinction is crucial, as it highlights the nuanced understanding of state behaviour within the neo-realist framework. John Mearsheimer's theory of offensive realism presents a variant of structural realism that diverges from Waltz's perspective in certain aspects. While sharing fundamental assumptions with neo-realism, Mearsheimer contends that states are inherently driven to maximize power in the anarchic international system. Unlike Waltz, who emphasizes security as the ultimate goal, Mearsheimer argues that states are continually vying for hegemony, viewing power acquisition as essential for survival.

The systemic analysis of structure in neo-realism focuses on three key elements: differentiation of units, organizing principles, and the distribution of capabilities. States are viewed as undifferentiated in their pursuit of security, necessitated by the anarchic nature of the international system. Anarchy breeds mistrust and uncertainty, hindering cooperation even in areas such as economics and trade. States, akin to oligopolistic firms, prioritize relative gains over absolute gains, wary of becoming dependent on others in a system where self-help is imperative. The distribution of capabilities, particularly in the military realm, is deemed the fundamental changing element in the international system, leading to configurations ranging from bipolarity to multipolarity. The balance of power, an automatic mechanism in Waltz's view, serves to counteract excessive accumulation of power and maintain equilibrium in the international system. Great powers tend to adopt defensive behaviours to uphold the status quo in response to the constraints imposed by the balance of power. However, critiques of neo-realism, particularly from neoclassical realists, challenge its assumptions regarding state



NOTES

behaviour. Some scholars argue for the relevance of domestic politics and human nature factors in shaping state interests, while others contest the automaticity attributed to processes such as the balance of power. This ongoing debate underscores the dynamic nature of realist thought and its continuous evolution in response to changing international dynamics.

2.5 UNDERSTANDING LIBERALISM

Liberalism, as a model of government, has proven remarkably successful across the globe, with many liberal democracies existing worldwide, more than any other regime-type. While liberal democracies are predominantly found in Europe and the Americas, their influence is increasingly spreading to parts of Africa and Asia. However, despite the prevalence of liberal values and institutions within national governance structures, they have encountered resistance in the realm of global governance. Harvard scholar Stanley Hoffmann once famously remarked that “*international affairs have been the nemesis of Liberalism*,” attributing this to the contrasting nature of liberal principles and the realities of international politics. Liberalism, at its core, emphasizes self-restraint, moderation, compromise and peace, qualities that are often at odds with the power dynamics and conflicts inherent in international relations, as realists argue. Realists contend that progress, law and justice can only exist where there is a common power to enforce them. However, proponents of liberal internationalism reject this defeatist perspective, asserting that power politics itself is shaped by ideas and that ideas are subject to change. They argue that although international affairs have historically been inhospitable to liberal notions of progressive change, it is possible to reshape the international system in accordance with liberal values. Throughout history, thinkers from the Enlightenment onwards, such as Immanuel Kant, J.S. Mill and Jeremy Bentham, have advocated for liberal internationalism, envisioning governments that are just in their dealings with their citizens and lawful in their interactions with other states. These thinkers laid the foundation for later liberals to embed these concepts into international practice, albeit with setbacks along the way. For instance, Bentham’s introduction of



NOTES

the term “international” in 1780 signalled a shift in understanding relations between sovereigns, away from the previously used term “the law of nations.”

The evolution of liberal internationalism has seen distinct waves of thought. The first wave, often associated with the aftermath of World War I, led to the establishment of institutions like the League of Nations, aimed at preventing conflicts between nations. The idealist fervour of this period emphasized peace through law and marked a significant moment in the promotion of liberal values on the global stage. The second wave occurred in the post-World War II era, characterized by the emergence of the United States as a global leader and the establishment of a liberal international order underpinned by institutions like the United Nations and the Bretton Woods system. However, contemporary challenges, such as America’s relative decline and the rise of other powers like China, have raised questions about the future of liberal internationalism. In the current era, marked by geopolitical shifts and increasing multipolarity, there is a sense of crisis within liberal internationalism. Scholars like G. John Ikenberry question whether other states are capable of assuming leadership roles in maintaining world order. Despite these challenges, the belief persists that liberal internationalism embodies universal values that can bridge diverse societies and mediate between different value systems.

Liberalism, often associated with the political philosophy of the modern West, is characterized by principles such as freedom, human rights, reason, progress and toleration. These ideals, along with constitutionalism and democracy are deeply ingrained in Western political culture. However, the reception of liberal theories in international relations was initially dismissive, particularly during periods of global conflict like the World Wars and the Cold War. Since the end of the Cold War, the global landscape has undergone significant changes, with liberal internationalism gaining renewed relevance. Democratization, institutionalization and economic interdependence are seen as forces driving this transformation. Yet, there are also challenges to liberalism’s universal claims in a world characterized by cultural diversity and extreme inequalities. The historical roots of liberalism trace back to seventeenth-century England, where it emerged as a response to monarchical absolutism. John Locke’s writings laid the groundwork for liberal ideology, emphasizing individual rights, limited government, and religious toleration. Liberalism further developed during the Enlightenment, with



NOTES

thinkers like Adam Smith advocating for free trade and Immanuel Kant envisioning a world of perpetual peace through republican governance (Jackson and Sørensen 2019).

Early liberal thought, however, was not inherently democratic, with concepts of consent often limited to property-holders. It wasn't until the nineteenth century that liberal democracy began to take shape, albeit initially excluding marginalized groups like women. Liberalism has always been a diverse creed, accommodating various philosophical perspectives and intellectual styles. From utilitarianism to German idealism, liberalism has evolved over time, grappling with ethical dilemmas and adapting to changing societal norms. While Enlightenment thinkers exuded confidence in reason, later theorists like John Stuart Mill introduced a more reflective and critical approach, particularly in Europe.

2.5.1 Basic Assumptions of Liberalism

In short, understanding the liberal tradition helps you to form your own opinion on a major debate in IR: the contrast between the pessimistic realism and the optimistic liberalism. While the previous lesson discussed realism, which emphasizes power and conflict, this one delves into liberalism's different perspective. But why are liberals optimistic? What makes them believe in a more peaceful world ahead? Let's explore. The liberal tradition in IR is closely tied to the rise of modern liberal states. Thinkers like John Locke, dating back to the 17th century, saw huge potential for progress in societies that embraced individual freedoms within a framework of governance. They believed that modernity offered a path to a better life, one free from oppressive rulers and with higher material well-being.

This optimism stems from the belief in progress. Liberals trust in human reason and rationality. While they acknowledge people's self-interest and competitiveness, they also see common interests that enable collaboration and cooperation, both domestically and internationally. Liberals argue that conflict and war aren't inevitable; through rationality, people can achieve mutually beneficial cooperation, fostering peace. However, liberals differ in their views on the challenges to progress. Some see it as a long-term process with setbacks, while others believe success is imminent. Nevertheless, they all agree that cooperation based on mutual interests will ultimately prevail, especially as modernization increases the need for collaboration.



NOTES

The idea of progress is central to liberalism but is also a topic of debate. How much progress? Scientific and technological, yes, but also social and political? And who benefits from this progress? These questions have sparked varying degrees of optimism among liberals over time. For liberals, progress is about improving the lives of individuals. The core concern is the happiness and contentment of people. Unlike realists, who see states primarily as wielders of power, liberals view states as entities that uphold the rule of law and protect citizens' rights. They argue that constitutional states, respecting each other's sovereignty and governed by mutual toleration, can establish peace. Thinkers like Jeremy Bentham and Immanuel Kant expanded on these ideas, advocating for international law and envisioning a world of peaceful republics.

1. **Human Nature:** Liberalism's perspective on human nature is optimistic, viewing individuals as inherently capable of goodness and capable of change. Unlike more pessimistic views, liberals believe that humans are not inherently bad or self-interested. Instead, they emphasize the potential for cooperation and progress among people, highlighting their capacity to work together towards common goals.
2. **Individualism:** At the core of liberalism is the idea of individualism, which stresses the importance of individual freedom and self-interest. Liberals argue that when individuals are allowed to pursue their own interests within a framework of liberty, property rights and free markets, it not only benefits them but also contributes to the overall well-being of society.
3. **Liberty:** Individual freedom is paramount in liberalism. Liberals argue that people can only achieve their full potential when they are free to make choices without excessive government interference. This includes the freedom to own property, sell labour and engage in economic activities without undue constraints from the state.
4. **Property Rights:** Liberalism strongly supports the protection of property rights and the promotion of free markets. Liberals believe that private ownership and free exchange stimulate productivity and economic growth. They advocate for limited government intervention in private affairs, arguing that excessive regulation can stifle innovation and entrepreneurship.



NOTES

5. **Rule of Law:** Central to liberalism is the rule of law, which ensures equality before the law, protects contracts, and fosters fair competition. A robust legal system is seen as essential for maintaining political stability and economic prosperity by providing a level playing field for individuals and businesses alike.
6. **Rationalism:** Liberalism values rational decision-making and cooperation based on the principle of utility. Individuals are seen as rational actors who weigh the costs and benefits of their actions before making choices. Cooperation among individuals is encouraged when it leads to mutually beneficial outcomes, reflecting the belief in the inherent rationality of human behaviour.
7. **Free Market and Free Trade:** Liberals argue that freedom flourishes in a market free from excessive government intervention. They believe that state regulation limits individual choices and hampers economic liberty. While some modern liberals acknowledge the need for limited state involvement to ensure equality and justice, they generally advocate for minimal government interference in economic affairs.
8. **Cooperation:** Liberals are optimistic about human nature and believe in the potential for cooperation among individuals. They argue that institutions can facilitate cooperation and promote common goals. Additionally, liberals recognize the increasing influence of non-state actors, such as multinational corporations and international organizations, in shaping global affairs alongside traditional state actors.
9. **Domestic and International Politics:** Liberalism acknowledges the interconnectedness of domestic and international politics in an era of globalization. It emphasizes the importance of interdependence, multiculturalism and international cooperation, blurring the boundaries between national and global issues. Liberals argue that addressing global challenges requires collaboration among nations and a recognition of shared interests and responsibilities (Jackson et al, 2019).



NOTES

2.5.2 Classical Liberalism

Classic liberalism, often termed as the ideological foundation of the pre-World War II era, revolves around the primacy of human reason and individual agency in shaping societal and political structures. At its core, classical liberalism posits that individuals are rational beings capable of discerning their own interests and making informed decisions. This rationality not only underpins personal autonomy but also fosters cooperation, both domestically and internationally, particularly in areas of shared interest.

The intellectual roots of classical liberalism trace back to seminal thinkers such as Adam Smith, John Locke and Jeremy Bentham. John Locke, widely regarded as the progenitor of classical liberalism, advocated for a social contract theory wherein governance should derive from the consent of the governed. He argued for a limited government whose primary function is to safeguard the natural rights and liberties of its citizens.

Adam Smith, in his magnum opus “The Wealth of Nations” (1776), introduced the concept of the “economic man.” Smith posited that individuals, when left to pursue their self-interest within a free market framework, inadvertently contribute to the overall economic prosperity of society. This laissez-faire approach, advocating minimal governmental intervention in economic affairs, became a cornerstone of classical liberal economic thought.

Jeremy Bentham, a utilitarian philosopher, furthered the classical liberal discourse by emphasizing the pursuit of the “*greatest happiness of the greatest number*.” Bentham’s utilitarian calculus prioritized actions that maximize collective pleasure while minimizing pain. Additionally, Bentham proposed the establishment of an international judicial body and endorsed the idea of codifying laws to govern interstate relations, reflecting in modern institutions like the International Court of Justice.

During the early 20th century, classical liberal ideas held sway in both academia and policy circles, particularly in the aftermath of World War I. Liberal thinkers diagnosed the causes of conflict, attributing them to factors such as secret diplomacy, militarism and the absence of democratic governance and international institutions. Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points epitomized the liberal vision for post-war



NOTES

reconstruction, advocating for transparent diplomacy, economic cooperation, national self-determination, and the formation of international associations to ensure peace and stability.

The League of Nations, established in 1919, embodied the liberal aspiration for collective security, wherein member states pledged to defend each other's territorial integrity against aggression. However, despite liberal efforts to institutionalize peace, the interwar period witnessed continued geopolitical tensions, culminating in World War II.

In the post-World War II era, the failures of the League of Nations prompted the establishment of more robust international institutions such as the United Nations and the European Community. These organizations aimed to institutionalize liberal principles of collective security, multilateral cooperation and conflict resolution, marking a continued commitment to the classical liberal vision of global order and peace.

2.5.3 Neo-Liberalism

In the evolution of Liberalism within international relations theory, a significant shift occurred in response to the emergence and ascendancy of Neo-realism or structural realism. This shift mirrored the changes seen in Realism but offered a distinct Liberal perspective. Key figures in this transition were Robert Keohane with his seminal work "After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy" (1984) and Robert Axelrod, whose "Evolution of Cooperation" (1981) applied game theory to illuminate the dynamics of cooperation in international affairs. These works marked a departure from traditional Liberalism and laid the foundation for what became known as Neo-liberalism.

Neo-liberalism, as articulated by Keohane and Axelrod, introduced a new conceptual framework within Liberal studies. It retained some foundational elements of Neo-realism, such as acknowledging international anarchy and the rational pursuit of self-interest by states. However, Neo-liberals diverged from Neo-realists by emphasizing the potential for cooperation in anarchic systems. They questioned why, despite the absence of a central authority in the international arena, conflict was not more pervasive and cooperation could still emerge.



NOTES

One of the fundamental distinctions between Neo-liberalism and classical Liberalism lies in their respective approaches to understanding conflict and cooperation. While classical Liberalism often attributed conflict to individual actors' behaviour or failures in cooperation, Neo-liberalism introduced the idea of international institutions as critical factors in shaping state behaviour and mitigating conflict. These institutions serve various functions, including facilitating communication and negotiation between states, promoting transparency in agreements, establishing norms for stability, and providing frameworks for peaceful dispute resolution. This emphasis on institutions earned Neo-liberalism the moniker of Neo-liberal Institutionalism. Furthermore, Neo-liberalism diverges from classical Liberalism in its conceptualization of actors in global politics. While classical Liberalism tends to prioritize individual agents and their choices, Neo-liberalism aligns more closely with Neo-realism in recognizing the state as the primary actor. However, Neo-liberals expand this perspective to include international institutions and non-state actors like multinational corporations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as influential players in shaping international outcomes. Another significant departure of Neo-liberalism from classical Liberalism is its analytical approach to conflict. While classical Liberalism often adopts a historical and philosophical orientation, Neo-liberal explanations tend to focus on structural factors, drawing heavily from disciplines like game theory and behavioural economics. This shift allows Neo-liberals to analyze how the structure of the international system incentivizes or constrains state behaviour, leading to outcomes that may appear suboptimal despite rational decision-making.

2.6 UNDERSTANDING MARXISM

Karl Marx's ideas have sparked diverse interpretations and debates, reflecting the multifaceted nature of Marxism. At its core, Marxism advocates for a holistic analysis of society, emphasizing the interconnectedness of economic, social, and political factors. Marx's materialist conception of history posits that economic forces drive historical change, with class conflict serving as a fundamental driver. Class struggle, a central tenet of Marxism, highlights the inherent tensions between different socio-economic



NOTES

classes, particularly the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Marx envisioned a transformative process wherein the working class would overthrow capitalist structures, leading to the establishment of a classless society.

However, the application and interpretation of Marxist theory have varied widely. Some scholars have focused on Marx's critique of capitalism, highlighting its exploitative nature and inequalities. Others have expanded Marxist analysis to incorporate issues of gender, race and imperialism, recognizing the intersectionality of oppression. Moreover, critiques of Marxism have emerged, questioning its relevance in contemporary contexts and pointing to historical instances where Marxist revolutions resulted in authoritarian regimes. Additionally, debates persist regarding the feasibility and desirability of achieving Marx's vision of a communist society. Despite these complexities and divergent interpretations, Marxism continues to serve as a foundational framework for understanding social relations, economic systems, and struggles for social justice. Its enduring relevance lies in its capacity to inspire critical inquiry and analysis of power dynamics within society.

2.6.1 Classical Marxism

Classical Marxism, as depicted in the text, refers to the foundational theories and perspectives developed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in the 19th century. These theories provide the basis for understanding the dynamics of capitalism, historical materialism, and the transition from feudalism to capitalism. One key aspect of classical Marxism highlighted in the text is its emphasis on the centrality of class struggle in driving historical change. According to this perspective, history is propelled forward by conflicts between social classes, particularly between the bourgeoisie (capitalist class) and the proletariat (working class). The transition from feudalism to capitalism is seen as a result of this struggle, with the bourgeoisie overthrowing feudal lords to establish capitalist relations of production.

Moreover, classical Marxism posits that capitalism contains inherent contradictions that ultimately lead to its downfall. These contradictions, such as the exploitation of labour and the tendency towards overproduction and economic crises, are seen as inevitable outcomes of the capitalist mode of production. In this lesson, we will discuss how Marx and Engels argued that these contradictions would eventually



NOTES

lead to the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism by the proletariat, leading to the establishment of a classless society based on common ownership of the means of production (socialism). Furthermore, classical Marxism offers a critical analysis of capitalism, focusing on its exploitative nature and its impact on social relations, culture and ideology. Marx and Engels famously described capitalism as a system in which “*all that is solid melts into air*,” highlighting its transformative and destabilizing effects on traditional social structures.

2.6.2 Neo-Marxism

New Marxism in international relations is championed by Bill Warren and Justin Rosenberg. They believe that traditional Marxist ideas have been overlooked and misunderstood in the study of international relations. According to them, Marxism offers valuable insights into understanding global politics.

They challenge mainstream theories in international relations, which they believe dominate the field without considering Marxist perspectives.

In his book “Imperialism: Pioneer of Capitalism,” Bill Warren disagrees with Lenin’s view that imperialism is the final stage of capitalism. Instead, Warren argues that imperialism actually kick-started capitalism by helping develop industries in less developed countries. He sees capitalism as paving the way for future socialist movements by creating a working class that resists exploitation.

Justin Rosenberg, another New Marxist scholar, critiques realism in international relations in his book “*The Empire of Civil Society*. ” He points out three main issues with realism:

1. Realism separates domestic and international interactions too rigidly.
2. It lacks a historical perspective in its analysis.
3. It’s more like a manual for managing power balances than a comprehensive theory of international politics.

Rosenberg argues that anarchy in international relations is a result of capitalist social structures, not just random circumstances. He builds on Marx’s ideas to challenge traditional theories and proposes alternatives. Rosenberg also highlights that concepts



NOTES

like sovereignty and balance of power are not timeless, but emerged alongside modern states and capitalism. He believes these concepts are crucial for understanding how modern capitalist states operate and how capitalism benefits from separating public governance from private economic interests.

2.6.3 The World System and Marxism

In more recent times, a theory called World System Theory has become important. It was created by Immanuel Wallerstein in the 1970s because people were criticizing another theory called Modernization Theory, which tried to explain how countries develop. Dependency Theory, another important idea at the time, looked at how countries in Africa and Latin America were affected by more powerful ones. Wallerstein, along with other scholars like Terence Hopkins, Samir Amin, Andre Gunder Frank, and Giovanni Arrighi, argued that the world is structured in a way that allows some countries to benefit a lot while others suffer. Wallerstein said that powerful countries exploit weaker ones through things like colonization and unfair trade. He explained that capitalism became dominant in Europe and other places in the 16th century. Rich countries, called Core States, got richer by taking advantage of poorer ones, called semi-periphery and periphery states. Other thinkers like Amin and Frank talked about similar ideas, focusing on the relationships between rich and poor countries.

In this system, every group cares mainly about making money for themselves. To understand how different societies fit into this world-system, we need to look at the bigger picture.

Wallerstein describes three types of social systems:

1. **Mini system:** This is a small group of similar societies that are pretty self-sufficient. They hunt, gather food, and live simply. They don't interact much with the outside world, only when they need to.
2. **Social system:** This is bigger and acts more like a world empire. These societies get their extra stuff from outside their own area. They use a lot of this extra stuff to pay their leaders and keep control over their people.
3. **World-economies or world capitalist system:** Wallerstein talked a lot about this one. It's like what we see today, where some countries are really



NOTES

good at making money, while others struggle. He divided these countries into three groups: Core, Semi-Periphery, and Periphery.

- (i) *Core*: These are the countries that benefit the most from the world economy. Think of places like the wealthy countries in Europe. They have strong governments, high buying power, and they make money by trading with others.
- (ii) *Periphery*: These are the countries that don't have as much power. They sell their resources to the core countries but don't get as much in return. They often end up poorer because of this unequal trade.
- (iii) *Semi-Periphery*: These are in-between. They're not as powerful as the core, but they're also not as weak as the periphery. They try to improve their situation, but it's tough.

Wallerstein said the world-system keeps changing, but some things stay the same. For example, the rich countries keep getting richer at the expense of the poorer ones. This doesn't mean everyone in a rich country is rich or everyone in a poor country is poor, but it does mean that the system favours certain groups over others (Wallerstein 2000).

Antonio Gramsci, another thinker, looked at why revolutions are hard to start in some places. He talked about "hegemony," which is basically how those in power keep control. They do it through both consent (like getting people to agree with them) and coercion (using force if needed). Gramsci didn't like how globalization was happening. He thought it was just a way for rich countries to stay in charge and keep making money off poorer ones. He believed that people needed to challenge this system by creating their own ways of thinking and organizing.

2.7 UNDERSTANDING FEMINISM

Feminism is a nuanced and multifaceted movement that defies singular definition, much like other ideological frameworks such as liberalism or Marxism. At its core, feminism serves as a lens through which to examine the pervasive global subordination of women



NOTES

across various spheres, including economics, politics, physicality, and social interactions. Its primary aim is the eradication of these systems of oppression, advocating fervently for equality and justice for women of all backgrounds. Central to feminism is an interrogation of power dynamics and their far-reaching implications. It recognizes the intricate ways in which societal structures, whether political, economic, or cultural, construct and perpetuate notions of women's identities, experiences and worth. By delving into these power dynamics, feminism seeks to unveil and challenge the systemic inequalities that disadvantage women solely on the basis of their gender.

Moreover, feminism is not merely an abstract theoretical construct but a dynamic force driving both scholarly inquiry and real-world activism. It has catalyzed the development of new research methodologies and epistemologies, illuminating women's diverse experiences and roles that have often been marginalized or overlooked in traditional narratives. Through this lens, feminists have critically re-examined historical accounts, redefining traditional concepts and shedding light on women's agency and contributions, even in contexts where their power may have been obscured or underestimated. Importantly, feminism is not a monolithic entity but a tapestry of intersecting identities and perspectives. It embraces the complexities of women's lived experiences, recognizing the diverse struggles faced by different groups of women, including those of varying racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and sexual identities. This inclusivity extends to addressing internal tensions within the feminist movement itself, such as the historical marginalization of lesbian/bisexual women and the critique of Western-centric definitions of feminism. Furthermore, feminism's evolution over time reflects its responsiveness to changing social contexts and understandings of gendered oppression. It has adapted to incorporate emerging issues such as race, colonialism and sexuality, challenging hegemonic narratives and advocating for more inclusive and intersectional approaches. This ongoing dialogue and introspection within feminism serve to enrich its theoretical frameworks and strengthen its capacity for transformative social change.

2.7.1 Feminism and International Relations

Feminist international relations theories emerged in the late 1980s as a response to dissatisfaction with the conventional approaches dominating the field of International



NOTES

Relations (IR). Marysia Zalewski, Ann Tickner, Jan Jindy Pettman and V. Spike Peterson, among others, critiqued the limitations of existing theories, particularly realism/neorealism and liberalism/neoliberalism, for excluding diverse perspectives and neglecting women's experiences and gender dynamics in global politics. These feminist scholars aimed not only to include women in the study of international politics but also to challenge and transform the fundamental assumptions of the discipline. They argued that existing theories and methodologies were biased and limited, reflecting primarily men's experiences, roles, and status. By highlighting the marginalization and invisibility of women's roles and concerns in international affairs, feminist IR theorists sought to broaden the scope of analysis and introduce new methods and theories.

A key aspect of feminist IR scholarship is its critical examination of the concept and practice of the state. Women's historical absence or underrepresentation in state institutions and global governance became a focal point of inquiry. Feminist theorists questioned why women had been excluded and how traditional theories of the state perpetuated gender inequality. Drawing on feminist insights from history, anthropology and political theory, they revealed how the concept and practices of the state systematically marginalized women and centralized male control. Moreover, feminist IR scholars challenged the uncritical reliance on canonical texts such as Hobbes' "Leviathan" and Machiavelli's "*The Prince*," which reinforced patriarchal norms and excluded women from political participation. They demonstrated how these texts were rooted in a context where women lacked legal status and were considered subordinate to men. The state, as conceptualized in traditional IR discourse, was revealed to be deeply gendered, perpetuating male dominance through legal and social violence. Feminist analyses also extended to the military sphere, exposing how beliefs about masculinity and femininity shaped military institutions and practices. By highlighting the exclusion of women from combat roles and the valorization of male prowess, feminist scholars challenged the notion of a natural association between masculinity, militarism, and state power. They argued for the inclusion of women in military institutions and the recognition of diverse forms of masculinity beyond traditional norms.

Postcolonial feminism, like its critical feminist counterpart, delves into the intricate complexities of gender within the realm of international relations. It scrutinizes the intersection of everyday life, local contexts and broader transnational political and



NOTES

economic structures, particularly highlighting the enduring impact of colonial legacies on gender dynamics. Central to postcolonial feminist analysis is the recognition of how colonialism shaped and perpetuated gendered hierarchies. Colonial regimes not only imposed rigid gender norms but also exploited the labour and sexuality of colonized peoples to sustain imperial power dynamics. Women, especially those from the Global South, were often subjected to multiple forms of oppression, both within their own communities and under colonial rule.

One of the critical aspects illuminated by postcolonial feminists is the intricate link between sexuality, race, and power during colonial rule. Rules governing sexual conduct were wielded to reinforce racial hierarchies, with white colonizers asserting sexual dominance over colonized populations. This exploitative dynamic reinforced the broader systems of oppression inherent in colonialism.

Moreover, postcolonial feminists challenge the Eurocentric framing of feminism, which often prioritizes issues of rights and equality from a Western perspective. They emphasize that the concerns and priorities of feminism in the Global North may not fully capture the experiences and struggles of women in postcolonial contexts. The legacy of colonialism continues to manifest in contemporary global dynamics, perpetuating racial and gender inequalities.

2.7.2 Criticism

Critics of feminist International Relations (IR) scholarship often argue that it disproportionately focuses on women, sometimes to the extent that gender becomes synonymous with women. This critique suggests that there's a lack of attention given to 'men and masculinity' as subjects of study. Advocates for a more balanced approach argue that equal emphasis should be placed on examining how men also contend with constructs like toxic masculinity. This involves scrutinizing societal expectations that dictate men must embody traits like being a breadwinner, protector and rational, while shunning anything perceived as effeminate. The pressure to constantly prove one's manliness is highlighted as a significant aspect of male experiences. However, it's worth noting that certain feminist IR scholars, such as Tickner, have delved into both masculinity and femininity within their work. Moreover, feminists are actively exploring



NOTES

intersectionality and alternative knowledge systems, such as indigenous traditions, to broaden their perspectives. Initially, feminist engagement with IR primarily focused on women, as they were the most marginalized group largely ignored by mainstream IR theories. Yet, as gender analysis gained traction within IR, feminists expanded their scope to address various sectors beyond solely focusing on women.

Another critique levelled against feminist IR scholars is the perceived lack of a cohesive theoretical framework. Unlike traditional IR theories such as Liberalism and Realism, feminist analysis is often considered a meta-theory, as it doesn't offer a singular, overarching theory of international politics. Instead, there are multiple strands of feminism contributing to the field, leading to accusations of a lack of coherence. In response, feminists argue against the reduction of diverse realities into a single theory, emphasizing the richness of multiple perspectives.

Feminist IR scholars also face challenges regarding the assumption of a universal category of womanhood. Recognizing the vast differences in women's experiences across societies and cultures, critics point to the limitations of Western feminism in understanding the diverse realities of women in non-Western contexts. This critique intersects with post-colonial and post-structuralist perspectives, which highlight the need to acknowledge and respect cultural differences. While feminists acknowledge the importance of recognizing these differences, they maintain a commitment to addressing gender inequalities and violence against women across all cultures and societies.

Conclusion

The discipline is a mosaic of diverse perspectives, each offering a unique vantage point on the complexities of global affairs. Realism, with its emphasis on power politics and state-centric analysis, provides valuable insights into the enduring dynamics of international relations. However, its focus on security and self-interest may overlook opportunities for cooperation and collective action.

Conversely, Liberalism's emphasis on cooperation, human rights, and progress offers a hopeful vision for a more interconnected and peaceful world. Yet, its optimism must be tempered with an understanding of the challenges posed by power disparities and conflicting interests among states.



NOTES

Marxism's critique of capitalism and its focus on class struggle highlight the systemic inequalities perpetuated by global economic structures. However, its deterministic view of history may overlook the agency of individuals and the potential for transformative change through collaboration and dialogue.

Feminist perspectives enrich our understanding of International Relations by illuminating the gendered dimensions of power and inequality. However, they also remind us of the complexities inherent in navigating intersecting identities and experiences within global politics. In this nuanced landscape of theoretical inquiry, the challenge lies in synthesizing these diverse perspectives to develop a comprehensive understanding of the forces shaping our world. By embracing pluralism and fostering interdisciplinary dialogue, we can move beyond rigid dichotomies and towards a more holistic approach to global governance.

In-Text Questions

Multiple Choice Questions (1-5)

1. What is the primary focus of Realism in international relations?
A) Cooperation between states B) Economic interdependence
C) Power politics and state interests D) Gender equality
2. Which theorist's work laid the foundation for Realpolitik in ancient India?
A) Thucydides B) Machiavelli
C) Kautilya D) Hobbes
3. What does Liberalism emphasize in the context of international relations?
A) Power politics B) Anarchy
C) Class struggle D) Cooperation and rule of law
4. Neo-Realism attributes state behaviour primarily to what factor?
A) Human nature
B) Domestic politics
C) Anarchic structure of the international system
D) Economic conditions



NOTES

5. Which theory focuses on the intersection of gender and international relations?
- A) Realism B) Liberalism
C) Marxism D) Feminism

Fill in the Blanks (6-10)

6. Realism posits that states pursue _____ driven by motives like fear, honor, and profit.
7. Kautilya's work, the _____, laid the foundation for Realpolitik in ancient India.
8. Liberalism emphasizes self-restraint, moderation, and _____ in international relations.
9. Neo-Realism, also known as _____ Realism, emerged as a dominant theory with the publication of Kenneth Waltz's work.
10. Feminism critiques traditional IR theories for their _____-dominated perspectives

2.8 SUMMARY

- Theories in international relations help interpret and understand global dynamics.
- Realism focuses on power politics and the competitive nature of state interactions.
- Neo-realism attributes state behaviour to the anarchic structure of the international system.
- Liberalism emphasizes cooperation, rule of law, and international institutions.
- Neo-liberalism focuses on the role of international institutions in promoting cooperation.
- Marxism highlights class struggle and economic determinism in international relations.



NOTES

- Feminism critiques traditional IR theories for being male-dominated and examines gendered dimensions of global politics.
- Realpolitik, as conceptualized by Kautilya, emphasizes practical considerations in power politics.
- Classical realism views the power struggle as an innate aspect of human nature.
- The balance of power concept prevents any one state from becoming too dominant.
- Anarchy in IR theory refers to the lack of a central authority in the international system.
- Diplomacy is the practice of managing international relations through negotiation and dialogue.
- Constructivism emphasizes the role of ideas, beliefs, and identities in shaping state behaviour.
- Sovereignty is the principle that states have supreme authority within their territories.
- Security dilemmas arise when defensive measures by one state lead to increased tension with others.
- Hegemony refers to the dominance of one state or group over others in international politics.
- Globalization increases interconnectedness and interdependence among states and markets.
- Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) operate internationally to address various global issues.
- Soft power shapes the preferences of others through appeal and attraction rather than coercion.
- Multilateralism involves coordinating national policies among multiple states, often through international institutions.



2.9 GLOSSARY

- **Realism/Neo-realism:** It is a theory of international relations that emphasizes power politics, state interests, and the anarchic nature of the international system.
- **Liberalism/Neo-liberalism:** It is a theory that highlights cooperation, rule of law, and international institutions as means to achieve global order and peace.
- **Marxism/Neo-Marxism:** It is a theory focusing on class struggle, economic determinism, and the interconnectedness of social, economic, and political factors.
- **Feminism:** It is a perspective in international relations that examines the gendered dimensions of global politics and critiques the male-dominated nature of traditional IR theories.
- **Realpolitik:** It is a system of politics or principles based on practical rather than moral or ideological considerations, often associated with Kautilya's Arthashastra.
- **Classical Realism:** It is a branch of realism focusing on human nature and the innate drive for power as central to understanding international politics.
- **Neo-Realism/Structural Realism:** It is a theory that attributes state behaviour to the structure of the international system rather than human nature.
- **Constructivism:** It is a theory in international relations that emphasizes the role of ideas, beliefs, and identities in shaping state behaviour and the international system.
- **Sovereignty:** The principle that states have supreme authority within their own territories and are equal under international law.
- **Hegemony:** It is the dominance of one state or group over others, often seen in the context of a single state exerting significant influence over international politics.



NOTES

- **Bipolarity:** It is an international system characterized by two dominant superpowers.
- **Multipolarity:** It is an international system in which multiple states or power centers hold significant power.

2.10 ANSWERS TO IN-TEXT QUESTIONS

1. C: Power politics and state interests
2. C: Kautilya
3. D: Cooperation and rule of law
4. C: Anarchic structure of the international system
5. D: Feminism
6. Power
7. Arthashastra
8. Peace
9. Structural
10. Male

2.11 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. How does Realism in International Relations differ from Idealism, particularly in its assessment of power dynamics and conflict resolution?
2. Discuss the historical evolution of Liberalism in International Relations and its impact on contemporary global governance structures.
3. In what ways does Marxism offer a critique of capitalist structures and their influence on international politics?



NOTES

4. How does World System Theory explain the unequal distribution of power and resources in the global arena, and what implications does it have for developing nations?
5. Analyze the contributions of Feminist International Relations theory in uncovering gendered power dynamics and their impact on global politics.

2.12 REFERENCES/SUGGESTED READINGS

- Baylis, J., & Smith, S. *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2001, “Realism”, pp. 141-161.
- Jindal, N. “Kautilya’s Realpolitik,” in N. Jindal & K. Kumar (Eds.), *International Relations: Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications, India, 2020, pp. 151-170.
- Jackson, R., & Sørensen, G. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2019, ‘Liberalism’, Chapter 4, pp. 107-142.
- Wallerstein, I. “The Rise and Future Demise of World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis,” in M. Smith & R. Little (Eds.), *Perspectives on World Politics*. Routledge, New York, 2000, pp. 305-317.

Unit III: Concepts & Issues

Lesson 3: State and Sovereignty

Lesson 4: War and Peace

Lesson 5: Human Rights

Lesson 6: Global Governance and Climate Change Negotiations



LESSON 3

STATE AND SOVEREIGNTY

Shaitan Singh

Assistant Professor
School of Open Learning
University of Delhi, Delhi

STRUCTURE

- 3.1 Learning Objectives
- 3.2 Introduction
- 3.3 State and Sovereignty
 - 3.3.1 Definition and Meaning
 - 3.3.2 Theories of State
 - 3.3.3 Major Characteristics of State
 - 3.3.4 State Sovereignty
 - 3.3.5 Challenges to state Sovereignty
- 3.4 Summary
- 3.5 Glossary
- 3.6 Answers to In-Text Questions
- 3.7 Self-Assessment Questions
- 3.8 References/Suggested Readings

3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to:

- Understand the concept of the state and its historical evolution.
- Analyze the significance of sovereignty in defining statehood and the relationship between internal and external sovereignty.
- Examine the theoretical perspectives of realism, liberalism, and other schools of thought on the nature and function of the state in global politics.
- Critically assess the challenges to state sovereignty posed by globalization, technological advancement, and the rise of non-state actors.



NOTES

3.2 INTRODUCTION

The concept of the state and sovereignty lies at the heart of political organization and international relations, shaping the dynamics of power, governance and global cooperation. In this lesson, we embark on a comprehensive exploration of these foundational concepts, delving into their historical evolution, theoretical underpinnings and contemporary challenges. As we journey through the intricacies of statehood and sovereignty, we confront the complexities of political authority, the diversity of state formations and the shifting paradigms of global governance.

At its essence, a state embodies a political entity wielding supreme authority within a defined geographic territory, empowered with the exclusive right to exercise legitimate force. Yet, the traditional narratives portraying states as static, monolithic entities belie the dynamic and multifaceted nature of statehood. Through a nuanced lens, we unravel the historical contingencies and socio-political forces that have shaped the evolution of states across time and space. From the classic Weberian framework delineating the essential elements of the modern state to the intricate interplay between sovereignty and territoriality, we traverse the theoretical landscape underpinning statecraft and international relations. We confront the dichotomy between positivist and post-positivist perspectives, exploring how divergent philosophical outlooks shape our understanding of the state's nature and function. Moreover, we confront the contemporary challenges to state sovereignty in an era marked by globalization, technological advancement and the rise of non-state actors. From the erosion of traditional power structures to the proliferation of transnational threats, we interrogate the resilience of state sovereignty amidst a rapidly evolving global landscape. As we navigate through the theoretical debates and empirical realities surrounding the state and sovereignty, we seek not only to elucidate their conceptual contours but also to critically engage with their implications for contemporary politics and governance. By illuminating the complexities and contradictions inherent in these foundational concepts, we endeavour to enrich our comprehension of the intricate tapestry of power and authority that defines the modern world order.



3.3 STATE AND SOVEREIGNTY

3.3.1 Definition and Meaning

The State

A state is a political organization that holds supreme authority within a specific geographic region and has the exclusive right to use legitimate force. Sovereign states are considered the fundamental units of the international system and are central to most theories in International Relations (IR). However, the common narratives portraying them as permanent, primordial, and unproblematic entities starkly contrast with the reality of how statehood has evolved and how political authority and statecraft are understood and practiced in various parts of the world. These stories reveal that the experiences of statehood and sovereignty vary significantly across different historical periods and geographical locations, yet IR's academic debates often overlook these diverse realities. We should view the sovereign state as a historically evolving and dynamic entity, continuously shaped by its internal and external structures, social forces, political decisions and cultural interpretations. To rethink its conceptualization, we should move away from using the Treaty of Westphalia as the universal reference point and recognize the different ways political authority, statecraft and statehood are imagined. We will explore the meaning and significance of the concepts of state and sovereignty from three perspectives: their theoretical notions, the underlying methodological assumptions and the empirical realities.

The state system is a unique form of political community, which stands as the primary entity with the legitimacy, authority and recognition needed to organize international affairs in today's world. The classic Weberian concept of the state describes it as a territorial entity with established and legitimate borders, inhabited by a largely homogeneous population. This state possesses a monopoly on the legitimate use of force and commands the unwavering loyalty of its citizens. Weber highlighted four key elements of the modern state: community, legitimacy, violence, and territory.

A modern state is considered sovereign because it exercises absolute and legitimate authority within its territorial boundaries without challenge from any other



NOTES

political entity. Sovereignty, in its classic sense, implies the power to command and rule, made legitimate by a claim to authority. Internally, this means consolidating the territory under a single authority recognized as legitimate by its population. Externally, it involves recognition by other states. Thus, state and sovereignty are mutually defining concepts. States shape the meaning of sovereignty through mutual recognition practices, while such recognition in turn helps define the state itself. Hinsley also notes that the concept of sovereignty is closely linked with the nature and history of the state. Both concepts are rooted in territoriality, as a state requires territory to exist and sovereignty can only be exercised within a state's fixed borders. The Westphalian ideal of sovereignty emphasizes the inviolability of these borders.

Debates on the state and sovereignty concepts fall into two broad approaches: positivist and post-positivist, each with its own philosophical bases, theoretical principles, and methodologies. Positivist philosophy asserts that authoritative knowledge can only be derived through scientific methods based on empirical evidence. This means all social phenomena are knowable through human reason and can be verified through observation, experimentation and logical proof. Positivism rejects value judgments and believes in an objective reality, leading scholars to make definitive claims about what counts as knowledge and how to validate it. In International Relations (IR), realists and liberals follow a positivist view of the sovereign state as a natural and permanent entity. This perspective treats the state as timeless and universal.

Realists, using positivist tools, argue that the fundamental features of the state and sovereignty are “given” and self-perpetuating, dismissing the possibility of transformation. They see the state as a unitary actor in the international system, asserting that domestic and international politics operate under different logics. Hence, scholars should focus on the state’s external behaviour, with its internal workings being irrelevant to IR’s subject matter. Realists believe all states are functionally alike, providing basic social values like security, freedom, order, justice and welfare. Classical realist Hans Morgenthau argued that states pursue interests defined by power, while neorealist Kenneth Waltz claimed that international system structures constrain state behaviour. In this view, the international system is anarchical without an overarching authority, leading to power struggles among states. Liberals, on the other hand, believe

**NOTES**

international institutions can mitigate anarchy and that market forces limit a state's power and authority both internally and externally.

Neither realists nor liberals consider different historical trajectories of state formation, often basing their views on Western Europe's history, particularly the Peace of Westphalia treaties of 1648. The "Westphalian state" model's global spread is often overlooked.

In contrast, post-positivism encompasses various IR theoretical schools like critical theory, constructivism, Marxism, feminism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism and historical sociology. This approach rejects positivism's foundation that reality exists independently "out there" and argues that reality is shaped by historical context, values, norms, and social practices. Post-positivists believe knowledge is created, not discovered, and that it serves the interests of those in power. This approach emphasizes historicizing and offers a sociological understanding of the sovereign state, recognizing it as a historically and socially constructed phenomenon rather than a natural or permanent one.

Charles Tilly's work on European state formation focuses on how states acquired a monopoly on coercive power, describing state-making as a "quintessential protection racket". Benno Teschke uses Marxist and historical sociology to argue that the modern sovereign state emerged after capitalism took root in 17th-century England, distinguishing between France's "absolutist sovereignty" and England's "capitalist sovereignty". Feminist scholars trace the public-private dichotomy to the Athenian polis, where propertied men gained status and authority, relegating women to a subordinated private sphere.

Post-positivist theories reject the state as merely a legal-territorial entity, challenging the inside-outside binary and emphasizing the state-society relationship. Society shapes the state's character and informs its interests and political choices. Feminists argue the state organizes patriarchy, manipulating gender identities to maintain internal unity and external legitimacy. Neo-Marxists focus on social property relations to understand states and the international system, highlighting the intertwined development of the modern state and capitalism. They argue that capitalist enterprises now operate with greater autonomy from state control due to the separation of sovereign governance and production. Critical theorists critique the state and sovereignty's ethical dimensions, challenging their benign image. They highlight the state's hierarchical power



NOTES

structures and its role as a site of oppression against women. Marx and Engels saw the state as an instrument for exploiting the proletariat. Later neo-Marxists like Nicos Poulantzas and Peter Evans argued that the state could act against the ruling class to preserve capitalism. Post-modernists and critical theorists explore how the sovereign state can create insecurity, injustice, and conflict, questioning its claims on citizens' loyalties and proposing cosmopolitan arrangements for freedom, justice, and equality (Behera, 2020).

The Sovereignty

The term “sovereignty” comes from the Latin word “superanus,” meaning supreme or paramount. It’s the cornerstone of a state, giving legal weight to its actions and enabling it to govern through laws, policies, and decisions. The concept dates back to Aristotle, who referred to the “supreme power of the state.”

Sovereignty, as conceptualized by various thinkers, encompasses the supreme power of the state over its citizens and subjects, as described by Bodin, and the highest political authority vested in an entity whose actions are unbounded by external forces, according to Grotius. Burgess emphasizes sovereignty as the original and absolute power over individuals and associations, while Willoughby simplifies it as the supreme will of the state, with Wilson viewing it as the operational power to enact laws effectively. This sovereignty is dual in nature: internally, it grants the state absolute control over its territory and citizens, while externally, it ensures the equal status of states internationally, free from interference in internal affairs. Characterized by originality, permanence, absoluteness, exclusiveness, comprehensiveness, inalienability, and indivisibility, sovereignty can take various forms, including titular, real, de jure, de facto, legal, and political. Popular sovereignty, emphasizing the people as the ultimate source of authority, plays a crucial role in democratic systems. Ultimately, sovereignty is essential for effective governance, although collaboration with other nations under established laws is often necessary.

3.3.2 Theories of State

Political theory profoundly shapes our understanding of the state, an intangible yet pivotal entity in societal dynamics. Central to this is the notion that politics, distinct

**NOTES**

from other human activities, often revolves around the state, symbolizing a struggle for power. Concepts such as rights, liberty, and equality find practical relevance in relation to the state, which serves both as protector and violator of human rights, shaping national identity and wielding political power within society. Moreover, political ideologies and parties seek to gain control of the state apparatus to implement their agendas or influence those who do. Meanwhile, interest groups and movements, whether economic or cause-driven, aim to sway those in control of state institutions. Theoretical approaches to the state vary widely, from viewing it as a neutral arbiter to a tool of class domination or patriarchal structure, reflecting the complexity and significance of its role in political discourse and practice.

The Liberal-Pluralist View of the State

Liberal-pluralists have a different take on the state compared to Marxists and conservatives. Instead of focusing on social classes or nationalism, they emphasize the importance of individuals and private groups in society. They see society as a big arena where various groups and people compete (sometimes cooperate) for power over state institutions. According to this view, the state isn't biased towards any particular group; rather, it balances power dynamics among different groups. The state itself is made up of many interests and groups. Sometimes, state interests align with those of social groups, but the state is supposed to remain impartial, acting like a referee in their power struggles. The state is supposed to serve the entire nation, acting as a guardian of people's rights against oppression. Liberal-pluralists argue that there's a kind of "social contract" between citizens and the state, similar to an agreement between an employer and an employee. If the state abuses its power, citizens have the right to hold state officials accountable and even remove them from office. This idea of citizens having the right to revolt against an oppressive state has made liberals appear radical to conservatives and appealing to radicals themselves. Early classical liberal thinkers believed in limiting state power to the bare minimum, focusing only on maintaining law and order, defending against external threats and protecting individual rights through laws. They believed that most other services, like education and healthcare, should be provided by private organizations. Similar views resurfaced in the late 20th century as part of neoliberalism in many conservative parties in the West.



NOTES

The Social-Democratic View of the State

Modern Western states are largely shaped by social-democratic ideals. It's hard to imagine a state today not influenced by social democracy. This ideology suggests that the state should take responsibility for key industries, economic development, healthcare, education, pensions, and various social benefits. This concept of an active state involvement in society is relatively new. Before the 20th century, only a few states, like Germany, had such systems in place. Social democracy gained traction in response to economic crises, the rise of socialist movements, and the demands of war during the mid-20th century.

Social-democratic states aim to address social problems like poverty, unemployment, and sickness through state intervention. They set up institutions to ensure healthcare and education for all and provide financial support for those in need. Many Western European countries even nationalized key industries, putting them under state control. Although the 1970s saw some setbacks for social democracy, with the rise of privatization and reduction in state benefits in the following decades, many aspects of social-democratic states remain intact. They still provide major services like healthcare and education and are seen as instruments for promoting social justice.

The Marxist View of the State

Marxists view the state as a product of class struggle. It reflects the economic structures of society and serves the interests of the ruling class. According to Marxists, the state isn't neutral; it's an instrument used by the capitalist class to maintain their power and exploit the working class. Even when the state intervenes in conflicts between classes, its primary goal is to uphold the dominance of the capitalist class. Marxists believe that only when the working class controlling the state will truly act in the interests of the people. In a communist society, the state would become unnecessary and eventually disappear.

The Feminist View of the State

Feminists see the state as another tool of male domination in society. It's mainly run by men and serves their interests. Despite equal opportunity and pay laws, women still face barriers in politics, with few holding high-ranking positions in government. Women

**NOTES**

often find themselves relegated to “women’s issues” areas, like healthcare and education, rather than being involved in major decision-making roles.

The Self-Serving State

In the 19th century, as monarchies declined, the state gained power and authority. This led to the idea of the state as something greater than its individual citizens, potentially becoming a master rather than a servant. In the 20th century, the state became increasingly powerful, intervening in all aspects of social life and suppressing opposition. Under regimes like fascism and communism, the state exercised extensive control over society, with surveillance and oppression becoming common. Even in democratic states, there are concerns that increasing state power could lead to the erosion of freedom. Critics argue that as the state expands its role in areas like family and education, it risks infringing on individual liberties (Lake, 2008).

3.3.3 Major Characteristics of State

States, regardless of their form or philosophical foundations, share several key characteristics. Firstly, they exercise control over a recognizable population inhabiting a specific geographical territory. Secondly, they tend to endure over time, often outlasting other social institutions. Thirdly, they establish and uphold a framework of laws that regulate behaviour and interactions within society. Finally, states possess sovereignty, meaning they wield ultimate authority and autonomy within their borders. These traits collectively define the essence of a state and distinguish it as a fundamental unit of governance in the modern world.

Key aspects of a State

It includes:

- *Population:* Every state has a group of people who are primarily loyal to it. While there's no set size requirement, populations vary widely, from just a few thousand in places like Nauru to hundreds of millions in countries like China and India. But having a large population doesn't automatically mean a state has more political power. Factors like technological advancement and education



NOTES

levels play significant roles too. For instance, even though India has a large population, the USA, with a smaller population, might have more resources and influence.

- *Geography:* States control specific territories, which can range from vast expanses like Russia to tiny areas like the Vatican City. The size of the territory isn't fixed; it's more about having control over an area recognized by both the state's inhabitants and other states. Boundaries can change over time due to historical events or negotiations, as seen in Europe's shifting borders over the centuries.
- *Longevity:* States often tout their long histories to bolster legitimacy and loyalty among their citizens. Some, like the UK and France, trace their origins back over a thousand years. However, many modern states are relatively young, established within the last century or so. Despite changes in governments or boundaries, the state itself endures, often relying on invented traditions to strengthen claims of ancient heritage.
- *Law and Government:* States operate under their own legal systems, with sovereignty within their borders. They're bound by international laws and treaties they agree to, but enforcement relies on the power and self-interest of individual states. While states generally have autonomy over their internal affairs, international pressure can sometimes lead to reforms, especially if a regime's actions affect other states' interests. Understanding these elements helps grasp the complex nature of statehood, where factors like population, geography, longevity, and legal systems all intersect to define a nation's identity and role in the world.

3.3.4 State Sovereignty

Human societies are complex webs of relationships, governed by rules, hierarchies, and structures. From schools to social clubs, these associations share common characteristics such as identifiable populations, territories and power structures. However, when it comes to defining a state, sovereignty emerges as the defining feature that sets it apart from all other social organizations. Sovereignty, both external and internal, is the cornerstone of statehood. External sovereignty refers to a state's

**NOTES**

recognition and status in the international community. Regardless of a state's wealth or power, all sovereign states are considered equal under international law. This legal equality is manifested in institutions like the United Nations General Assembly, where each state, regardless of its size or influence, has an equal vote. However, achieving full external sovereignty requires recognition from other states, especially the most powerful ones. Without this recognition, a state may exist in name only, as was the case with certain "pseudo-states" that lacked recognition beyond their borders. Internal sovereignty, on the other hand, pertains to a state's authority within its own borders. It encompasses both legal and practical sovereignty. Legal sovereignty grants a state the exclusive right to make and enforce laws within its territory, free from external interference. Citizens are obligated to obey the laws of their state, and any sharing of sovereignty dilutes this fundamental principle. Practical sovereignty, meanwhile, refers to a state's ability to effectively enforce its laws and maintain control within its borders. A strong state can ensure compliance with its laws both domestically and internationally, while a weak state may struggle to exert authority over its territory.

The concept of sovereignty is not merely a legal abstraction; it is intrinsically tied to a state's power and effectiveness. A state's sovereignty can be challenged and undermined in various ways, such as through military defeat, internal revolt, or foreign occupation. For example, a state that loses a war may temporarily forfeit its ability to govern according to its own principles and interests, as was the case with Germany and Japan after World War II. Similarly, internal unrest or insurgency can weaken a state's practical sovereignty, leading to a breakdown of law and order within its borders. The consequences of weakened sovereignty can be profound, often resulting in humanitarian crises and societal upheaval. In Lebanon during the late 1970s and early 1980s, for instance, the government's practical sovereignty was severely limited as various factions vied for control, leading to widespread violence and instability. Similar challenges have been witnessed in other conflict-ridden regions such as Somalia, Bosnia, Sierra Leone, and Afghanistan, where the breakdown of state authority has resulted in chaos and suffering for the civilian population.

Despite these challenges, the concept of sovereignty remains fundamental to the modern state system. While globalization and interdependence have led some to question the traditional notion of state sovereignty, particularly in the context of supranational organizations like the European Union, the state continues to be the



NOTES

primary actor in international relations. Membership in international bodies does not negate a state's sovereignty; rather, it reflects a recognition of the benefits of cooperation and collective action in addressing global challenges. Moreover, sovereignty is not static; it is constantly evolving in response to changing circumstances and dynamics. The rise of non-state actors such as multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations and terrorist groups has complicated the traditional understanding of sovereignty, blurring the lines between state and non-state actors. In an increasingly interconnected world, states must navigate a complex landscape of competing interests and influences, while balancing the demands of domestic governance with international obligations (Osiander, 2001).

3.3.5 Challenges to State Sovereignty

The concept of the 'Westphalian state', which has been around for nearly four centuries, is facing some serious challenges. Its defining feature, sovereignty, is being undermined by the increasing number of international treaties that limit a state's ability to make its own laws. In the past century, there's been a growing awareness of the moral implications of allowing states to do whatever they want under the guise of sovereignty. While non-interference was once seen as a way to prevent religious wars, it's now risky when some states use it to commit atrocities against their own people. Today, the problems we face as a global community are so massive and complex that individual states seem too small to tackle them alone. Issues like pollution, poverty, and environmental degradation require global solutions that go beyond traditional notions of sovereignty. Although states have always limited their own actions by signing international treaties, the sheer number of agreements today is unprecedented. While states still maintain their legal sovereignty by only being bound to treaties they've signed, they're now subject to more international interference in their internal affairs than ever before. Even though there are international organizations like the United Nations, they are still primarily state-based and non-governmental organizations often have to work within frameworks created by states. So, while the idea of sovereignty is being challenged, in practical terms, states remain the most powerful players in international affairs, from being the largest donors of aid to shaping global politics.

**NOTES**

State sovereignty, once a bedrock principle of international relations, faces a myriad of challenges in today's global landscape. The traditional notion of sovereignty, rooted in a state's ability to exercise control over its territory and population, is increasingly under strain. One significant challenge arises from the structure of international society. Historically, the power dynamics among states have varied, but the emergence of superpowers like the USA has tilted the balance, undermining the practical sovereignty of weaker states. This imbalance has been exacerbated in the post-Cold War era, where the dominance of a single superpower further diminishes the autonomy of other states. Another formidable challenge to sovereignty comes from the forces of globalization. The interconnectedness fostered by global economic integration and technological advancement has blurred the lines between national and international domains. Economic ties between states have become so interdependent that the concept of national economic independence is now questioned. Furthermore, the rapid spread of technology, ideas, and capital undermines the state's ability to control information flow and economic activity within its borders.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction presents yet another obstacle to traditional state sovereignty. In the past, a state's military strength was a cornerstone of its sovereignty, but the advent of nuclear and other devastating weapons has altered this dynamic. Even the most powerful states are vulnerable to catastrophic military strikes, challenging their ability to protect their citizens and assert control over their territory. Moreover, the growth of informal ties between people across borders poses a significant threat to state sovereignty. Factors such as religious affiliations, tourism and digital connectivity create avenues for individuals to form allegiances and identities that transcend national boundaries. This weakening of traditional loyalties to the state undermines its authority and ability to govern effectively. In addition to these challenges, the rise of new international actors further complicates the landscape of sovereignty. Non-state actors such as multinational corporations, terrorist organizations, and international NGOs wield significant influence and often pursue agendas that diverge from those of states. This divergence can lead to conflicts of interest and undermine the sovereignty of states as they grapple with competing sources of power and authority.

Despite these formidable challenges, the state remains a crucial actor in global politics, wielding significant power and commanding loyalty from its citizens. While



NOTES

sovereignty may evolve in response to changing realities, it remains a fundamental aspect of statehood, albeit one that must adapt to the complexities of the modern world.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our exploration of the state and sovereignty reveals the intricate tapestry of power, authority, and governance that defines the modern political landscape. Through a historical lens, we have traced the evolution of statehood from its classical origins to its contemporary manifestations, illuminating the dynamic interplay of social forces, political structures and cultural interpretations that shape the nature of the state. From the classic Weberian framework delineating the essential elements of the modern state to the nuanced debates surrounding sovereignty and territoriality, we have encountered a rich array of theoretical perspectives that offer insight into the complexities of statecraft and international relations. We have grappled with the tension between positivist and post-positivist paradigms, navigating the divergent philosophical outlooks that shape our understanding of the state's role and function in society.

Moreover, our analysis has laid bare the myriad challenges confronting state sovereignty in an era marked by globalization, technological advancement, and the rise of non-state actors. From the erosion of traditional power structures to the proliferation of transnational threats, we have witnessed the resilience of the state tested against the backdrop of a rapidly evolving global landscape. Yet, amidst these challenges, the state remains a central actor in global politics, wielding significant power and commanding loyalty from its citizens. While sovereignty may evolve in response to changing realities, it remains a fundamental aspect of statehood, albeit one that must adapt to the complexities of the modern world. As we reflect on our journey through the complexities of state and sovereignty, we are reminded of the enduring relevance of these foundational concepts in shaping the contours of political authority and governance. By engaging critically with the theoretical debates and empirical realities surrounding the state and sovereignty, we deepen our understanding of the complex dynamics that underpin the modern world order, laying the groundwork for informed dialogue and informed action in the pursuit of a more just and equitable global society.



NOTES

In-Text Questions

Multiple Choice Questions (1-5)

1. Which theory in international relations emphasizes power politics and the competitive nature of state interactions?
A) Liberalism B) Constructivism
C) Realism D) Feminism
2. What does the concept of “anarchy” refer to in IR theory?
A) The dominance of one state over others
B) The practice of managing international relations through negotiation
C) The lack of a central authority in the international system
D) The interconnectedness among states and markets
3. Which approach in IR critiques traditional theories for being male-dominated?
A) Marxism B) Constructivism
C) Realism D) Feminism
4. What does “internal sovereignty” mean?
A) Recognition by other states
B) Control within a state’s borders
C) The process of increasing interconnectedness among states
D) The dominance of one state over others
5. Which theory focuses on the role of international institutions in promoting cooperation despite the anarchic system?
A) Realism B) Neo-liberalism
C) Marxism D) Feminism

Fill in the Blanks (6-15)

6. Theories in international relations help interpret and understand _____ dynamics.
7. _____ focuses on power politics and the competitive nature of state interactions.



NOTES

8. Neo-realism attributes state behaviour to the _____ structure of the international system.
9. _____ emphasizes cooperation, rule of law, and international institutions.
10. Sovereignty is the principle that states have supreme _____ within their territories.
11. Security dilemmas arise when defensive measures by one state lead to increased _____ with others.
12. _____ refers to the dominance of one state or group over others in international politics.
13. _____ increases interconnectedness and interdependence among states and markets.
14. Diplomacy is the practice of managing international relations through _____ and dialogue.
15. Constructivism emphasizes the role of _____, beliefs, and identities in shaping state behaviour.

3.4 SUMMARY

- Theories in international relations help interpret and understand global dynamics.
- Realism focuses on power politics and the competitive nature of state interactions.
- Neo-realism attributes state behaviour to the anarchic structure of the international system.
- Liberalism emphasizes cooperation, rule of law, and international institutions.
- Neo-liberalism focuses on the role of international institutions in promoting cooperation.
- Marxism highlights class struggle and economic determinism in international relations.
- Feminism critiques traditional IR theories for being male-dominated and examines gendered dimensions of global politics.



NOTES

- Realpolitik, as conceptualized by Kautilya, emphasizes practical considerations in power politics.
- Classical realism views the power struggle as an innate aspect of human nature.
- The balance of power concept prevents any one state from becoming too dominant.
- Anarchy in IR theory refers to the lack of a central authority in the international system.
- Diplomacy is the practice of managing international relations through negotiation and dialogue.
- Constructivism emphasizes the role of ideas, beliefs, and identities in shaping state behaviour.
- Sovereignty is the principle that states have supreme authority within their territories.
- Security dilemmas arise when defensive measures by one state lead to increased tension with others.
- Hegemony refers to the dominance of one state or group over others in international politics.
- Globalization increases interconnectedness and interdependence among states and markets.
- Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) operate internationally to address various global issues.
- Soft power shapes the preferences of others through appeal and attraction rather than coercion.
- Multilateralism involves coordinating national policies among multiple states, often through international institutions.
- The state is a political entity wielding supreme authority within a defined geographic territory.
- The Weberian framework identifies community, legitimacy, violence, and territory as key elements of the modern state.



NOTES

- Internal sovereignty means consolidating territory under a single authority recognized as legitimate by its population.
- External sovereignty involves recognition by other states.
- Positivist philosophy in IR asserts that authoritative knowledge comes from scientific methods based on empirical evidence.
- Realists argue that the state and sovereignty are “given” and self-perpetuating.
- Liberals believe international institutions can mitigate anarchy and that market forces limit state power.
- Post-positivist theories reject the state as merely a legal-territorial entity.
- The state-society relationship is crucial in shaping the state’s character and political choices.
- Sovereignty includes internal aspects (control within borders) and external aspects (recognition by other states).

3.5 GLOSSARY

- **State:** A political organization with supreme authority within a specific geographic region, possessing the exclusive right to use legitimate force.
- **Sovereignty:** The supreme power of a state to govern itself and control its internal affairs without external interference.
- **Liberalism:** An IR theory focusing on cooperation, rule of law, and international institutions to achieve global order and peace.
- **Marxism:** A theory that highlights class struggle, economic determinism, and the role of the state in perpetuating capitalist interests.
- **Feminism:** An approach in IR that critiques traditional theories for being male-dominated and examines the gendered dimensions of global politics.
- **Positivism:** A philosophy asserting that authoritative knowledge comes from scientific methods based on empirical evidence, often applied in social sciences including IR.



NOTES

- **Post-positivism:** A critique of positivism, arguing that scientific methods and empirical evidence are not the only sources of knowledge, emphasizing the subjective nature of social sciences.

3.6 ANSWERS TO IN-TEXT QUESTIONS

1. C: Realism
2. C: The lack of a central authority in the international system
3. D: Feminism
4. B: Control within a state's borders
5. B: Neo-liberalism
6. Global
7. Realism
8. Anarchic
9. Liberalism
10. Authority
11. Tension
12. Hegemony
13. Globalization
14. Negotiation
15. Ideas

3.7 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. How does the traditional narrative of statehood contrast with the dynamic reality of political authority and governance?



NOTES

2. What are the key elements of the classic Weberian concept of the modern state, and how do they shape our understanding of statecraft?
3. Compare and contrast the positivist and post-positivist approaches to the study of state and sovereignty in international relations.
4. How do realist and liberal perspectives differ in their conceptualization of the state and its role in international politics?
5. Analyze the challenges to state sovereignty posed by globalization, technological advancement, and the rise of non-state actors in the contemporary world.
6. What role do international organizations play in shaping the dynamics of state sovereignty and global politics?
7. In what ways do feminist and post-colonial perspectives challenge traditional notions of state and sovereignty, and how do they contribute to our understanding of power dynamics in international relations?

3.8 REFERENCES/SUGGESTED READINGS

- Biersteker, T.J., *Sage Handbook of International Relations*. Sage Publications, London, 2002, pp. 207-234.
- Lake, D.A., *The State and International Relations*. In Reus-Smit, C. & Snidal, D. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press, London, 2008.
- Behera, N.C., *State and Sovereignty*. In Tickner, A.B. & Smith, K. (eds.), *International Relations from the Global South: Worlds of Difference*. Routledge, London, 2020, pp. 139-160.
- Reus-Smit, C., *A Very Short Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2020, Chapter four, pp. 87-112.
- Osiander, A., *Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth*. International Organization, 55(2), 2001, pp. 251-287. Available at: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-organization/article/sovereigntyinternational-relations-and-the-westphalian>



LESSON 4

WAR AND PEACE

Shaitan Singh

Assistant Professor

School of Open Learning

University of Delhi, Delhi

STRUCTURE

- 4.1 Learning Objectives
- 4.2 Introduction
- 4.3 War and Peace
 - 4.3.1 Meaning and Definition
 - 4.3.2 Underlying causes of War
 - 4.3.3 Approaches to Peace Missions
 - 4.3.4 Development of Peace Missions
 - 4.3.5 The Future of Peace Missions
- 4.4 Summary
- 4.5 Glossary
- 4.6 Answers to In-Text Questions
- 4.7 Self-Assessment Questions
- 4.8 References/Suggested Readings

4.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to:

- Understand the multifaceted nature of war by examining diverse perspectives from scholars such as Quincy Wright and Carl von Clausewitz.
- Explore the evolution of armed conflict in the contemporary world, including the impact of technological advancements, demographic shifts, and the rise of non-state actors.



NOTES

- Evaluate the various approaches to peace missions, including peacekeeping, peacemaking, peace enforcement, peacebuilding, and their effectiveness in resolving conflicts and fostering lasting peace.
 - Develop analytical skills to evaluate the impact of war and peace on societies, economies and global stability, considering both short-term and long-term implications.
-

4.2 INTRODUCTION

War and peace, two timeless concepts that have shaped the course of human history, continue to hold profound significance in our contemporary world. As we delve into the intricacies of these themes, it becomes evident that they are not static entities but dynamic processes influenced by a multitude of factors. In this lesson, we embark on a journey to explore the multifaceted dimensions of war and peace, from their meanings and underlying causes to the transformation of armed conflict and the approaches to peace missions.

The lesson begins by grappling with the elusive nature of war, as we navigate through diverse perspectives offered by eminent scholars such as Quincy Wright and Carl von Clausewitz. Through their insights, we gain a deeper understanding of war as more than just a violent clash between entities but as a complex interplay of political, social, and economic dynamics. From traditional interstate wars to the proliferation of intrastate conflicts and unconventional warfare, we confront the evolving nature of armed confrontation in today's world.

Transitioning to the realm of peace, we challenge traditional notions by embracing a more proactive understanding that extends beyond the absence of violence. In this new paradigm, peace becomes a proactive endeavour aimed at fostering stability, cooperation, and reconciliation. We delve into the role of democratic institutions, economic systems, and normative constraints in shaping the likelihood of conflict or cooperation among nations.

**NOTES**

As we delve deeper into the underlying causes of war, we shift our focus to the individual and state levels of analysis. Exploring the psychological factors influencing leaders' decision-making processes and the impact of domestic institutions on international relations, we unravel the intricate web of influences that shape the trajectory of conflicts.

Moving forward, we examine the transformation of armed conflict in the contemporary world, marked by technological advancements, demographic shifts, and the rise of non-state actors. From traditional state-based warfare to privatized conflicts and intrastate strife, we confront the changing face of warfare and its implications for global security.

Finally, we explore the approaches to peace missions, tracing their evolution from traditional peacekeeping to more comprehensive strategies encompassing peacemaking, peace enforcement, and peacebuilding. Through case studies and historical analyses, we assess the effectiveness of these approaches in resolving conflicts and fostering lasting peace. As we embark on this exploration, we are confronted with complex questions and divergent perspectives that challenge our understanding of war and peace. Yet, amidst the uncertainties and complexities, one thing remains clear: the pursuit of peace is an enduring aspiration that transcends borders, ideologies and conflicts.

4.3 WAR AND PEACE

4.3.1 Meaning and Definition

War

Defining war requires navigating a labyrinth of perspectives, each offering unique insights into its nature and manifestations. Quincy Wright's portrayal of war as "violent contact of distinct but similar entities" captures its essence in a raw, elemental sense, yet falls short of encapsulating its multifaceted dimensions. Carl von Clausewitz, on the other hand, delves deeper into the psychological and strategic underpinnings, framing war as a continuation of politics through violent means. War, in its essence, emerges as an



NOTES

armed confrontation between adversaries driven by irreconcilable political objectives. It represents the pinnacle of conflict escalation, where dialogue and diplomacy have failed to resolve differences, necessitating recourse to force. Embedded within its fabric lies the implicit pursuit of dominance and submission, where each side seeks to impose its will upon the other. This definition underscores the inherent complexity of war, which extends beyond mere physical confrontation to encompass a myriad of political, social, and economic dynamics. Gaston Bouthoul's emphasis on war as an organized process further elucidates its systematic and structured nature. Indeed, war is not a chaotic eruption of violence but a meticulously planned endeavour, orchestrated by political and military entities with defined objectives and strategies. From a realist standpoint, war emerges as a manifestation of power struggles between actors vying for dominance in the international arena. It embodies the ultimate expression of statecraft, where coercion and violence serve as tools to achieve geopolitical objectives. In this view, peace is not merely the absence of war but a precarious equilibrium maintained through the threat of force.

However, the reality of war transcends traditional state-centric narratives, encompassing a spectrum of conflicts ranging from interstate wars to intrastate strife and unconventional warfare. The post-Cold War era has witnessed a proliferation of intrastate conflicts, fuelled by ethnic, religious and ideological tensions. These conflicts, often characterized by fluid alliances and asymmetrical power dynamics, challenge conventional notions of war and peace. Moreover, the nature of war has evolved with advances in technology and changes in global dynamics. Conventional warfare, marked by conventional military operations, has been complemented by unconventional tactics such as terrorism, insurgency and cyber warfare. The rise of non-state actors and transnational threats has blurred the boundaries between war and peace, necessitating innovative approaches to conflict resolution.

In this nuanced landscape, wars vary in duration, intensity and scope, from brief skirmishes to protracted conflicts spanning decades. The distinction between total and limited war reflects varying degrees of escalation and restraint, with some conflicts escalating to existential struggles while others are contained within defined parameters. Unconventional wars, including proxy conflicts and information warfare, further complicate the picture, highlighting the role of propaganda and psychological

**NOTES**

manipulation in shaping perceptions and influencing outcomes. The emergence of new threats, such as international terrorism and cyber warfare, underscores the need for adaptive strategies and multilateral cooperation in addressing complex security challenges.

Peace

A peacekeeping mission, in simple terms, is when the United Nations or another international organization sends out a mix of civilian experts, police officers, and peacekeeping troops (often called Blue Helmets) to try and prevent, manage, or resolve conflicts around the world. These missions cover a wide range of activities, from traditional peacekeeping tasks to more robust actions like enforcing peace agreements. Traditionally, peace was often seen as just the absence of violence. But in the years after the Cold War, people started to realize that this definition wasn't enough. Now, there's a push for a more positive understanding of peace. Instead of just keeping conflict at bay temporarily, this new idea of peace is about building a world where stability and cooperation are the norm. The old way of thinking about peace saw it as a fragile thing, sort of like a break between fights. It could be maintained by the strength of one powerful country, the balance of power between several big nations, or alliances between countries. But this approach often failed, and wars kept happening. Realists, who take this view, see war as a natural part of human history. The new idea of peace is much more proactive. It's about setting up systems and values that can keep the world stable over the long term. Instead of relying on military might, it's about countries working together and sharing responsibility. It means changing how individuals think and act, moving away from conflict and towards cooperation. It involves promoting education and justice so that everyone can play a part in building a more peaceful world (Gray, 2012).

4.3.2 Underlying causes of War

The immediate causes of international conflicts, highlights the nuanced triggers behind wars. It emphasizes that conflicts often arise from disputes over economic resources, policy differences, political ideologies, ethnic tensions and territorial claims. For instance, conflicts over scarce resources like water and energy have historically fuelled military



NOTES

confrontations between nations. Additionally, policy disputes, such as concerns over nuclear proliferation, can escalate tensions and lead to militarized conflicts. Ethnic identity plays a significant role as well, as seen in interventions aimed at preventing ethnic cleansing or protecting minority rights. Moreover, territorial disputes, driven by strategic interests or nationalist aspirations, have frequently sparked armed conflicts throughout history. While conflicts of interest can set the stage for war, the passage acknowledges that most disputes are resolved through diplomacy. However, when conflicts escalate to military action, it suggests that deeper underlying causes, beyond just immediate disagreements, are often at play. It includes:

- **The Individual Level of Analysis:** Understanding the causes of war requires placing individuals at the forefront, especially leaders and policymakers who ultimately decide on matters of conflict. While realist international theory traditionally views states as rational and cohesive entities, emerging scholarship challenges this perspective. Instead, it argues that grasping the roots of war necessitates understanding the complexities of individual leaders and their decision-making processes. One critical aspect explored is the impact of stress and “motivated biases” on leaders’ perceptions and judgments. During diplomatic crises, leaders under stress may misperceive their options and those of their adversaries, potentially escalating conflicts. Classic studies, like Ole Holsti’s analysis of the lead-up to World War I, highlight how stress can distort leaders’ perceptions and decision-making, leading to disastrous outcomes. Moreover, cognitive psychologists have identified “motivated biases,” where individuals hold beliefs that serve their interests or preferences, hindering their ability to adapt to new information. For instance, during the Anglo-German crisis over Morocco, decision-makers committed to a confrontational stance were reluctant to change course, influenced by their initial biases. Another psychological phenomenon, “groupthink,” suggests that the need for acceptance within decision-making circles can lead to flawed judgments. The Bay of Pigs invasion under President Kennedy exemplifies this, where dissenting opinions were silenced to maintain group cohesion, ultimately resulting in a failed operation.

Additionally, leaders’ over-optimism about the outcomes of war plays a significant role. Studies show that leaders tend to overestimate their military capabilities

**NOTES**

and the ease of victory, leading to risky decisions. This overconfidence can be influenced by factors like gender, with males often exhibiting higher levels of overconfidence and a greater propensity for conflict. Furthermore, feminist perspectives suggest that gender dynamics influence decision-making, with countries exhibiting greater gender equality being less prone to military aggression. Studies also indicate a correlation between domestic security for women and peaceful relations between states.

- **The State Level of Analysis:** Realist theory suggests that we can understand international affairs by assuming that states act as single, unified entities. This means that state leaders make decisions based on the international landscape, not influenced by domestic politics or conditions. However, many scholars dispute this realist view, arguing that domestic institutions and policies within countries significantly influence how leaders handle international issues, including decisions about going to war. These scholars believe that domestic economic and political factors can impact the likelihood of war.
- **Domestic Economic Systems and War:** Some scholars, particularly those drawing from Marxist theory, argue that a country's economic system influences its likelihood of using military force. For example, whether a country has a capitalist or socialist economy can affect its tendency to resolve conflicts through war. In capitalist systems, where markets are relatively unregulated, the competition and economic interactions often lead to underpaid workers and insufficient domestic demand. Historically, figures like Russian Bolshevik leader Vladimir Lenin suggested that this economic competition among capitalist countries led to World War I, as they sought colonies and ultimately clashed with each other. However, more recent studies indicate that capitalist countries are actually more likely to remain at peace with one another. They tend to avoid conflicts because they benefit from open trade and stable international financial systems. These countries recognize that economic prosperity is more achievable through trade and financial integration than through conquest.
- **Domestic Political Institutions and Governmental Processes:** A major challenge to the realist perspective comes from the liberal tradition, particularly



NOTES

the democratic peace thesis, which posits that democracies almost never go to war with each other. This theory is supported by two main arguments: institutional constraints and normative constraints.

- o *Institutional Constraints*: In democratic countries, there are constitutional or customary checks that limit the power of leaders to unilaterally decide to go to war. Citizens in democracies, aware of the costs of war, use their political influence to restrain leaders from engaging in conflicts except in extreme situations. In contrast, authoritarian leaders can shift the burdens of war onto the public and may even seek war to gain power and distract from domestic issues.
- o *Normative Constraints*: These are the beliefs and values that shape leaders' behaviours. Democratic leaders, who typically rise to power by valuing compromise and peaceful resolution of conflicts, are more likely to resolve disputes amicably with other democracies. Authoritarian leaders, often coming to power through violence, bring a different approach to international relations, making peaceful resolutions less likely.

Democratic institutions and norms not only help maintain peace between democracies but also prevent military conflicts from undermining these institutions. For example, in his farewell address, President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned about the undue influence of the military-industrial complex on U.S. national security policy, cautioning against a rise in misplaced power that could threaten democratic processes. Similarly, sociologist Harold Lasswell warned about the emergence of 'garrison states,' where military priorities dominate economic and political life. However, the U.S. system of checks and balances has helped maintain its democratic character despite these pressures. While the democratic peace thesis is compelling, we should remember that democracies can still become involved in conflicts with non-democracies, and there is no consensus on why democratic peace exists. Additionally, even in democracies, policy misinterpretations by subordinates can lead to incoherent foreign policies and increase the risk of war. In summary, the economic and political systems of countries significantly influence their tendencies toward peace or war in the face of serious conflicts of interest (Ayson, 2007).

**NOTES****4.3.3 Approaches to Peace Mission**

Approaches to peace and peace missions often vary between positive and negative conceptions of peace. During the Cold War, the prevailing concept of peacekeeping was primarily negative. However, since 1989, with the increase in peace missions and mandates, more positive concepts have emerged. One significant development was the “Agenda for Peace” proposed by UN Secretary-General Boutros, Boutros-Ghali in 1992 and revised in 1995. This initiative introduced clearer principles and a more precise classification of peace missions, spurring further research. From the extensive literature on peace missions, four key terms have become widely recognized.

1. **Peacekeeping:** It involves deploying UN personnel—mainly military—with the consent of conflicting parties to maintain a cease-fire and prevent the resumption of hostilities. By placing multinational forces between opposing parties, the UN aims to preserve or enhance the chances of lasting peace. These forces are deployed only after a peace agreement is in place and are expected to remain impartial and neutral, using force only in self-defense. If hostilities resume, the forces are withdrawn immediately. Though the UN Charter did not originally provide for such forces, they are often said to operate under a “fictional Chapter VI and a half,” blending cooperative and coercive measures.
2. **Peacemaking:** It encompasses all forms of mediation and negotiation aimed at bringing conflicting parties closer together through peaceful means. This approach utilizes cooperative methods outlined in Chapter VI of the UN Charter to help settle conflicts. Preventive diplomacy, including the preventive deployment of peacekeepers, can also be effective in containing the outbreak and escalation of violence. The presence of forces with the consent of the parties can foster a climate of trust and security, facilitating the resumption of negotiations and mediation.
3. **Peace Enforcement:** It refers to coercive actions authorized by the UN Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter in response to threats to peace, breaches of peace and acts of aggression. Multinational military forces under



NOTES

UN command are tasked with enforcing agreements and, if necessary, engaging in armed action. Peace enforcement can also be conducted by a regional organization under Chapter VIII of the Charter, following Security Council guidelines.

4. **Peace-building:** It involves a concerted effort by the UN and the international community to develop political, economic, and security infrastructures aimed at achieving long-term conflict resolution. Peacebuilding seeks to lay the groundwork for reconciliation and reconstruction, preventing the resumption of violence and redrawing the settlement. Although primarily intended for the post-conflict phase, it can also be applied preventively before violence erupts or during a conflict to stabilize a fragile peace. This approach is based on the economic and social measures outlined in Chapters IX and X of the Charter. These approaches are typically used in succession as part of a comprehensive strategy for peace.

4.3.4 Development of Peace Missions

The development of peace missions can be divided into three key periods: the Cold War era (1948-1988), the immediate post-Cold War period (1989-1993), and a less distinct but evolving phase starting in 1994.

1. **Cold War Era (1948-1988):** This period began with UN Observer Missions in Palestine (1948) and Kashmir (1949), aimed at monitoring ceasefires and armistice agreements. The “Blue Berets” were deployed to monitor these agreements. A significant shift occurred in 1956 when Canadian-invented “Blue Helmets” were stationed along the Suez Canal, marking a more proactive engagement. These peacekeepers were also deployed to manage buffer zones and prevent conflicts in areas like Cyprus (1964), the Sinai (1973) and the Golan Heights (1974). The mission of the Blue Helmets was straightforward: they were to position themselves between warring parties to maintain peace. Their success was measured by the absence of war, reflecting a negative conception of peace. They were also involved in overseeing the cessation of hostilities in conflicts such as the Iran-Iraq War (1988), the withdrawal of foreign

**NOTES**

troops from Afghanistan (1988) and Angola (1989), and in the first intrastate conflicts like Congo (1960-1964) and southern Lebanon (1978). During this time, there were also multilateral efforts outside the UN, such as the 1982 Lebanon mission.

2. **Immediate Post-Cold War Period (1989-1993):** In this period, the number of peacekeeping missions surged, with 17 new missions launched. The 1992 Agenda for Peace noted that tens of thousands of Blue Helmets were deployed on expanded missions.

Three notable changes marked in this period are:

- The Security Council recognized the right to intervene for humanitarian assistance post-Gulf War in 1991.
- Many missions addressed intrastate conflicts without necessarily obtaining prior consent from the governments or factions involved.
- The missions became multidimensional, involving peacekeeping, peacemaking, peace enforcement, and peace-building.

3. **Post-1994 Period:** The third phase emphasized peace enforcement to stabilize collapsed states through reconstruction, democratization, and development. These missions often started with other actors and later transitioned to UN control. For example, U.S. troops initially went to Somalia in 1992 for humanitarian reasons. Later, force was used by various countries in places like Haiti (1994), Bosnia (1995), Kosovo (1999), Sierra Leone (1997 and 2000), East Timor (1999), Afghanistan (2001), and Ivory Coast (2002). Over the past six years, UN peace forces, often with support from regional organizations like the African Union (AU), the Organization of American States (OAS), and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), have taken over missions in Sudan, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ivory Coast, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti and East Timor. The UN only assumed control once the situations were relatively stable. However, significant challenges remain in giving the UN real peace enforcement capabilities, such as outdated military mechanisms, poor coordination, inadequate resources, and dependency on



NOTES

troop-contributing countries. Consequently, military operations are often delegated to organizations like NATO or major powers like the United States. A promising alternative is to regionalize peace enforcement, empowering regional organizations with the necessary resources and training to conduct missions independently but still under UN oversight. Hybrid missions could better reflect the contributions of southern hemisphere countries, which supply most of the Blue Helmet troops. Ultimately, the UN may be more effective as an impartial mediator than as a military force. Nonetheless, the need for armed force to establish and maintain peace is clear, a challenge unforeseen by the UN's founders and one for which the Blue Helmets are not fully prepared (Grieco et al, 2015).

4.3.5 The Future of Peace Missions

Since the early 1990s, the United Nations (UN) has been pivotal in implementing strategies for conflict prevention and resolution. Generally, the UN is inherently involved in peace missions. The ability of an international organization to deploy soldiers from member countries to maintain or restore fragile peace marks a significant historical development. Over the past 75 years, the UN has dispatched hundreds of thousands of Blue Helmets (peacekeeping forces) to conduct various observation and monitoring missions aimed at preventing the resumption of hostilities. Following the end of the Cold War, the UN expanded its goals to include (1) creating conditions for lasting peace settlements and (2) supporting reconciliation and reconstruction efforts in societies emerging from violent conflicts. This broader agenda explains the notable increase in peacekeeping missions over the past decade. From 1989 to 1993, the UN launched 17 peace missions—equivalent to the number launched in the previous four decades. Before 1989, there had been a total of 15 missions, with only five addressing intrastate conflicts. Between 1989 and 2000, 38 new missions were initiated, with only five addressing interstate conflicts. In 1991, approximately 11,000 peacekeepers were deployed, but by 1993, that number had surged to over 78,000, an all-time high. The late 1990s saw a decline in the number of Blue Helmets to 30,000 due to fatigue and cost concerns. However, by the end of the first decade of the 21st century, nearly 80,000 UN soldiers were involved in over 20 missions (around 100,000 including

**NOTES**

military observers and civilian police). Additionally, 65,000 NATO and European Union (EU) soldiers were on duty in Afghanistan, Kosovo, and Bosnia, participating in robust operations to maintain fragile peace. The UN's involvement in peace missions is more extensive than ever, even as the number of conflicts has decreased. Three-quarters of the total peace missions in UN history have been initiated since the end of the Cold War, costing around \$5 billion annually, which is 1/100th of the U.S. security budget. According to Peter Wallensteen, the UN facilitated 25 of the 39 peace agreements signed between 1989 and 2000 to end armed conflicts. The UN is actively engaged in peacemaking and peacebuilding in at least half of today's civil wars. Between 1990 and 2002, peacemaking initiatives increased fourfold, the imposition of sanctions fivefold, preventive diplomacy missions sixfold, and mediation mechanisms and truth and reconciliation commissions sevenfold. The total number of peace operations more than tripled from seven in 1988 to 23 in 2008. From 1948 to 2008, approximately 2,200 Blue Helmets lost their lives during peace missions, with more than half of these deaths occurring post-1993. As intrastate wars have largely replaced interstate wars, peace missions have become more demanding and dangerous. In this new security environment, the UN has been redesigning the mandates and methods of peace operations aimed at ending civil wars and ethnic conflicts, with mixed results. The UN's own self-assessment reports on the Rwandan genocide in 1994 and the massacre in Srebrenica in 1995 revealed serious weaknesses in its peacekeeping mechanisms and decision-making processes. These deficiencies were further highlighted by the UN's inaction in Darfur and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The impartial stance of the Blue Helmets, standing between combatants with the consent of both parties, seems to be a thing of the past. Today, UN soldiers are tasked with upholding and strengthening the standards that underpin peace. In countries that have become ungovernable, the mere presence of UN forces can provide a level of security that allows the country to address the causes and effects of war, at least temporarily. Additionally, there is hope that these countries will move toward democratic standards and a market economy, recovering peace they lost or never knew. Together with other actors, such as humanitarian organizations and financial institutions, the Blue Helmets are undertaking initiatives and applying principles that go beyond traditional



NOTES

peacekeeping. Their new role encompasses the more ambitious goals of peacemaking, peace enforcement, and peacebuilding.

Realists view this approach as praiseworthy but naive, believing it is based on false hopes and doomed to failure. They argue that the UN cannot abandon the Westphalian concept of security on which it was founded in 1945. According to realists, the UN's increasing practical commitment to human security and the right of interference will falter due to the severe limitations and enormous obstacles faced by intrastate peace missions. The idea of artificially reshaping a society to resemble a Western democracy is seen as highly doubtful. There is a fundamental contradiction: while during the Cold War, most states wanted the UN to act as a weak arbiter of interstate relations, today, some expect the UN to rescue and, if necessary, revive collapsed states incapable of self-governance or maintaining security. Can the UN fulfill this role? Can UN peace forces resolve intrastate conflicts? These questions are likely to arise with each new peace mission and fuel intense debate for years to come.

Conclusion

Our exploration of war and peace has illuminated the intricate tapestry of human conflict and cooperation, revealing a dynamic interplay of factors that shape the course of history and the fate of nations. From the raw essence of war as depicted by Quincy Wright to the nuanced perspectives of contemporary scholars, we have grappled with the complexity of armed confrontation and its multifaceted manifestations. As we journeyed through the underlying causes of war, delving into the realms of individual decision-making and state dynamics, we confronted the stark realities of human strife driven by economic interests, political ideologies, and social tensions. Yet, amidst the darkness of conflict, we also glimpsed the flicker of hope offered by diplomatic efforts, institutional constraints, and normative values that seek to mitigate the scourge of war.

The transformation of armed conflict in the modern era has presented both challenges and opportunities, as technological advancements, demographic shifts, and the rise of non-state actors redefine the landscape of global security. While traditional notions of warfare may fade, new forms of conflict emerge, demanding innovative

**NOTES**

approaches to peacebuilding and conflict resolution. In our exploration of approaches to peace missions, from traditional peacekeeping to comprehensive strategies encompassing peacemaking and peacebuilding, we have witnessed the tireless efforts of international organizations, governments, and stakeholders to forge a path towards lasting peace. Yet, we also acknowledge the inherent complexities and limitations that accompany such endeavours, as we grapple with the enduring realities of human conflict and suffering. As we contemplate the lessons learned from this journey, we are reminded of the imperative to nurture a culture of peace, cooperation, and understanding in our interconnected world. Through dialogue, diplomacy, and collective action, we can strive to transcend the barriers of division and strife, embracing the shared humanity that binds us together.

In the final analysis, the pursuit of peace is not merely an abstract ideal but a tangible commitment that requires courage, compassion, and collective resolve. As we navigate the complexities of war and peace in our ever-changing world, let us heed the lessons of history and strive to build a future where peace prevails and the aspirations of humanity find fulfilment.

In-Text Questions**Multiple Choice Questions (1-5)**

1. Which scholar defines war as “violent contact of distinct but similar entities”?
A) Carl von Clausewitz B) Quincy Wright
C) Gaston Bouthoul D) Boutros Boutros-Ghali

2. What is the primary focus of peace-building efforts?
A) Enforcing peace agreements
B) Developing long-term political, economic, and security infrastructures
C) Mediating negotiations between conflicting parties
D) Deploying UN personnel to maintain cease-fires



NOTES

3. Which term refers to coercive actions authorized by the UN Security Council in response to threats to peace?
A) Peacekeeping B) Peacemaking
C) Peace enforcement D) Peace-building
4. What does the democratic peace thesis suggest?
A) Democracies are more likely to engage in war
B) Democracies almost never go to war with each other
C) Democracies have no impact on war likelihood
D) Democracies rely on military might to maintain peace
5. What percentage of war casualties are indirect victims?
A) 20% B) 40%
C) 60% D) 80%

Fill in the Blanks (6-10)

6. War is an armed confrontation between adversaries driven by irreconcilable _____ objectives.
7. Peacekeeping involves the deployment of UN personnel to maintain a _____ and prevent the resumption of hostilities.
8. The transformation of armed conflict includes the rise of _____ actors and the privatization of warfare.
9. The _____ peace thesis posits that democracies almost never go to war with each other.
10. _____ warfare involves the use of digital attacks by one state to disrupt the computer systems of another state.

4.4 SUMMARY

- Understanding war requires examining diverse perspectives from scholars like Quincy Wright and Carl von Clausewitz.



NOTES

- The evolution of armed conflict includes the impact of technological advancements, demographic shifts, and the rise of non-state actors.
- Various approaches to peace missions include peacekeeping, peacemaking, peace enforcement, and peace-building.
- War is an armed confrontation between adversaries driven by political objectives and involves more than just physical confrontation.
- Peace extends beyond the absence of violence to include stability, cooperation, and reconciliation.
- Traditional interstate wars have been complemented by unconventional tactics such as terrorism, insurgency, and cyber warfare.
- The immediate causes of war include disputes over resources, policy differences, political ideologies, ethnic tensions, and territorial claims.
- Individual leaders' decision-making processes and psychological factors influence the onset of wars.
- Domestic institutions and economic systems significantly influence a country's likelihood of engaging in war.
- Democratic countries are less likely to go to war with each other due to institutional and normative constraints.
- The transformation of armed conflict includes the privatization of warfare and the rise of non-state conflicts.
- The majority of war casualties are indirect victims, including women and children suffering from displacement, disease, and famine.
- More wars are ending than starting, but ethnic wars and civil wars still pose significant challenges.
- Resource competition and state collapses drive many armed conflicts.
- The democratization process can lead to instability and political violence if human rights and the rule of law are not upheld.



NOTES

- Peacekeeping missions involve deploying UN personnel to maintain cease-fires and prevent hostilities.
- Peacemaking involves mediation and negotiation to bring conflicting parties together.
- Peace enforcement involves coercive actions authorized by the UN Security Council.
- Peace-building aims to develop long-term political, economic, and security infrastructures for conflict resolution.
- The pursuit of peace transcends borders, ideologies, and conflicts, requiring cooperative efforts and shared responsibilities.
- The UN's "Agenda for Peace" proposed in 1992 introduced clearer principles for peace missions.
- Preventive diplomacy can help contain the outbreak and escalation of violence.
- The emergence of new threats such as international terrorism and cyber warfare necessitates adaptive strategies and multilateral cooperation.
- Democratic leaders who value compromise are more likely to resolve disputes peacefully.
- Non-state actors and transnational threats have blurred the boundaries between war and peace.

4.5 GLOSSARY

- **War:** It is an armed confrontation between adversaries driven by irreconcilable political objectives, representing the pinnacle of conflict escalation.
- **Peace:** Not merely the absence of war but a proactive endeavour aimed at fostering stability, cooperation, and reconciliation.



NOTES

- **Peacekeeping:** It is the deployment of UN personnel to maintain a cease-fire and prevent the resumption of hostilities with the consent of conflicting parties.
- **Peacemaking:** Mediation and negotiation aimed at bringing conflicting parties together through peaceful means.
- **Peace Enforcement:** Coercive actions authorized by the UN Security Council to enforce agreements and engage in armed action if necessary.
- **Peace-building:** Efforts to develop political, economic, and security infrastructures to achieve long-term conflict resolution and prevent the resumption of violence.
- **Democratic Peace Thesis:** The theory that democracies almost never go to war with each other due to institutional and normative constraints.
- **Non-State Actors:** Entities like terrorist groups, insurgencies, and private military companies that participate in armed conflicts but are not sovereign states.
- **Ethnic Conflict:** Armed conflict driven by ethnic tensions, often arising from state collapses or severe governance crises.
- **Cyber Warfare:** It is the use of digital attacks by one state to disrupt the computer systems of another state.
- **Intrastate Conflict:** It is the armed conflict within a state, often involving factions or groups vying for control or autonomy.
- **Proxy Conflict:** It is a war where two opposing countries or parties support combatants that serve their interests instead of waging war directly.
- **Motivated Biases:** These are beliefs held by individuals that serve their interests or preferences, influencing their decision-making processes.

4.6 ANSWERS TO IN-TEXT QUESTIONS

1. B: Quincy Wright
2. B: Developing long-term political, economic, and security infrastructures



NOTES

3. C: Peace enforcement
4. B: Democracies almost never go to war with each other
5. C: 60%
6. Political
7. Cease-fire
8. Non-state
9. Democratic
10. Cyber

4.7 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the underlying causes of war, considering economic, political, and social factors. Provide examples to illustrate each cause.
2. How has armed conflict transformed in the contemporary world, and what are the implications of these transformations for global security?
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of different approaches to peace missions, such as peacekeeping, peacemaking, peace enforcement, and peacebuilding. Provide examples of successful and unsuccessful peace missions to support your analysis.
4. How do individual decision-making processes and state dynamics contribute to the outbreak of war? Provide examples from historical or contemporary events to illustrate your points.
5. Analyze the role of democratic institutions, economic systems, and normative constraints in shaping the likelihood of conflict or cooperation among nations. How do these factors influence the prospects for peace?
6. Discuss the challenges and opportunities presented by the rise of non-state actors in armed conflict. How do these actors impact the dynamics of warfare and peacebuilding efforts?



7. Compare and contrast traditional peacekeeping missions with more comprehensive strategies that encompass peacemaking and peacebuilding. What are the advantages and disadvantages of each approach?

NOTES

4.8 REFERENCES/SUGGESTED READINGS

- Gray, C.S., *War, Peace and International Relations: An Introduction to Strategic History*. Routledge, London, 2012, pp. 245-261, 279-306.
- Ayson, R., *The Changing Nature of Warfare*. In Devetak, R., Burke, A. & George, J. (eds.), *An Introduction to International Relations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007, pp. 199-216.
- Grieco, J., Ikenberry, G.J. & Mastanduno, M., *War and its Causes and Pathways to Interstate Peace*. In *Introduction to International Relations: Enduring Questions and Contemporary Perspectives*. Palgrave, London, 2015, pp. 137-204.



LESSON 5

HUMAN RIGHTS

NOTES

Shaitan Singh

Assistant Professor
School of Open Learning
University of Delhi, Delhi

STRUCTURE

- 5.1 Learning Objectives
- 5.2 Introduction
- 5.3 Human Rights
 - 5.3.1 Meaning and Definition
 - 5.3.2 The core assumptions of Human Rights
 - 5.3.3 Human rights in ethics, law and social activism
 - 5.3.4 The Global Human Rights Structure
 - 5.3.5 The Humanitarian Intervention in World Politics
- 5.4 Summary
- 5.5 Glossary
- 5.6 Answers to In-Text Questions
- 5.7 Self-Assessment Questions
- 5.8 References/Suggested Readings

5.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to:

- Understand the concept of human rights, including its meaning, definition, and foundational principles.
- Analyze the core assumptions of human rights, including their transformative nature, universality, and the concept of a common human subject.
- Explore the intersection of human rights with ethics, law, and social activism, and evaluate the roles of each in promoting and protecting human rights.



NOTES

- Critically evaluate the concept of humanitarian intervention in world politics, considering its moral, legal, and practical implications.
- Examine the arguments for and against humanitarian intervention, including legal justifications, moral imperatives, and concerns regarding sovereignty, selective application, and effectiveness.

5.2 INTRODUCTION

The concept of human rights stands as a beacon of justice and dignity in a world often marred by inequality and oppression. Embedded within national laws and international agreements, human rights serve as a moral compass, guiding societies toward a more equitable and humane existence. However, beneath the surface of this seemingly universal framework lies a tapestry of complexities and contradictions, shaping the discourse surrounding human rights and humanitarian intervention. This lesson delves into the multifaceted nature of human rights, exploring their meaning, core assumptions and manifestations in ethics, law and social activism. It navigates through the intricate landscape of global human rights structures, examining mechanisms for accountability and avenues for redress. Additionally, the lesson scrutinizes the contentious issue of humanitarian intervention, probing the moral and legal dilemmas inherent in balancing sovereignty with the imperative to protect vulnerable populations. Human rights, as elucidated in the lesson, are not static principles but dynamic constructs shaped by historical legacies, cultural perspectives, and political agendas. While the formalization of human rights frameworks represents a milestone in human history, their implementation often falls short of the lofty ideals they espouse. Despite tangible progress in abolishing slavery, advancing women's rights, and protecting children, human rights discourse remains fraught with challenges.

The lesson unfolds a critical examination of the assumptions underpinning human rights, challenging notions of universality and the autonomy of the human subject. It navigates through ethical, legal, and social dimensions, unravelling the intricate interplay between moral imperatives, legal frameworks, and grassroots activism. Through nuanced analysis, it sheds light on the power dynamics and structural limitations that

**NOTES**

shape the human rights landscape. Central to the discourse on human rights is the vexing dilemma of humanitarian intervention. As the global community grapples with atrocities and mass violations of human dignity, questions of sovereignty, legitimacy, and efficacy loom large. The lesson presents contrasting perspectives on the moral and legal justifications for intervention, probing the complexities of navigating geopolitical realities and ethical imperatives. Ultimately, the lesson serves as a comprehensive exploration of human rights and humanitarian intervention, inviting readers to critically engage with these complex issues. By illuminating the nuances and tensions inherent in these concepts, it seeks to foster a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities in advancing the global human rights agenda.

5.3 HUMAN RIGHTS

5.3.1 Meaning and Definition

Human rights are essentially a code of conduct that governs how individuals and groups should be treated, whether by governments or other entities, based on widely accepted ethical principles that define what constitutes a dignified existence within society. These principles are enshrined in both national laws and international agreements, which establish mechanisms and procedures to ensure that those responsible for upholding these rights are held accountable and that victims of rights abuses have avenues for seeking justice.

Human rights, at first glance, seem like universally agreed-upon principles that are both obvious and essential. They're often presented in a formal, structured manner, commonly found in textbooks that outline their framework within the United Nations and discuss legal approaches to their enforcement. These texts usually highlight the role of international courts, expert bodies and non-governmental organizations like Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International. However, delving deeper reveals that human rights hold diverse meanings and can have political implications. They're not as straightforward as they may seem. For some, human rights are seen as inherent to being human, existing independently of social recognition. They're viewed as negative



NOTES

obligations that prohibit states from engaging in certain acts, like torture or racial discrimination.

Others perceive human rights as political values adopted by societies, aspiring for universal acceptance but acknowledging the challenge of achieving it. Another perspective sees human rights as tools of resistance wielded by marginalized groups to challenge injustice and demand social and political change. This view recognizes that the struggle for human rights is ongoing, driven by a perpetual fight against injustice. Critical scholars offer a more nuanced view, seeing human rights as constructs shaped by discourse rather than inherent truths. They acknowledge that human rights discourse can be co-opted to serve various agendas, including imperial or neoliberal interests. This perspective highlights the complexities and power dynamics inherent in discussions about human rights, emphasizing that they're not solely about law and may not always lead to progress (Clapham, 2015).

5.3.2 The core assumptions of Human Rights

Human rights, despite their universal appeal, are a complex and contested concept with deep-rooted assumptions. From the dominant liberal internationalist perspective and international human rights law, three core assumptions emerge: they are seen as transformative and progressive, they are considered universal, and they presume a common subject on which these rights are conferred. The adoption of formal human rights frameworks in the post-World War II era marked a significant milestone in human history. It signalled a departure from a time when states could shield themselves from accountability behind claims of sovereignty. This period was viewed as a step forward in human progress, driven by the conviction that history moves towards a purposeful direction. Indeed, tangible achievements have been made globally—slavery has been abolished, women's rights have advanced, and children are better protected. These victories have bolstered faith in the ideals of human rights and reinforced the commitment to justice. However, skepticism exists regarding the transformative nature of human rights. Critics argue that the claim of progress is flawed both empirically and theoretically. Despite the emphasis on human rights in the 20th century, it witnessed a staggering number of violations. Post-colonial, feminist and critical theorists highlight the “dark side” of human rights, revealing imperialistic ambitions, assertions of moral

**NOTES**

and racial superiority, and religious evangelism underlying some interventions. Moreover, critiques extend to the structural limitations of human rights frameworks. The narrow focus on formalistic and individual rights fails to address systemic injustices. For instance, initiatives like the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa have been criticized for overlooking the broader socio-political context of apartheid, limiting their effectiveness in addressing structural inequalities.

The notion of universality is another cornerstone of human rights discourse. Human rights are perceived as objective and inclusive principles applicable to all individuals regardless of distinctions. Yet, scholars challenge this notion, arguing that claims to universality often conceal historical particularities and biases. The legacy of colonialism and Eurocentrism has shaped perceptions of who is deemed worthy of rights, perpetuating exclusionary practices. Contemporary examples, such as the treatment of refugees and the persecution of marginalized groups like the Rohingyas in Myanmar, underscore the ongoing struggle to fulfill the universal promise of human rights. Critics contend that assertions of universality overlook historical contexts and deny the experiences of those marginalized by these claims.

Human rights, a cornerstone of international discourse, revolve around the concept of the sovereign, autonomous individual. Every person, regardless of background or status, is deemed inherently equal and entitled to these fundamental rights. This notion of a universal human subject, independent and timeless, forms the bedrock of human rights frameworks, as evident in documents like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and various covenants. However, critical voices, particularly from postcolonial and Third World scholars, challenge this conventional understanding. They argue that the prevailing human subject in the global human rights regime relies on its 'Other' counterpart for its very existence. This 'Other' represents those marginalized or excluded from mainstream human rights discourse. While some may access rights, it's often conditional on their resemblance to the established human rights subject. The treatment of this 'Other' takes various forms. Assimilation suggests erasing differences to integrate the 'Other' into the familiar subjectivity, often through cultural or behavioural conformity. This approach is seen in historical colonial laws, where subjects had to adopt certain standards of civilization to access rights. Contemporary examples include the debate over Islamic veils in Europe, where wearing



NOTES

one may limit access to certain rights. Essentializing differences portrays marginalized groups as inherently different, justifying unequal treatment based on gender, race, or sexual orientation. This historical essentialism, seen in justifications for slavery or denial of women's rights, persists today, hindering access to rights through stereotypes and biases. Incarceration of the 'Other' involves outright denial or restriction of rights based on perceived threat or undesirability. Resistance to the 'Other' extends to contemporary issues like migration, where fears of social disruption or cultural dilution lead to policies that compromise human rights, such as harsh immigration laws or refusal to assist migrants in peril. These examples illustrate the complexities and challenges in realizing universal human rights. While the discourse centers on the autonomous individual, the treatment of the 'Other' reveals deep-seated biases and power dynamics that continue to shape the human rights landscape. Recognizing and addressing these dynamics is essential for building a more inclusive and equitable framework for human rights (Langlois, 2007).

5.3.3 Human rights in ethics, law and social activism

The discourse surrounding human rights encompasses a rich tapestry of theoretical debates spanning political science, moral philosophy, and jurisprudence. At its core, the term "human rights" or "human rights discourse" is invoked through moral reasoning, socially sanctioned norms, or social mobilization, each serving distinct but interconnected purposes depending on the context, audience and desired outcomes.

- **Human Rights as Ethical Concerns:** Human rights, as ethical concerns, are deeply rooted in fundamental principles of justice, empathy, and altruism. They represent a moral imperative for the fair and just treatment of individuals, drawing from diverse philosophical traditions spanning centuries. Amartya Sen's perspective underscores the ethical dimension of human rights, emphasizing the implicit presumption that these rights withstand open and informed scrutiny. Within moral reasoning, the term "human rights" often transcends mere legal entitlements, encompassing broader notions of inherent human dignity and entitlements grounded in philosophical concepts such as natural law, social contract theory, and theories of justice. This rich tapestry of ethical discourse

**NOTES**

reflects ongoing tensions between political liberalism and democratic egalitarianism, as well as competing conceptions of individual liberty and collective equality.

The ethical basis of human rights extends beyond abstract principles to encompass concrete concerns such as human flourishing, dignity, individual freedom, and social justice. These moral arguments form the bedrock of ethical discourse surrounding human rights, engaging with pressing contemporary issues such as exploitation based on sex, class, or caste.

- **Human Rights as Legal Rights (Positive Law Tradition):** In contrast to the ethical underpinnings of human rights, the legal perspective emphasizes their formal recognition within political and legal systems. Legal positivism views human rights as products of a norm-creating process, where authoritative formulations within laws, treaties, and international instruments confer legal status upon these rights. The evolution of human rights within the positive law tradition reflects a complex interplay of historical, political and societal factors. Legal recognition shapes the universality and scope of human rights, often subject to compromises and contextual interpretations. Documents like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and subsequent treaties serve as primary sources, embodying societal values and aspirations for justice. However, the legal positivist perspective raises questions about the nature of human rights, challenging assumptions of inherent or divine entitlements. Instead, it highlights the role of legal frameworks in codifying and enforcing human rights, subject to pragmatic considerations and evolving norms.
- **Human Rights as Social Claims:** Before formal recognition in legal texts, human rights often emerge as social claims driven by grassroots activism and advocacy. Social mobilization against injustices catalyzes movements for change, grounded in moral sentiments and cultural beliefs. NGOs and civil society organizations play a crucial role in amplifying these social claims, challenging existing norms, and advocating for transformative change. The appeal to human rights in advocacy discourse is both legitimate and powerful, inspiring legal and philosophical inquiry. Grassroots movements challenge the status quo, pushing



NOTES

for the expansion of rights and protections for marginalized communities. Their efforts contribute to the evolution of human rights norms, shaping societal attitudes and legislative frameworks.

5.3.4 The Global Human Rights Structure

In the tumultuous aftermath of World War II, the 20th century bore witness to a remarkable surge in the recognition of human rights. The establishment of the United Nations in 1945 marked a pivotal moment, as human rights became a central focus of the organization's mission. The Commission on Human Rights, formed initially to craft the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), laid the groundwork for holding states accountable for human rights violations. This commission later evolved into the Human Rights Council in 2006.

The adoption of the UDHR by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948 was a landmark achievement, representing a culmination of global dialogue affirming the intrinsic importance of human rights in fostering a just and democratic world order. The UDHR delineates a comprehensive array of rights, encompassing civil, political, economic, social, and cultural dimensions. These rights are universally applicable, underscoring their indivisibility and interdependence across all nations and peoples. Building upon the UDHR, two significant international covenants were established. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) aims to safeguard individuals against state abuse and ensure broad political participation. Key provisions include protections for equality before the law, freedom of speech, assembly, and the right to life. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) guarantees access to essential resources such as education, food, housing and healthcare, fostering inclusive social and cultural participation. Since their ratification in 1976, numerous binding international treaties have been adopted, addressing issues ranging from racial and gender discrimination to torture and the rights of marginalized groups such as children, migrants, and indigenous peoples.

In terms of accountability, the formal human rights apparatus encompasses various mechanisms to hold states accountable for violations. These include reporting processes, individual complaint mechanisms, and the universal periodic review conducted by the

**NOTES**

Human Rights Council. Additionally, specialized procedures, such as country visits and thematic studies, provide in-depth scrutiny of human rights issues on both national and global scales. At the international level, the International Criminal Court (ICC) plays a critical role in prosecuting grave human rights abuses, including genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. Regionally, multilateral and regional mechanisms, such as the European Court of Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, serve to monitor and enforce human rights standards within their respective jurisdictions. Furthermore, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and grassroots movements play a vital role in advocating for human rights and holding states accountable. While international NGOs like Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International wield significant influence, local and regional organizations often serve as essential actors in grassroots mobilization and community-based advocacy efforts.

Despite these advancements, challenges persist, including funding constraints, donor-driven agendas, and geopolitical divides that can hinder the effectiveness of human rights advocacy and accountability efforts. Balancing the roles of international and local actors remains crucial in addressing these complex challenges and advancing the global human rights agenda (Baxi, 2002).

5.3.5 The Humanitarian Intervention in World Politics

Humanitarian intervention is a challenging dilemma for an international community grounded in the principles of sovereignty, non-intervention, and the non-use of force. After the Holocaust, the global community enacted laws to prevent genocide, protect civilians, and uphold basic human rights. However, these humanitarian principles often clash with the doctrines of sovereignty and non-intervention. States are traditionally expected to safeguard their citizens, but what should be done when a state turns against its own people, using its sovereignty as a license to commit atrocities? Should such tyrannical regimes still be recognized as legitimate members of the international community, shielded by the principle of non-intervention? Or should they lose their sovereign rights and be subject to intervention if they grossly abuse or fail to protect their citizens? Moreover, what obligations do other states or international bodies have to enforce human rights against governments that commit widespread violations?



NOTES

During the Cold War, armed humanitarian intervention was not considered a legitimate practice because the international community prioritized sovereignty and order over the enforcement of human rights. This perspective began to shift in the 1990s, but the new norm remained weak. It wasn't until the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) adopted Resolution 1973 in 2011, in response to the humanitarian crisis in Libya, that forcible intervention against a sovereign state was authorized. Even then, interventions without UNSC authorization remained highly controversial. Many states, particularly in the Global South, continued to fear that humanitarian intervention was merely a pretext for powerful nations to meddle in the affairs of weaker ones.

Simultaneously, a coalition of states from both the Global North and South, along with non-governmental organizations (NGOs), sought to build a consensus around the principle of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). This principle asserts that states have the primary responsibility to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. The UNSC has invoked R2P in numerous crises, including those in Libya, Syria, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Mali, South Sudan, Yemen, and Darfur. This evolving norm reflects a growing recognition that the international community must act to prevent mass atrocities, despite the enduring tensions between humanitarian imperatives and state sovereignty.

The Case for Human Intervention

It includes:

- 1. Human Security:** Traditionally, both realist and liberal scholars have understood security as the domain of states. Security studies, therefore, have predominantly focused on the security of states. This perspective posits that security is best achieved through a basic degree of international order, where each state recognizes every other state's right to govern a specific territory and engage in external relations. Key principles underpinning state security include sovereignty and non-interference, foundations of the “rules-based” or “liberal” order established post-World War II. This framework is often referred to as “Westphalian sovereignty,” named after the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, which established a world order based on the rights of sovereigns to govern their own

**NOTES**

people as they saw fit. The Westphalian system's value lies in the assumption that sovereign states are the best guardians of human security, as they protect their citizens from violence. However, in practice, states often become sources of profound insecurity. For instance, in the twentieth century alone, governments were responsible for the deaths of approximately 262 million people, a figure six times greater than those killed in all the international wars of that period. This stark reality has led to the emergence of the human security approach in the 1990s, which calls for a reconceptualization of security to focus on individuals and communities rather than states.

- 2. Broadening the Scope of Security Threats:** The human security approach had two profound effects on our understanding of security. First, it broadened the range of perceived security threats. From the perspective of individuals, issues like poverty, human rights abuses, gender violence, civil war, and climate change pose more significant threats than interstate wars. Second, it highlighted that states could be primary sources of threat, given their roles in perpetrating genocide and mass atrocities. This shift raised crucial moral, legal, and practical questions about whether states should retain their sovereign rights when they systematically abuse their populations.
- 3. Legal Arguments for Humanitarian Intervention:** The case for a legal right of individual and collective humanitarian intervention, known as the “counter-restrictionist” perspective, rests on two claims: first, the UN Charter (1945) commits states to protecting fundamental human rights; second, a right of humanitarian intervention exists in customary international law. Counter-restrictionists argue that human rights are as important as peace and security within the UN Charter. They interpret the Charter’s preamble and Articles 1(3), 55, and 56 as emphasizing the protection of human rights, suggesting a humanitarian exception to the ban on the use of force in Article 2(4). Some international lawyers contend that humanitarian intervention does not breach Article 2(4) since it does not threaten the “political independence” or “territorial integrity” of states. Others argue that while the UN Charter does not explicitly permit unilateral humanitarian intervention, customary international law allows it. They cite historical precedents, such as interventions in Greece (1827) and



NOTES

Cuba (1898), and more recent instances like the creation of safe havens in Iraq (1991) and the proposed intervention in Syria (2013), to support this claim.

- 4. Moral Arguments for Humanitarian Intervention:** Beyond legal considerations, many argue that there is a moral duty to intervene to protect civilians from genocide and mass killings. They assert that sovereignty is contingent upon a state's responsibility to protect its citizens, and failure to do so should result in the loss of sovereign rights. Advocates point to a common humanity and global interconnectedness, arguing that massive human rights violations in one part of the world affect everyone, thereby creating moral obligations to intervene. Supporters of just war theory argue for a universal duty to offer charity to those in need, suggesting a moral imperative to prevent mass killings and punish perpetrators. They cite moral agreement among major world religions and ethical systems about the duty to prevent atrocities.
- 5. Challenges and Concerns:** However, this perspective is not without problems. Granting states a moral permit to intervene risks potential abuse, where humanitarian arguments could be used to justify wars that are far from humanitarian. Furthermore, defining the threshold for humanitarian intervention is challenging—how severe must a crisis be before force is justified? There is also the contentious issue of whether force should be used pre-emptively to prevent a humanitarian emergency.

The Case against the Humanitarian Intervention

Scholars, international lawyers, and policymakers have raised seven main objections to humanitarian intervention. These objections are not mutually exclusive and are discussed across various theoretical frameworks including realism, liberalism, feminism, and postcolonial theory. Each framework places different emphasis on these objections as mentioned below:

- 1. Lack of Legal Basis for Humanitarian Intervention:** Restrictionist international lawyers argue that international law strictly limits the use of force, with exceptions only for self-defense under Article 51 of the UN Charter. They maintain that Article 2(4) prohibits any use of force without UN Security Council

**NOTES**

(UNSC) authorization. Historically, states have avoided claiming a legal right to humanitarian intervention. Instead, they justify their actions under self-defense or implied UNSC authorization, as seen in India's 1971 intervention in East Pakistan, Vietnam's 1978 intervention in Cambodia, and the US-led NATO intervention in Kosovo in 1999.

- 2. States' Motivations Are Not Primarily Humanitarian:** Interventions are often driven by a mix of motives, with states rarely willing to risk their soldiers' lives without some self-interest at stake. Realists argue that true humanitarian interventions are impractical because they do not align with national interests. Critics suggest that powerful states intervene when it benefits them, implying that interventions are more about national interest than aiding victims.
- 3. Risking Soldiers' Lives for Strangers:** Realists believe states should prioritize their citizens' safety and not intervene solely for humanitarian reasons. Political leaders, according to this view, lack the moral authority to risk their soldiers' lives for foreign crises. They argue that dealing with internal issues should be the responsibility of the affected state's citizens and leaders, not external forces.
- 4. Potential for Abuse:** Without an impartial mechanism to decide when intervention is justified, states might exploit humanitarian motives to pursue national interests. The pretext of protecting human rights could mask ulterior motives, as exemplified by Hitler's justification for invading Czechoslovakia. Critics fear that legalizing humanitarian intervention would enable more powerful states to interfere in weaker states' affairs under false pretenses.
- 5. Selective Application of Humanitarian Principles:** States apply humanitarian principles selectively, often influenced by national interest rather than consistent moral standards. This selectivity leads to inconsistent responses, undermining the credibility of humanitarian intervention. For instance, NATO's intervention in Kosovo contrasts sharply with the lack of action in the more severe humanitarian crisis in Darfur.
- 6. Disagreement on Moral Principles:** Pluralist international society theory highlights the difficulty in reaching a consensus on the moral principles that should guide humanitarian intervention. Without agreement on what constitutes extreme



NOTES

human rights violations, powerful states might impose their culturally specific values on weaker states, leading to further discord and potential misuse of intervention rights.

7. Ineffectiveness of Intervention: Critics argue that humanitarian intervention often fails to achieve its goals. According to some liberal thinkers, such as John Stuart Mill, sustainable democracy and human rights must emerge from internal struggles, not external imposition. Interventions may inadvertently cause more harm, such as inciting rebellions that provoke severe government reprisals, thereby triggering further violence and instability. Globalization is pushing forward ideas of global moral interconnectedness, encouraging people to see themselves as part of a larger, interconnected world. However, despite this growth in cosmopolitan moral sensibilities, there hasn't been a clear consensus internationally regarding when it's appropriate to intervene forcibly for humanitarian reasons. While Western societies are becoming more aware and sensitive to the suffering of others, their response to that suffering can be quite selective. Sometimes, interventions that start with humanitarian intentions can end up straying from that path and pursuing goals that conflict with the original purpose.

Another significant issue with the idea of forcible humanitarian intervention is what's often referred to as the 'body-bag' factor. Essentially, it questions whether the public, especially in Western countries, is willing to accept military casualties in the name of humanitarian causes. Notably, despite numerous humanitarian crises since the end of the Cold War, no Western government has taken the risk of deploying its military personnel in defense of human rights when there was a high likelihood of casualties. The concept of the 'responsibility to protect' (RtoP) has emerged as an attempt to change the dynamics of the debate surrounding humanitarian intervention. It aims to shift the conversation and actions concerning genocide and mass atrocities. Its adoption at the 2005 UN World Summit marked a significant milestone, altering the political discourse surrounding humanitarian intervention. However, while RtoP holds promise in reshaping how the international community addresses such crises, it's seen as a long-term agenda that may not immediately spark new political determination (Brown, 2008).



Conclusion

NOTES

The exploration of human rights and humanitarian intervention reveals a rich tapestry of complexities, contradictions, and challenges inherent in the pursuit of justice and dignity on a global scale. Throughout this lesson, we have traversed diverse perspectives, examined core assumptions, and scrutinized the intricate interplay between ethics, law, and activism. Human rights, as we have learned, are not static principles but dynamic constructs shaped by historical, cultural, and political forces. While they embody universal ideals of fairness and equality, their implementation often encounters obstacles rooted in power dynamics, historical legacies, and cultural contexts. From the liberal internationalist perspective to critical and postcolonial critiques, the discourse surrounding human rights reflects a multiplicity of voices and perspectives, underscoring the need for nuanced understanding and engagement. Central to the discourse on human rights is the complex issue of humanitarian intervention. As the global community grapples with atrocities and mass violations of human dignity, questions of sovereignty, legitimacy, and efficacy come to the forefront. Through contrasting perspectives and rigorous analysis, we have explored the moral and legal dilemmas inherent in navigating geopolitical realities and ethical imperatives.

Despite the challenges, our examination has underscored the enduring importance of human rights as a moral compass guiding societies toward a more equitable humane existence. While progress may be incremental and obstacles may be formidable, the commitment to justice and dignity remains unwavering. By critically engaging with the complexities of human rights and humanitarian intervention, we are better equipped to confront the injustices of our time and strive for a world where every individual is afforded the rights and freedoms they deserve.

As we conclude our exploration, let us heed the lessons learned and the insights gained, recognizing that the journey towards a more compassionate world is ongoing and requires collective action, empathy, and perseverance. Through continued dialogue, advocacy, and activism, we can work towards realizing the full potential of human rights and building a future where dignity and equality are truly universal.



NOTES

In-Text Questions

Multiple Choice Questions (1-5):

1. What is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)?
 - A) A treaty guaranteeing civil and political rights.
 - B) A document outlining basic rights and freedoms for all humans.
 - C) An organization monitoring human rights violations.
 - D) A legal system for prosecuting war crimes.
2. The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle emphasizes:
 - A) The sovereignty of states over all other considerations.
 - B) The duty of states to protect their populations from genocide and crimes against humanity.
 - C) The economic and cultural rights of individuals.
 - D) The prioritization of political stability over human rights.
3. Which international body prosecutes individuals for crimes such as genocide and war crimes?
 - A) United Nations Human Rights Council
 - B) International Court of Justice
 - C) International Criminal Court (ICC)
 - D) Amnesty International
4. The term “Westphalian sovereignty” refers to:
 - A) The authority of international organizations to intervene in state affairs.
 - B) The principle that states have sovereignty over their territory and domestic affairs.
 - C) The legal recognition of human rights.
 - D) The universal application of human rights.

**NOTES**

5. Humanitarian intervention often involves:

- A) Financial aid to developing countries.
- B) Military action to prevent or stop human rights violations.
- C) Diplomatic negotiations for trade agreements.
- D) Promoting cultural exchange programs.

Fill in the Blanks (6-10):

- 6. The _____ outlines basic rights and freedoms for all humans.
- 7. The _____ has the responsibility to protect populations from genocide and other crimes against humanity.
- 8. _____ refers to the principle that each state has sovereignty over its territory and domestic affairs.
- 9. The _____ is an international court established to prosecute individuals for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.
- 10. _____ are independent organizations that work towards various social, political, or humanitarian goals.

5.4 SUMMARY

- Human rights are moral principles that outline the fundamental rights and freedoms entitled to all humans.
- These rights are protected under international laws and frameworks, including the UDHR, ICCPR, and ICESCR.
- The core assumptions of human rights include their transformative nature, universality, and the concept of a common human subject.
- Human rights intersect with ethics, law, and social activism, serving as moral imperatives and legal entitlements.
- Ethical perspectives on human rights emphasize justice, empathy, and altruism, while legal perspectives focus on their formal recognition.



NOTES

- Grassroots activism and NGOs play crucial roles in advocating for human rights and challenging injustices.
- The global human rights structure includes mechanisms like the Human Rights Council and the ICC to hold states accountable for violations.
- Despite formal frameworks, human rights implementation faces challenges, including geopolitical tensions and funding constraints.
- Humanitarian intervention remains a contentious issue, balancing state sovereignty with the need to protect populations from atrocities.
- The principle of R2P highlights the responsibility of states and the international community to protect vulnerable populations.
- Historical contexts, such as colonialism, have influenced perceptions of universality in human rights.
- Critiques of human rights frameworks point to their limitations in addressing systemic injustices.
- The ethical, legal, and social dimensions of human rights are complex and often involve power dynamics and political agendas.
- The notion of a universal human subject is debated, with critical perspectives highlighting the exclusion of marginalized groups.
- The effectiveness of human rights advocacy depends on the collaboration of international and local actors.
- The post-World War II era marked a significant shift in the global human rights landscape, with increased focus on accountability and justice.
- The tension between humanitarian intervention and state sovereignty continues to shape international relations.
- Legal arguments for humanitarian intervention emphasize the protection of fundamental human rights under international law.

**NOTES**

- Human security, as a concept, expands the understanding of security threats beyond state-centric perspectives.
- The global community's commitment to human rights is challenged by practical and ethical dilemmas in enforcing these principles.

5.5 GLOSSARY

- **Human Rights:** These are fundamental rights and freedoms that every person is entitled to regardless of nationality, sex, ethnicity, religion, or any other status.
- **Humanitarian Intervention:** These are actions taken by states or international organizations to prevent or stop violations of human rights, often involving military force.
- **Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR):** It is a landmark international document adopted by the United Nations in 1948, outlining basic rights and freedoms for all humans.
- **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR):** It is a treaty ensuring the protection of civil and political rights.
- **International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR):** It is a treaty guaranteeing economic, social, and cultural rights.
- **Responsibility to Protect (R2P):** It is a global norm that states have a duty to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity.
- **Ethics:** Ethics are moral principles that govern a person's behaviour or the conducting of an activity.
- **Legal Positivism:** It is a school of thought that views laws as rules set by human beings and considers law as distinct from morality.



NOTES

- **Grassroots Activism:** Local or community-based movements aiming to bring about social or political change.
- **Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs):** These are independent organizations that work towards various social, political, or humanitarian goals.
- **International Criminal Court (ICC):** It is a permanent international court established to prosecute individuals for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.
- **Westphalian Sovereignty:** It is a principle of international law that each state has sovereignty over its territory and domestic affairs.
- **Genocide:** It is the deliberate and systematic destruction of a racial, political, or cultural group.

5.6 ANSWERS TO IN-TEXT QUESTIONS

1. B: A document outlining basic rights and freedoms for all humans.
2. B: The duty of states to protect their populations from genocide and crimes against humanity.
3. C: International Criminal Court (ICC)
4. B: The principle that states have sovereignty over their territory and domestic affairs.
5. B: Military action to prevent or stop human rights violations.
6. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)
7. Responsibility to Protect (R2P)
8. Westphalian sovereignty
9. International Criminal Court (ICC)
10. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)



5.7 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Define human rights and explain why they are considered essential for individuals and groups within society.
2. Discuss the various perspectives on human rights, including the liberal internationalist perspective, critical perspectives, and postcolonial critiques. How do these perspectives shape our understanding of human rights?
3. What are the core assumptions of human rights according to the dominant liberal internationalist perspective? How do these assumptions influence the discourse and implementation of human rights?
4. Explore the intersection of human rights with ethics, law, and social activism. Provide examples of how each domain contributes to the promotion and protection of human rights.
5. Describe the global human rights structure, including key mechanisms and institutions responsible for upholding human rights. Assess the effectiveness of these mechanisms in addressing human rights violations.
6. Analyze the concept of humanitarian intervention in world politics. What are the moral, legal, and practical considerations involved in deciding whether to intervene in a humanitarian crisis?
7. Evaluate the arguments for and against humanitarian intervention, considering legal justifications, moral imperatives, and concerns regarding sovereignty, selectivity, and effectiveness.

5.8 REFERENCES/SUGGESTED READINGS

- Langlois, A.J., *Human Rights*. In Devetak, R., Burke, A. & George, J. (eds.), *An Introduction to International Relations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007, pp. 440-449.



NOTES

- Baxi, U., *An Age of Human Rights?* In Baxi, U. (ed.), *The Future of Human Rights*. Oxford University Press, Delhi, 2002, pp. 1-32.
- Brown, C., *Human Rights*. In Baylis, J. & Smith, S. (eds.), *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. 4th Edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2008, pp. 506-521.
- Clapham, A., *A Very Short Introduction to Human Rights*. Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2015, Chapters two and three, pp. 22-80.



LESSON 6

GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND CLIMATE CHANGE NEGOTIATIONS

Shaitan Singh

Assistant Professor
School of Open Learning
University of Delhi, Delhi

STRUCTURE

- 6.1 Learning Objectives
- 6.2 Introduction
- 6.3 Global governance and Climate change Negotiations
 - 6.3.1 Understanding the global governance and climate change negotiations
 - 6.3.2 The modes of global governance
 - 6.3.3 The State and Global Governance
 - 6.3.4 The global governance gaps
 - 6.3.5 Climate change governance
 - 6.3.6 Clean Energy and Global Governance
- 6.4 Summary
- 6.5 Glossary
- 6.6 Answers to In-Text Questions
- 6.7 Self-Assessment Questions
- 6.8 References/Suggested Readings

6.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to:

- Understand the concept of global governance and its significance.
- Examine the challenges and complexities inherent in global climate negotiations, such as historical injustices, divergent interests, and enforcement mechanisms.
- Examine the evolution of clean energy governance, including the establishment of norms, policies and institutions aimed at transitioning towards sustainable energy systems.



NOTES

- Analyze the modes of global governance, including hierarchical, networked and market-driven approaches and their implications for addressing climate change and other global challenges.
- Critically evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of existing global governance mechanisms in addressing pressing global challenges, such as knowledge disparities, normative disagreements and institutional gaps.

6.2 INTRODUCTION

This lesson delves into the intricate realms of global governance and climate change negotiations, offering a panoramic view of the multifaceted landscape shaping our planet's future. At its core, global governance encompasses the intricate web of interactions and institutions orchestrating collective responses to shared global challenges. Nestled within this framework are climate change negotiations, a crucible where nations, international organizations, and non-state actors converge to address the existential threat of climate change. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) stands as the principal arena for these negotiations, hosting annual Conference of the Parties (COP) meetings where divergent interests collide against the backdrop of historical legacies and evolving scientific understandings. Central to these negotiations are the persistent disparities between developed and developing nations, echoing historical injustices and economic realities. Bridging this gap demands a delicate balance between equity and ambition, navigating the complexities of financing, technology transfer, and adaptation. Against the backdrop of historical legacies of colonialism and imperialism, climate negotiations grapple with questions of justice, reparations, and historical responsibility. The principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities" (CBDR-RC) underpins these discussions, recognizing the divergent historical contributions to climate change. Enforcement mechanisms emerge as a critical dimension of global climate governance, ensuring the efficacy of international agreements. Yet, the fragility of the international climate regime is underscored by the absence of legally binding commitments and the withdrawal of key actors, highlighting the vulnerability of global climate cooperation to



NOTES

geopolitical shifts. Amidst these challenges, this lesson charts a path forward, envisioning a future grounded in solidarity, cooperation, and shared responsibility. As the world grapples with the dual crises of COVID-19 and climate change, there exists an opportunity to forge a more equitable and sustainable path forward, centered on principles of justice, equity, and sustainability. The trajectory of global climate governance, as illuminated by upcoming COP meetings, will be shaped by a confluence of factors, from geopolitical tensions to technological innovations. Key issues such as increasing ambition in Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and enhancing climate finance will demand concerted efforts from all stakeholders. Fostering inclusive decision-making processes that center the voices of marginalized communities will be essential for building a truly sustainable future.

6.3 GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND CLIMATE CHANGE NEGOTIATIONS

6.3.1 Understanding the Global Governance and Climate Change Negotiations

Global governance and climate change negotiations stand at the forefront of contemporary global challenges, demanding nuanced analysis and strategic responses. At its essence, global governance denotes the intricate web of interactions and institutions that mediate the actions of states, international organizations, and non-state actors in addressing common global concerns. Climate change negotiations, nestled within this framework, represent a concerted effort to navigate the complexities of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, mitigating climate impacts, and fostering resilience across diverse socio-economic landscapes. This multifaceted endeavour involves a spectrum of actors, from nation-states to civil society groups, each wielding varying degrees of influence and agency. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) serves as the principal platform for these negotiations, convening annual Conference of the Parties (COP) meetings where deliberations unfold amidst a backdrop of divergent interests, historical grievances, and evolving scientific understanding. Central to the challenges inherent in global climate governance are the



NOTES

divergent interests and priorities of participating nations. Developed countries often advocate for stringent emissions reductions, emphasizing historical responsibility and the imperative of mitigating climate change. Conversely, developing nations may prioritize economic growth and poverty alleviation, asserting their right to pursue development pathways unencumbered by stringent emission targets. Bridging this gap necessitates a delicate balance between equity and ambition, recognizing the asymmetries of historical emissions while fostering a shared commitment to collective action. Furthermore, issues of financing loom large in climate negotiations, with developing countries insisting on adequate financial support and technology transfer to facilitate their transition to low-carbon economies. Disputes over funding mechanisms and the fulfilment of existing pledges underscore the perennial challenge of translating financial commitments into tangible climate action on the ground.

Historical legacies of colonialism and imperialism further complicate the terrain of climate negotiations, imbuing discussions with questions of justice, reparations and historical responsibility. The principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities” (CBDR-RC) enshrined in the UNFCCC recognizes the differential historical contributions to climate change and underscores the need for tailored approaches to climate action. However, operationalizing this principle remains fraught with challenges, as evidenced by the protracted debates over burden-sharing and the allocation of emission reduction targets. Addressing these historical injustices demands not only financial restitution but also a reckoning with systemic inequalities and power imbalances that continue to shape global climate governance.

Enforcement mechanisms constitute another critical dimension of global climate governance, with the efficacy of international agreements contingent on robust monitoring, reporting, and verification mechanisms. The Paris Agreement, hailed as a landmark accord for its inclusive architecture and ambitious temperature targets, nonetheless grapples with the challenge of ensuring compliance and accountability. The absence of legally binding commitments and the lack of meaningful penalties for non-compliance underscore the fragility of the international climate regime. Moreover, the withdrawal of key actors such as the United States underlines the tenuous nature of global climate cooperation and the susceptibility of climate agreements to geopolitical shifts and domestic politics. Despite these challenges, the landscape of global climate

**NOTES**

governance is not devoid of progress and innovation. The Paris Agreement, with its emphasis on nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and long-term decarbonization goals, represents a paradigm shift towards bottom-up, participatory approaches to climate action. The burgeoning momentum around renewable energy, green finance, and sustainable development offers glimmers of hope amidst the gloom of climate pessimism. Moreover, the growing role of non-state actors, including cities, businesses, and civil society organizations, underscores the importance of multi-level governance and decentralized climate action.

The COVID-19 pandemic has both disrupted and reshaped the contours of global climate governance, highlighting the interplay between environmental, social and economic crises. The pandemic-induced economic slowdown led to a temporary dip in global emissions, offering a glimpse of what radical emissions reductions might entail. However, the uneven impacts of the pandemic have exacerbated existing inequalities, underscoring the imperative of integrating climate resilience and social equity into recovery efforts. As the world grapples with the dual crises of COVID-19 and climate change, there exists an opportunity to forge a more equitable and sustainable path forward, grounded in solidarity, cooperation and shared responsibility. Looking ahead, the trajectory of global climate governance will be shaped by a confluence of factors, from geopolitical tensions and technological innovations to social movements and cultural shifts. The upcoming COP meetings, including COP27 and beyond, will serve as critical junctures for reinvigorating global climate action and advancing the objectives laid out in the Paris Agreement. Key issues such as increasing ambition in NDCs, enhancing climate finance, and strengthening adaptation and resilience efforts will require concerted efforts from all stakeholders. Moreover, fostering inclusive, participatory decision-making processes that center the voices of marginalized communities will be essential for building a truly sustainable and just future.

The global governance and climate change negotiations represent an ongoing struggle to reconcile competing interests, historical injustices, and existential threats. Navigating this complex terrain demands a nuanced understanding of power dynamics, historical legacies, and systemic inequalities that shape the contours of global climate governance. While challenges abound, the imperative of collective action and solidarity offers a glimmer of hope amidst the uncertainty of the Anthropocene. By embracing a



NOTES

holistic, inclusive approach to climate governance, grounded in principles of justice, equity, and sustainability, humanity can chart a course towards a more resilient and thriving planet for generations to come (Agarwal et al, 1991).

6.3.2 The Modes of Global Governance

Global governance traces its roots to the mid-nineteenth century but truly flourished following the upheavals of the two World Wars. In the aftermath of these conflicts, particularly the Second World War, nations recognized the necessity for a more coordinated approach to address global challenges. Spearheaded by influential figures like Harry Dexter White, John Maynard Keynes, Dean Acheson, and Jean Monnet, states embarked on a journey to establish comprehensive international organizations. These institutions, often embodied by grand edifices in cities like New York, Washington, or Geneva, symbolized a concerted effort to reshape the global landscape. However, as we reflect on these developments some seventy-five years later, scholars have begun to employ different narratives to capture the evolving nature of global governance. The traditional Westphalian model has given way to a more nuanced, post-Westphalian framework. Terms like “modern” have yielded to “post-modern,” signalling a shift in paradigms. The emergence of “new multilateralism” and a “Copernican world” underscores this transformation. Governance today is characterized by orchestration, delegated authority and a proliferation of stakeholders, reflecting a departure from the traditional state-centric approach.

The landscape of global governance has indeed become more diverse and intricate. While states and international organizations still play pivotal roles, they now operate alongside an array of actors, including NGOs, public-private partnerships, and transnational networks. The Global Alliance on Vaccines (Gavi) serves as a prime example, with its collaborative effort involving global institutions, foundations, private sector entities and governments. This shift in actors has been accompanied by a redefined relationship dynamics. Formerly dominant players like states and IOs now share the stage, fostering new patterns of inclusion. However, inclusion doesn't necessarily equate to equality, and power imbalances persist, leaving some voices marginalized. Moreover, the terrain of global governance has evolved from formal treaties and secretariats to more informal, decentralized spaces. The implications of



NOTES

these changes are hotly debated. Some argue that the evolving landscape reflects a rational adaptation to the complexities of the 21st century, fostering subtler and more pluralistic forms of governance. Others caution against the rise of dysfunctional outcomes driven by short-term interests and power dynamics. Additionally, the ambitious agendas of post-World War II institutions have given way to a more modest, experimental approach, raising questions about the effectiveness of contemporary governance mechanisms. To better understand these shifts, scholars have turned to different modes of governance – hierarchy, network, and market – as analytical lenses. While some contend that traditional hierarchical structures are waning in favour of more networked and market-driven approaches, the reality is more nuanced. Hierarchies persist, albeit in shadow form, influencing contemporary governance dynamics.

Several drivers underpin these evolving modes of governance, including geopolitical shifts, economic changes, and technological advancements. These structural forces intersect and intertwine, shaping the trajectory of global governance. Yet amidst this complexity, questions of effectiveness and normative considerations remain paramount, driving ongoing discourse and debate.

Global governance today is a dynamic tapestry woven with a diverse array of actors and mechanisms. While traditional states and intergovernmental organizations (IOs) remain pivotal, they now share the stage with a plethora of non-state actors, marking a significant shift in both quantity and quality. The evolution of global governance can be glimpsed through changing numbers of IOs, NGOs, networks, and trans governmental initiatives (TGIs). While these figures offer insights, they only scratch the surface of a complex landscape. The rise of NGOs, networks, and other non-state actors mirrors a broader trend towards inclusivity and diversification in decision-making processes. NGOs, in particular, have surged in number and influence, contributing to agenda-setting, negotiations, and monitoring of state compliance. Networks, though harder to quantify, have also proliferated, stepping in to fill gaps left by traditional IOs or complementing their efforts. Public-private partnerships, corporations, municipalities, and expert communities further enrich the governance landscape, each bringing unique perspectives and capacities to the table. But beneath this surface diversity lies a deeper question: how are these actors organizing themselves to govern? Modes of governance offer a lens through which to explore this question, distinguishing between hierarchical,



NOTES

market-driven, and network-based approaches. Hierarchies rely on centralized control, markets on decentralized incentives, and networks on negotiated agreements among equals. Yet, in practice, these modes often intertwine, creating hybrid forms of governance. Even in ostensibly market-driven or networked arrangements, hierarchies exert a subtle influence, providing the regulatory framework within which these modes operate. This “shadow of hierarchy” underscores the enduring importance of institutional structures, even in ostensibly decentralized systems. The concept of modes of governance allows for nuanced analysis across different issue areas and functions of governance. While hierarchies may dominate certain aspects, such as rule-making, networks may play a more prominent role in monitoring or implementation. Recognizing this complexity is essential for understanding the evolving nature of global governance and its implications for addressing pressing global challenges (Weiss, 2013).

6.3.3 The State and Global Governance

The increasing complexity of global issues, coupled with the rise of various actors involved in trans-boundary affairs, has highlighted the necessity for structured cooperation. Global market forces wield significant influence, evident in actions such as powerful governments advocating for their multinational corporations in trade disputes and the conditionalities attached to IMF loans. Despite this, there lacks a cohesive strategy for addressing global challenges, with sporadic effective measures taken by individual states and their affiliated organizations. Relying solely on the aggregate impact of national policies driven by self-interest is insufficient to tackle existential threats to humanity.

States remain the central players in global affairs, with sovereignty serving as the cornerstone principle governing their interactions. Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) play a crucial role in fostering collaboration among states to pursue common objectives and manage competition, thereby mitigating conflict potential. However, the proliferation of IGOs and non-state actors does not automatically translate into effective global governance. The evolution of intergovernmental institutions has lagged behind the emergence of collective transnational challenges, necessitating a more proactive approach to institution-building. In response to crises like the 2008 financial meltdown, ad hoc forums such as the G20 have emerged, showcasing attempts at

**NOTES**

institutionalized collaboration. While these efforts have provided temporary relief, they often revert to business-as-usual once immediate threats recede. The European Union's experience illustrates the challenges of achieving deeper integration amidst divergent national interests, highlighting the need for enhanced coordination to address systemic issues effectively. Critics argue that IGOs suffer from a "democratic deficit," with decision-making processes lacking transparency and public accountability. In liberal democracies, major political decisions are subject to public scrutiny through elections and legislative oversight, whereas interstate decision-making often occurs behind closed doors, diminishing democratic scrutiny. Power dynamics play a pivotal role in shaping global governance outcomes, extending beyond traditional state-centric perspectives. Various actors, including non-state entities like transnational corporations (TNCs) and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), wield influence through both material resources and normative authority. The ability to shape agendas, establish rules and influence policy outcomes underscores the multi-faceted nature of power in contemporary global governance.

6.3.4 The Global Governance Gaps

Acknowledging the gaps in global governance is crucial as it not only highlights areas requiring attention but also recognizes past achievements. It provides a comprehensive understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of different actors on the global stage. While focusing on these gaps may sometimes lead to maintaining the status quo and incremental changes, it also serves as a reminder of the urgent need for more radical reforms. The framework of gaps encompasses various aspects, starting with knowledge. Shared understanding among major global actors is essential for addressing major challenges effectively. However, disparities in knowledge, particularly across regions, pose significant hurdles. Bridging these knowledge gaps is fundamental for informed policy formulation and international cooperation, especially on contentious issues like climate change and nuclear proliferation.

Norms, another critical component, often face challenges in achieving universal acceptance. Cultural differences can lead to disagreements on fundamental principles like human rights, complicating efforts to establish global norms. Civil society plays a vital role in advocating for normative change, complementing the efforts of international



NOTES

institutions like the UN in setting global standards. Policies, as interlinked principles and actions, form the backbone of global governance. From environmental agreements like the Kyoto Protocol to nuclear non-proliferation treaties, policies shape collective responses to global challenges. However, the effectiveness of these policies depends on their formulation, adoption, and implementation, which often face political and logistical hurdles. Institutions provide the necessary structure for effective governance, yet many global organizations lack the authority and resources to address transnational issues adequately. The gap between institutional mandates and practical capabilities hinders global cooperation, especially in areas like peacekeeping and human rights enforcement. Finally, compliance remains a persistent challenge in global governance. Despite the existence of knowledge, norms, policies, and institutions, ensuring adherence to international agreements remains elusive. The lack of enforcement mechanisms and political will undermines efforts to tackle pressing global problems effectively. Addressing these gaps requires concerted efforts from states, international organizations, and civil society. While incremental progress has been made, the need for more robust institutions and mechanisms for global cooperation is evident. Bridging these gaps is essential for building a more equitable, stable, and prosperous world for all.

6.3.5 Climate Change Governance

The shifts in climate governance represent not just a relocation of authority but rather an expansion, akin to a “choose your own adventure” narrative. In this new era, various actors—from non-state entities to subnational bodies like cities—have gained agency to tailor their approaches to combatting climate change. States, both developed and developing, now wield the power to determine their own climate policies. Contrary to the notion that this approach diminishes state authority, it actually amplifies it by offering more avenues for engagement and coordination with non-state and subnational actors. Rather than a zero-sum game, authority in the climate regime is better understood as a positive-sum scenario, where multiple actors contribute to collective action. To grasp this proliferation of authority, it’s insightful to contrast the designs of the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement. While Kyoto was often seen as a top-down hierarchy, Paris is heralded as bottom-up. However, a closer examination reveals that both regimes

**NOTES**

incorporate elements of hierarchical rule-making, networked governance, and market mechanisms. The transformation lies in the reconfiguration of the relationships among these modes rather than a complete shift from one to another.

The Kyoto Protocol, despite its hierarchical structure, also featured market mechanisms like the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). This international carbon offset market allowed developed countries to offset their emissions by investing in emissions reduction projects in the developing world. Additionally, networked governance was present through institutions like the Global Environment Facility and the Rio Conventions, fostering collaboration among states for a common purpose. Fast forward to the Paris Agreement, where commitments have evolved, encompassing broader state participation and a more explicit acknowledgment of the roles of non-state and subnational actors. Through Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), each state outlines its unique measures to address emissions reduction and adaptation to climate impacts. This approach fosters inclusivity and recognizes the interdependence of various actors in tackling climate change. Furthermore, Paris embraces market approaches, as evidenced by Article 6, which encourages the use of internationally agreed mitigation outcomes to support national pledges. Carbon markets are gaining traction globally, with initiatives like the EU Emissions Trading System and China's national carbon market, signalling a shift towards market-based solutions.

The rise of the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India, China) marked a significant shift in global geopolitics, especially in the context of environmental agreements like the Kyoto Protocol. Common but differentiated responsibility (CBDR) has been a foundational principle in international environmental law since the mid-twentieth century. Although the formal phrase “common but differentiated responsibility” was not coined until the 1992 Rio Declaration, its essence had been present in various agreements preceding it. The implementation of CBDR within the climate regime, particularly through the Berlin Mandate of 1995, underscored the obligation of developed nations to lead in combating climate change while exempting developing countries from immediate emission reduction commitments. This exemption became a point of contention, with nations like the USA citing it as a reason for non-ratification. The involvement of crucial players like Russia became pivotal for the Kyoto Protocol’s entry into force, albeit with complexities such as Russia’s subsequent emissions decline and its



NOTES

advantageous position in carbon markets. However, as the BRICs and other emerging economies experienced rapid economic growth, particularly in the early 2000s, the foundation of the Kyoto Protocol became increasingly fragile. The exponential rise in emissions, notably China surpassing the USA as the world's top emitter in 2007, highlighted the need for global rules applicable to all nations. Amid negotiations for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, geopolitical dynamics underwent significant changes. The Doha Amendment of 2012 aimed for more ambitious reduction targets, but faced challenges with several nations opting out, including Japan, New Zealand, and Russia. The refusal of major players like the USA to ratify further complicated matters.

The USA-China joint commitment on climate in 2014 marked a turning point. It signalled a departure from the old paradigm, demonstrating that major emitters were willing to take action independently of global consensus. The Clean Power Plan in the USA and China's commitment to peak emissions by 2030 showcased a shift towards domestic policy action, contrasting with previous reliance on international agreements. The transition from Kyoto to Paris also reflected a broader cultural shift towards global rationalization. This approach, emphasizing rational-legal authority and standardized governance, characterized the Kyoto Protocol but proved inadequate in addressing the multifaceted nature of climate change. While Kyoto relied on market-based mechanisms like carbon markets, their efficacy came under scrutiny, with critics arguing they merely created tradable commodities without substantial emissions reductions. The emergence of non-state actors and the ideology of liberal environmentalism further reshaped climate governance. NGOs, businesses, and subnational governments became increasingly involved, challenging the traditional intergovernmental process. Liberal environmentalism, emphasizing market-based solutions, gained traction, influencing policy approaches.

In the realm of climate politics, the emergence of "new governance" appears to have brought about positive outcomes in terms of establishing fresh institutions and adopting a more adaptable, politically pragmatic approach to addressing climate change. This shift represents a wager that such a framework is better equipped to navigate the complexities of domestic politics and the inherent uncertainties surrounding climate issues compared to the traditional governance model. The hope is that this new

**NOTES**

arrangement sets the stage for decarbonization, even though challenges stemming from obstructionism persist. The looming question, however, remains: will progress occur swiftly enough? The timeframe for action is undeniably narrow. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, global emissions must reach net zero by 2050 to contain warming within the 1.5-degree Celsius threshold. The disparity between a 1.5-degree and 2-degree increase in temperature carries immense implications in terms of impacts, underlining the critical nature of every fraction of a degree we manage to avoid. In this perspective, governance processes aimed at facilitating change, while important, are insufficient on their own. What is urgently required is immediate and radical action (Andonova et al, 2009).

6.3.6 Clean Energy and Global Governance

The governance of clean energy encompasses the establishment of shared norms and goals aimed at transitioning towards energy systems that are more efficient and less harmful to both health and the environment. It involves the implementation of these principles through various policies, networks, and practices. Different organizations and networks working in the realm of clean energy have adopted different terminologies and policy focuses, such as “renewable energy,” “low-carbon energy,” or “sustainable energy.” For the purpose of our analysis, let’s define clean energy as the technologies, services, and processes that decrease energy consumption and facilitate a shift towards systems with minimal environmental and health impacts, primarily by enhancing efficiency and increasing the use of renewable sources.

In studying the paths to decentralized governance for clean energy, we’ll employ an intertemporal methodology, as outlined by Colgan, Keohane, and Van de Graaf. This involves documenting institutional changes over time. We’ll identify three key periods during which distinct modalities of clean energy governance emerged or, in some cases, failed to do so. The first period, spanning the 1980s to the 1990s, saw a surge in interest regarding alternative energy sources and energy efficiency following the OPEC embargo and heightened concerns about global warming. However, strong geopolitical interests in maintaining control over fossil fuels limited intergovernmental collaboration on cleaner energy. The second period, from the late 1990s to 2010, was marked by a stalemate in climate cooperation, particularly evident after the disappointing



NOTES

outcomes of the 2009 Copenhagen Conference. Despite this, there was a proliferation of networks for clean energy governance, indicating a shift towards cooperation outside traditional energy and climate institutions. The most recent period, from 2009 to 2017, witnessed a consolidation and formal recognition of decentralized clean energy governance. Institutions like the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) and initiatives like the UN Sustainable Energy for All and Sustainable Development Goal 7 on Affordable and Clean Energy played significant roles. Analyzing each period involves examining the political drivers behind the establishment or lack thereof of governance mechanisms for clean energy. This includes understanding the evolution of governance modalities, which serve as the foundation of decentralized governance architecture. The empirical analysis draws on a variety of sources, including studies situating clean energy within climate change or energy regime complexes, text analysis of treaty instruments, international reports, interviews, and a database on Transnational Clean Energy Governance. Traditionally, global energy governance has been structured around intergovernmental hierarchies. For instance, in response to the 1973 oil crisis, the International Energy Agency (IEA) was established to facilitate cooperation among Western industrialized nations. However, cooperation on cleaner energy sources within these hierarchies was limited.

Despite this, the late 20th and early 21st centuries witnessed the emergence of alternative forms of governance, particularly through transnational networks. These networks, involving public and private actors, played a crucial role in advancing clean energy agendas. For example, the establishment of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Energy Branch and initiatives like the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) under the Kyoto Protocol exemplify this trend. Moreover, the proliferation of public-private partnerships and the influence of market-based mechanisms further expanded the scope of clean energy governance. Organizations like the World Bank and the IEA adapted to these changes by engaging in partnerships and initiatives aimed at promoting cleaner energy technologies and policies.

Decentralized Governance for Clean Energy

In the realm of international relations, a decentralized landscape of networks, hierarchies, and hybrid arrangements has emerged as the norm for governing clean

**NOTES**

energy. Unlike traditional integrated regimes, this setup involves a complex interplay of organizational structures and sources of authority. This trend reflects a broader shift towards hybrid governance, blending public and private mechanisms, bureaucratic hierarchies, transnational networks, and informal instruments. Geopolitics plays a pivotal role in shaping this landscape. It initially hindered the integration of clean energy into existing international frameworks like the IEA and the UNFCCC. As issues like clean energy become more intricate, uncertainty about collaboration benefits and normative disputes increase, leading states to hesitate in delegating authority under traditional frameworks like the UNFCCC. Even landmark agreements like the Paris Agreement, while significant, lack explicit emphasis on energy transition, highlighting the influence of categorization in shaping institutional responses to global challenges. Beyond structural factors, the proliferation of clean energy governance owes much to the diversification of actors involved. Governance entrepreneurs, whether private entities, non-state actors, or institutional bodies, have played a crucial role in driving experimentation through transnational networks. These actors leverage normative, epistemic, or incentive-based motivations to foster new governance modalities. Empirical analysis underscores the role of networks and markets in governance, particularly in providing expertise, financing, and implementing technology-focused projects. These efforts aim to build consensus, update preferences and facilitate learning among stakeholders. Despite these transnational efforts, domestic politics largely dictate policy-making and regulation in the clean energy sector. Importantly, the development of decentralized governance is not devoid of institutional influence. Political entrepreneurs draw from intergovernmental spaces and domestic politics to forge alliances and identify opportunities for action. This trend has also seen a turn towards formal institutionalization, exemplified by the creation of bodies like IRENA and the adoption of UN resolutions on clean energy (Heywood, 2011).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the lesson weaves together the intricate threads of global governance and climate change negotiations, painting a nuanced portrait of the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead in humanity's quest for a sustainable future. As we navigate the complexities of the Anthropocene, marked by intertwined environmental, social,



NOTES

and economic crises, the imperative of collective action and solidarity has never been clearer. From the halls of the United Nations to the corridors of power in national capitals, the struggle to address climate change transcends boundaries, ideologies, and interests. At its heart lies a delicate balancing act between historical injustices and present-day imperatives, between competing visions of development and shared planetary stewardship. The journey towards a more resilient and just future is fraught with obstacles, from divergent interests among nations to the perennial challenge of enforcing international agreements. Yet, amidst the gloom of climate pessimism, there are glimmers of hope – in the burgeoning momentum around renewable energy, in the growing role of non-state actors, and in the solidarity forged in the face of adversity. As we stand at this critical juncture in history, the trajectory of global climate governance hangs in the balance. The upcoming COP meetings, including COP27 and beyond, offer opportunities to reinvigorate global climate action and advance the objectives laid out in the Paris Agreement. From increasing ambition in Nationally Determined Contributions to enhancing climate finance and strengthening adaptation efforts, the tasks ahead demand nothing short of collective resolve and unwavering commitment. In the final analysis, the lesson reminds us that the struggle for a sustainable future is not merely a technical or political endeavour – it is a moral imperative, grounded in principles of justice, equity and solidarity. By embracing a holistic, inclusive approach to climate governance, humanity can chart a course towards a more resilient and thriving planet for generations to come. The journey may be arduous, but the destination – a world where every individual and ecosystem can flourish – is worth every step along the way.

In-Text Questions

Multiple Choice Questions (1-5)

1. What does CBDR-RC stand for?
 - A) Comprehensive Biological Diversity and Resource Conservation
 - B) Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities
 - C) Climate-Based Disaster Response and Capacity
 - D) Carbon-Based Direct Reduction and Control



NOTES

2. Which international treaty aims to limit global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius?
- A) Kyoto Protocol B) Paris Agreement
C) Montreal Protocol D) Rio Declaration
3. The UNFCCC is primarily concerned with which global issue?
- A) Nuclear disarmament B) Global trade
C) Climate change D) Human rights
4. What is the primary purpose of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs)?
- A) To outline countries' military capabilities
B) To specify countries' financial contributions to the UN
C) To detail countries' climate actions and commitments
D) To regulate international trade
5. Which body is the supreme decision-making entity under the UNFCCC?
- A) General Assembly B) Security Council
C) Conference of the Parties (COP) D) International Court of Justice

Fill in the Blanks (6-10)

6. The principle of _____ recognizes the different historical contributions of countries to climate change.
7. The _____ Protocol was an international treaty that committed state parties to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
8. The _____ Agreement aims to limit global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius.
9. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) hosts annual _____ meetings to negotiate climate actions.
10. The _____ is a financial mechanism that provides grants for projects related to biodiversity, climate change, and more.



NOTES

6.4 SUMMARY

- Global governance involves a complex web of interactions and institutions addressing global challenges.
- Climate change negotiations are central to global governance, with the UNFCCC being the principal platform.
- Disparities between developed and developing countries create challenges in climate negotiations, particularly in terms of equity and ambition.
- The principle of CBDR-RC is crucial in these negotiations, acknowledging historical differences in contributions to climate change.
- Enforcement mechanisms in global agreements are often weak, highlighting the fragility of international cooperation.
- The Paris Agreement represents a shift towards a more inclusive, bottom-up approach to climate governance.
- The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted global governance, emphasizing the need for integrated approaches to crises.
- The evolution of global governance has seen a shift from hierarchical structures to more networked and market-driven approaches.
- The role of non-state actors, including NGOs and corporations, has grown in significance in global governance.
- Knowledge disparities and normative disagreements pose challenges to effective global governance.
- Climate governance has evolved to include a broader range of actors, including subnational and non-state entities.
- The Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement illustrate different approaches to international climate agreements.
- The rise of emerging economies, such as the BRICs, has shifted the dynamics of international climate negotiations.



NOTES

- The effectiveness of global governance mechanisms depends on robust institutions and compliance measures.
- There is a growing emphasis on inclusivity and the participation of marginalized communities in decision-making processes.
- Technological innovations and social movements are critical factors shaping the future of global climate governance.
- The urgency of addressing climate change is underscored by increasing global temperatures and extreme weather events.
- Global governance mechanisms must balance state sovereignty with the need for coordinated international action.
- The concept of “shared but differentiated responsibilities” is central to the discourse on global governance and climate change.
- Future COP meetings will play a crucial role in advancing global climate action and addressing key challenges.

6.5 GLOSSARY

- **Global Governance:** It is the system of rules, norms, and actions that guide the interactions and institutions addressing global issues and challenges.
- **Climate Change Negotiations:** These are international discussions aimed at addressing and mitigating the effects of climate change, primarily through agreements under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
- **UNFCCC:** The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, is an international environmental treaty to combat climate change.
- **COP (Conference of the Parties):** It is the supreme decision-making body of the UNFCCC, where countries negotiate climate-related actions.



NOTES

- **CBDR-RC (Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities):** It is a principle recognizing that while all states are responsible for addressing global environmental issues, not all bear the same level of responsibility or capability.
- **Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs):** Climate action plans submitted by countries outlining their efforts to reduce national emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change.
- **Paris Agreement:** It is a legally binding international treaty on climate change adopted in 2015, aiming to limit global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius.
- **Kyoto Protocol:** It is an international treaty that commits state parties to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, based on the premise that global warming exists and human-made CO₂ emissions have caused it.
- **Clean Development Mechanism (CDM):** It is a mechanism under the Kyoto Protocol allowing industrialized countries to invest in projects that reduce emissions in developing countries as an alternative to more expensive emission reductions in their own countries.
- **Global Environment Facility (GEF):** It is a financial mechanism that provides grants for projects related to biodiversity, climate change, international waters, and more.
- **Hierarchical Governance:** It is a top-down approach to governance, where rules and decisions are made by a central authority.
- **Networked Governance:** It is a governance approach where multiple actors, including non-state actors, collaborate and share responsibilities.
- **BRICs:** It is an acronym for Brazil, Russia, India, and China, representing major emerging economies with significant influence in global affairs.

6.6 ANSWERS TO IN-TEXT QUESTIONS

1. B: Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities



NOTES

2. B: Paris Agreement
3. C: Climate change
4. C: To detail countries' climate actions and commitments
5. C: Conference of the Parties (COP)
6. Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC)
7. Kyoto
8. Paris
9. Conference of the Parties (COP)
10. Global Environment Facility (GEF)

6.7 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. What is global governance, and why is it important in addressing contemporary global challenges?
2. How do historical legacies of colonialism and imperialism shape contemporary discussions on climate change governance? Provide examples.
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of international agreements and mechanisms in addressing climate change, considering factors such as compliance, accountability, and geopolitical dynamics.
4. How has the COVID-19 pandemic impacted global climate governance, and what lessons can be learned from this experience?
5. Explain the evolution of clean energy governance and its significance in transitioning towards sustainable energy systems.
6. Compare and contrast hierarchical, networked, and market-driven modes of global governance, and discuss their implications for addressing climate change.



NOTES

6.8 REFERENCES/SUGGESTED READINGS

- Agarwal, A. & Narain, S., *Global Warming and Unequal World: A Case of Environmental Colonialism*. Centre for Science and Environment, Delhi, 1991, pp. 81-91.
- Andonova, L.B., Betsill, M.M. & Bulkeley, H., *Transnational Climate Governance*. Global Environmental Politics, 9(2), 2009, pp. 52-73.
- Heywood, A., *Global Governance and the Bretton Woods System*. In *Global Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2011, pp. 461-484.
- Weiss, T.G., *What is Global Governance?* In *Global Governance: Why? What? Whither?* Polity, New York, 2013, pp. 90-127.

Unit IV: IR Beyond Eurocentrism

Lesson 7: Non-Western Perspectives

Lesson 8: Indian Contributions to International Relations



LESSON 7

NON-WESTERN PERSPECTIVES

Shaitan Singh

Assistant Professor

School of Open Learning

University of Delhi, Delhi

STRUCTURE

- 7.1 Learning Objectives
- 7.2 Introduction
- 7.3 Non-western Perspectives
 - 7.3.1 Understanding the Non-Western Perspective
 - 7.3.2 The History of Non-Western IR
 - 7.3.3 The Main Premises of Non-Western 'IRT'
 - 7.3.4 The explanations for the dominance of the West
- 7.4 Summary
- 7.5 Glossary
- 7.6 Answers to In-Text Questions
- 7.7 Self-Assessment Questions
- 7.8 References/Suggested Readings

7.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to:

- Understand the historical trajectory of non-Western perspectives within International Relations Theory (IRT), including the factors that have contributed to their marginalization in mainstream discourse.
- Gramscian dynamics of hegemony in shaping the dominance of Western perspectives in IR theory, considering the intersections between historical power dynamics and academic discourse.
- Explore the challenges and barriers faced by non-Western theories in gaining visibility and recognition within mainstream academic circles, including language barriers, institutional biases, and the uneven distribution of academic resources.



NOTES

7.2 INTRODUCTION

In the realm of International Relations (IR), the dominance of Western perspectives has long been unquestioned, with theories and frameworks predominantly reflecting Western experiences and interests. However, amidst this hegemony, a glaring gap emerges: the absence of non-Western International Relations Theory (IRT). This special lesson delves into this crucial lacuna, exploring the complexities underlying the non-Western perspective in IR scholarship. Since Martin Wight's seminal inquiry over 40 years ago into the absence of an overarching international theory, scholars have grappled with a more specific yet equally pressing question: why is there no non-Western IRT? This lesson embarks on a journey to unravel this puzzle, dissecting the historical, cultural, and geopolitical factors that have perpetuated Western dominance in IR discourse. The discourse begins by acknowledging the robust body of IR theory primarily produced by and for the West. It questions the assumption that Western history is synonymous with world history, highlighting the diverse global distribution of actors and perspectives. Despite significant strides in decolonization and the rise of non-Western powers, the mainstream discourse remains entrenched in Western-centric paradigms, marginalizing the voices and experiences of non-Western societies. The lesson challenges the notion that the absence of non-Western IRT can be attributed solely to the conflictual nature of non-Western states or their purported focus on internal progress and stability. Instead, it delves into ideational and perceptual factors, including Gramscian hegemonies, ethnocentrism, and exclusionary politics, that perpetuate the dominance of Western perspectives. Central to this exploration is the significance of Asia, a region housing a concentration of power and wealth comparable to the West. While acknowledging the importance of other regions, the lesson focuses on Asia due to its distinct history of international relations and its pivotal role in shaping global dynamics. By engaging both Western and non-Western audiences, it seeks to catalyze a global debate, challenging Western dominance and advocating for a more inclusive and diverse IR discourse.

Drawing on insights from Amitav Acharya, Arlene Tickner, John Hobson, and others, the lesson unravels the historical trajectory of non-Western IR thinking, tracing its emergence in response to the neglect of non-Western perspectives within existing

**NOTES**

IR theories. It emphasizes the necessity of developing theories rooted in local contexts and experiences, challenging the overgeneralization and misrepresentation inherent in Western-centric frameworks. Moreover, the lesson delves into the main premises of non-Western IRT, advocating for a “sub-systemic” or “homegrown” approach that integrates local histories, cultures, and contributions. It highlights the importance of pluralistic universalism, world history perspective, and rejection of exceptionalism in fostering a truly global IR discipline. Ultimately, the lesson confronts the explanations for the dominance of the West in IR, probing into the entrenched nature of Western intellectual hegemony, the Gramscian dynamics shaping global power relations, the visibility and recognition of non-Western theories, and the local conditions influencing the production of IR theory. As the discourse unfolds, it becomes evident that the absence of non-Western IRT is not a testament to its non-existence but rather to the systemic barriers that inhibit its recognition and integration into mainstream academic discourse. Through this lesson, we embark on a journey to dismantle these barriers, advocating for a more inclusive, diverse, and equitable IR scholarship that truly reflects the complexities and nuances of global politics.

7.3 NON-WESTERN PERSPECTIVES

You can understand the Non-Western perspectives by going through the sub sections given below.

7.3.1 Understanding the Non-Western Perspective

More than 40 years ago, Wight posed the provocative question, “why is there no international theory?” in an essay that has since become a cornerstone in the field. Inspired by Wight’s inquiry, this special issue of IRAP explores a more specific, yet equally compelling question: ‘why there is no non-Western international theory (IRT)?’ We begin with the recognition that there is now a robust body of theory on international relations (IR), but it is predominantly produced by and for the West. This theory assumes that Western history is synonymous with world history, a notion that doesn’t



NOTES

align with the global distribution of its subjects. Whether one believes that the entire world now adheres to the state-centric Westphalian model or that globalization has created a new structure, it is clear that many actors outside the West have gained significant independence since decolonization. Some non-Western states are even vying for great power status. Given these dynamics, our question is: ‘why is there no non-Western IRT?’ Wight argued that the satisfaction with political progress within states inhibited the need for a theory on the recurring drama of interstate relations. He suggested that the absence of non-Western IRT could be attributed to this focus on internal progress and stability. Today, concepts like democratic peace, interdependence, and institutional order are largely seen in the West, while the non-West remains characterized by survival struggles. However, we believe the lack of non-Western IRT requires a more nuanced explanation than simply acknowledging the conflictual nature of the non-West. We reject Wight’s notion that IRT should only be about survival and instead recognize the potential for progress and transformation globally. Our investigation considers ideational and perceptual factors, including Gramscian hegemonies, ethnocentrism, and exclusionary politics. These factors are influenced by both Western and non-Western contexts and their interactions.

This special issue aims to explore why there is no non-Western IRT and what can be done to address this imbalance, focusing on Asia. Asia is significant because it houses the only contemporary non-Western concentration of power and wealth comparable to the West and has a distinct history of international relations. While we acknowledge the importance of the Middle East and Africa, our expertise and resources limit our focus to Asia, hoping others will extend our approach to these regions. Our goal is to engage both Western and non-Western audiences in a global debate. We aim to introduce Western IRT scholars to non-Western IR traditions and challenge non-Western scholars to question Western dominance in IRT. This is not out of antagonism but because we believe Western IRT’s narrow focus is detrimental to a comprehensive understanding of global social dynamics. IRT, regardless of its origins, should be open to contributions from all parts of the world, proportionate to their participation in international relations.

**NOTES**

Cox argued that “*Theory is always for someone and for some purpose.*” IRT often presents itself as neutral, but it can be seen through a Coxian lens, where theories like Realism, Liberalism, and the English School serve the interests of the West, sustaining its power and influence. Marxist and critical theories have aimed to represent marginalized groups and challenge the status quo. From this perspective, Asian states need IRT that reflects their interests and realities. China and Japan, for instance, do not fit neatly into Realist or Liberal paradigms. China seeks to avoid being perceived as a threat while developing its own IR school. Japan grapples with its identity as a great power, often contradicting Realist expectations. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) defies conventional theories by emphasizing local power dynamics in regional order management. South Korea and India may align more closely with Realist models, but their roles in international society are still evolving. As IRT shapes the reality it studies, Asian states have a vested interest in contributing to this discourse.

Non-Western international relations (IR) theories have emerged to challenge the prevailing generalizations and parochialism within the field, and their importance lies in several key areas. Acharya emphasizes that the majority of international system members are non-Western, most post-World War II conflicts have occurred in non-Western regions, and these conflicts often have unique origins requiring local perspectives for accurate analysis. Conventional IR theories frequently overlook the distinct circumstances, values, histories, and political theories of non-Western areas, expecting these issues to be examined through Western frameworks. The Teaching Research and International Politics Project (TRIP) survey reveals that IR is predominantly Western/North American-dominated, with 66.98% of scholars from 32 countries agreeing on this point. Western scholars are typically seen as the main producers of theory, while non-Western scholars are relegated to testing these theories. Non-Western scholars argue that conventional IR theories are insufficient for addressing their specific issues, as each state has unique characteristics that defy broad generalizations. The critique of Western-centric IR includes issues of ethnocentrism, false universalism, and agency denial. Developing non-Western IR theories allows for insights derived from local histories, cultures, and dynamics, challenging Western dominance and enriching the discipline with diverse perspectives.



NOTES

7.3.2 The History of Non-Western IR

Non-Western international relations (IR) thinking is a relatively new area of research. Though the concept began to be discussed in the 1990s, it only gained significant traction in the 2000s, particularly from 2007 onwards. A key figure in this development is Amitav Acharya, whose work has been pivotal in highlighting the neglect of the non-Western world in contemporary IR theories. Acharya's work emphasized the problem of recognizing non-Western perspectives within IR, pointing out that existing theories often ignore and exclude non-Western states, leading to overgeneralization and misrepresentation. He identified this issue as ethnocentrism, describing it as a severe form of exclusion within IR theory. In 2007, a special issue of "International Relations of the Asia-Pacific", featuring contributions from Acharya and Barry Buzan, brought significant attention to non-Western IR. Inspired by Martin Wight's 1966 article, "Why is there no international theory?" they titled their article "Why is there no non-Western international relations theory?" They critiqued the Western dominance in IR, arguing that it neglects the realities and practices of the non-Western world, thus weakening the discipline through overgeneralizations. Acharya and Buzan contended that IR is overly focused on Western concepts and history, making it Western rather than truly international.

The authors pointed out that most IR theory is produced by and for the West, assuming that Western history is synonymous with world history. They argued that the lack of representation of non-Western perspectives limits the discipline, which should instead incorporate local histories, cultures, and contributions from non-Western scholars to provide a more comprehensive understanding of global politics. Acharya and Buzan also examined the reasons behind the underdevelopment of IR theory outside the West. They suggested that Western IR has achieved hegemonic status, operating largely unconsciously irrespective of its universal truth. They also noted that non-Western theories exist but are often marginalized due to language and cultural barriers, or because they fall outside the Western-defined academic realm. Additionally, local historical, cultural, political and institutional factors in non-Western regions hinder the development of IR theory. Despite these challenges, they stressed the importance of integrating area studies with IR to create a more inclusive discipline. Acharya's

**NOTES**

influence extended beyond academic publications. Elected as the first non-Western President of the International Studies Association (ISA) in 2014, he used his platform to advocate for a global IR that includes voices from both the East and the West. He highlighted the ongoing marginalization of non-Western perspectives and called for a discipline that better reflects the diverse experiences and contributions of non-Western societies. In his ISA Convention speech, Acharya illustrated the persistent divide between Western and non-Western scholars using the example of “sahib” and “munshi” from Indian colonial history, where British scholars set the agenda while local teachers were relegated to informant roles. This division, he argued, still exists in modern academia, with Western scholars often dominating the field. Arlene Tickner also contributed to this discourse, emphasizing the need to include non-Western perspectives to build a truly global IR discipline. In her work with Ole Wæver, they argued for the inclusion of diverse geographical and epistemological viewpoints, highlighting how the discipline would benefit from understanding different regional and cultural contexts. John Hobson’s 2004 book further argued that Western civilization was significantly shaped by Eastern influences, challenging the Eurocentric narrative of IR. He asserted that the West’s progress was enabled by its interaction with and appropriation of Eastern institutions, technologies, and ideas. In his 2007 article, Hobson criticized the inherent racism in Western thinking and the Eurocentrism prevalent in IR theories, calling for a recognition of the East’s role in global history (Acharya et al, 2007).

7.3.3 The Main Premises of Non-Western ‘IRT’

The traditional frameworks and ideas of International Relations Theory (IRT) fall short of addressing the unique perspectives and priorities of the non-Western world. Historically, non-Western regions have had different focal points compared to the West. For instance, while Western discourse often revolves around issues like war, peace, and European integration, non-Western concerns include anti-colonialism, anti-racism, development, and regionalism. Thus, applying Western IRT frameworks to non-Western contexts is inadequate and problematic. To address this gap, non-Western scholars advocate for developing theories rooted in their own historical and political contexts rather than relying on conventional Western concepts. Acharya and Buzan



NOTES

(2007) term this approach “sub-systemic,” while Aydynly and Mathews (2008) call it “homegrown.” Sub-systemic studies focus on creating alternative IR theories specific to Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. These theories are often inspired by local experiences and histories, making them distinct from Western approaches. Homegrown theories, while they may draw from existing frameworks, emphasize incorporating local experiences and contexts into the analysis, thereby addressing gaps or inconsistencies in the existing literature. Cultural and environmental conditions have facilitated non-Western contributions to academia. Each state asks different questions and offers unique perspectives, which should not be exoticized or idealized through a Western-centric lens. Non-Western IRT emphasizes locality, considering local culture, history, and civilization as crucial elements in understanding political, economic, and security dynamics. In addition to locality, the concept of “global IR” is another significant contribution from non-Western IR thinking. While acknowledging that Western IR was the first academic discipline to theorize world politics, global IR aims to transcend the divide between the West and the rest of the world. Acharya outlines six dimensions of global IR:

1. **Pluralistic Universalism:** Recognizing and respecting global diversity rather than imposing a singular universal standard.
2. **World History Perspective:** Integrating global histories rather than focusing solely on Greco-Roman, European, or US history.
3. **Integration with Existing Theories:** Incorporating rather than replacing existing IR theories and methods.
4. **Regional Studies:** Emphasizing the study of regions, regionalisms, and area studies.
5. **Rejecting Exceptionalism:** Avoiding claims of superiority or exceptionalism.
6. **Acknowledging Multiple Forms of Agency:** Recognizing diverse forms of agency beyond material power, including normative actions and local constructions of global order.

**NOTES**

Global IR suggests a new understanding of universality, moving away from Western-centric Enlightenment universalism to a pluralistic approach that accommodates multiple theories, cultures, civilizations and ideas. It calls for an appreciation of at least 5,000 years of global history, considering the full spectrum of civilizational developments and avoiding modern, narrow definitions of concepts like human rights and sovereignty. Moreover, global IR advocates for a rethinking of contemporary IRT by incorporating non-Western knowledge, ideas, and norms and recognizing the dynamic and purposeful nature of regions. This approach challenges the exceptionalism prevalent in contemporary IR thought and promotes the inclusion of non-Western actors as active agents in global politics. It also underscores the importance of interdependence and shared fates in an increasingly globalized world.

7.3.4 The Explanations for the Dominance of the West

The dominance of the West in the field of International Relations (IR) is a complex phenomenon rooted in historical, cultural, and geopolitical factors. Western IR emerged as the pioneering academic discipline, driven by a self-conscious effort to unravel the intricacies of global politics. Its foundational concepts and theories were deeply influenced by the unique trajectory of European history, marked by the ascent of the West to global power and the dissemination of its political structures across the globe. Nonetheless, attempts by non-Western scholars to engage with IR theory face a daunting challenge. They must navigate an intellectual landscape already shaped by centuries of Western scholarship and historical context. While IR has become a global endeavour, with participation from various regions, the dominance of Western perspectives remains unmistakable. This reality underscores the uneven distribution of academic resources and institutional influence, even within Western societies themselves. Understanding why Western thinking continues to dominate IR requires a nuanced examination of several factors. Some explanations point to the entrenched nature of Western intellectual hegemony, leaving little room for alternative perspectives to emerge. Others suggest that the current state of Western dominance may be temporary, subject to shifts in global power dynamics and evolving academic paradigms.



NOTES

1. Western IRT has discovered the right path to understanding IR:

Western International Relations Theory (IRT) has long been seen as the beacon illuminating the path to understanding international relations. It's been equated to disciplines like physics, chemistry and mathematics, whose principles seem universally applicable across cultures. But such a claim, if true, would imply that IRT transcends cultural boundaries, a notion that's hard to substantiate. Much of Western IRT is rooted deeply in the historical and cultural context of the West, particularly in modern Western history. This sometimes leads to an overemphasis on concepts like anarchy and a narrow focus on rational choice theories. However, the landscape of international relations is far more diverse and complex, encompassing factors like identity, honour and tradition, which Western IRT is only beginning to grapple with. While Western IRT has undeniably provided valuable insights, it's essential to acknowledge its limitations and biases. Viewing the world solely through a Western lens risks excluding alternative perspectives and approaches that may offer valuable insights. This is where a more inclusive world historical perspective becomes crucial, offering additional avenues for understanding international relations. Moreover, it's important to recognize that social theory, including IRT, is inherently political. The theories we accept and promote inevitably shape the world we perceive and inhabit. For instance, embracing ideas like unipolarity not only influences how we understand international order but also reinforces power dynamics, potentially privileging certain actors over others. The dominance of Anglo-American voices in shaping IRT raises valid concerns about representation and inclusivity. Diversifying the voices and perspectives within the field can lead to richer debates, deeper insights, and a more nuanced understanding of international relations. After all, the relevance and applicability of IRT depend not only on its intellectual merits but also on whose voices are heard and whose experiences are considered.

2. Western IRT has acquired hegemonic status in the Gramscian sense:

This discussion delves into the intricate question of whether Western International Relations Theory (IRT) holds sway not necessarily due to its inherent accuracy, but rather because it has been buoyed by the dominance of Western power over the past centuries. It raises the notion of a Gramscian hegemonic status that permeates the collective consciousness of societies worldwide, irrespective of the theory's veracity.

**NOTES**

An essential consideration is the profound impact of Western imperialism on global intellectual landscapes, especially in the aftermath of decolonization. This historical process often led to the adoption of Western concepts and structures, sometimes at the expense of indigenous traditions and knowledge systems. The emergence of European state models and concepts like sovereignty, territoriality, and nationalism became the norm, with local elites often compelled to accept and internalize them. While some Western ideas, such as democracy and human rights, faced more resistance, others like Westphalian sovereignty found widespread acceptance, particularly in the Third World. The erosion of norms like non-intervention in Western discourse contrasted with its steadfastness in non-Western contexts, highlighting the complex interplay between global power dynamics and theoretical frameworks. The notion of Western IRT's hegemony raises questions about the inclusivity of non-Western perspectives. If its dominance stems solely from its accuracy, then alternatives might seem unnecessary. However, if it owes its prominence to historical power dynamics, then there emerges a legitimate space and rationale for developing non-Western voices in the discourse. Significantly, the legacy of Western imperialism not only reshaped intellectual landscapes but also often disconnected societies from their own histories, framing their self-understanding within a Western historical context. Additionally, there exists a consciousness of Western hegemony, prompting a desire to avoid its pitfalls and reluctance to engage with theory for fear of being subsumed by it.

3. Non-Western IR theories do exist, but are hidden:

It's quite possible that there are alternative International Relations Theories (IRTs) existing outside the Western hemisphere. However, these theories might remain unnoticed due to language barriers or their location in academic spheres not typically associated with Western-defined International Relations (IR). This lack of visibility could mean that not only Western debates but also those in non-Western regions might miss out on these local theories. For instance, theoretical discussions held in Japanese might not reach audiences in China or India. Even in Europe, different languages give rise to distinct IR dialogues in countries like Germany and France, which only partially intersect with English-language debates. Engaging in English-language discussions alone can be overwhelming, leaving little room or incentive to explore beyond. Those who possess multilingual skills often gravitate towards Area Studies,



NOTES

which prioritizes the uniqueness of a particular region rather than general theoretical frameworks. Moreover, there might be barriers deliberately or inadvertently preventing the integration of non-Western perspectives into Western discourses. Western scholarship, sometimes unwittingly influenced by ethnocentrism, may view the world through its own cultural lens, underestimating the validity of other cultural models. Additionally, while English serves as a global lingua franca, for non-native speakers, publishing in English can be arduous, especially given the high rejection rates in top English-language IR journals. This hurdle, coupled with the dominance of Western themes and theories in these journals, may dissuade non-Western scholars from participating in wider discussions.

Despite the potential existence of non-Western theories, they often remain on the periphery, with limited representation in mainstream journals, which are predominantly Western-centric. Themes and issues explored in these journals predominantly reflect Western concerns, overlooking perspectives from other parts of the world. Even when Western scholars critique their own dominance, the focus tends to shift towards challenging American perspectives, with British and European alternatives receiving more attention than those from Asian contexts. Therefore, initiatives like this special issue aim not to create non-Western theory from scratch, but rather to shine a light on existing contributions and address the challenge of integrating them into broader academic discourse. The struggle lies not in the absence of non-Western theory, but in overcoming the barriers that prevent its widespread recognition and acceptance.

4. Local conditions discriminate against the production of IR theory:

The generation of International Relations Theory (IRT) outside the Western academic sphere is influenced by a multitude of local conditions encompassing historical, cultural, political, and institutional factors. To dissect these factors, let's delve into each dimension (Bilgin, 2007).

Historical Trauma and Cultural Nuances:

The establishment of Western IR as a discipline is often traced back to the aftermath of World War I, a cataclysmic event that propelled a fervent quest for understanding

**NOTES**

peace and war dynamics. This trauma fuelled a strong problem-solving ethos in IR, with liberalism and realism emerging as responses to the fear of war's devastating consequences. While this historical narrative is deeply embedded in Western consciousness, it's pertinent to note that many non-Western societies, particularly in Asia, also endured profound upheaval during World War II. Thus, the notion that historical trauma is a prerequisite for IRT's birth might extend beyond the Western context. Cultural disparities also play a pivotal role in shaping the inclination towards theoretical discourse. While Western academia tends to gravitate towards abstract theorizing, non-Western societies may prioritize empirical approaches or focus on local issues, eschewing the presumption of universalism inherent in Western social theory. This cultural dichotomy is reflected in the geographical distribution of IRT, which thrives predominantly in English-speaking countries. However, it's essential to differentiate between the strong assertion that theory is inherently Western and the weaker premise that societal priorities dictate the luxury of engaging in theoretical debates amidst pressing developmental concerns.

Political Dynamics and Institutional Frameworks:

Political regimes exert significant influence on the development of IRT. Democracies, with their emphasis on academic freedom, are more conducive to theoretical exploration, whereas totalitarian states may stifle intellectual discourse to maintain ideological control. Nevertheless, the relationship between undemocratic governments and IRT is nuanced; while some authoritarian regimes may embrace certain social theorists, genuine theoretical inquiry might be constrained by state interests. Institutional factors, such as resourcing, workload and career structures, also shape the landscape of IRT. In Western academia, research is esteemed, and career advancement often hinges on scholarly output. However, in contexts where research is undervalued or academics face excessive teaching and administrative burdens, the incentive for theoretical inquiry diminishes. Furthermore, disciplinary affiliations can influence the theoretical orientation of IR communities; strong ties to theoretically inclined disciplines like Political Science foster a culture of theorizing, whereas connections to less theoretical fields may deter theoretical engagement.



NOTES

Conclusion

In the exploration of non-Western perspectives within the realm of International Relations Theory (IRT), a multifaceted tapestry of insights and challenges emerges. This lesson has journeyed through the historical trajectories, ideological underpinnings, and systemic barriers that have shaped the absence of non-Western IRT in mainstream discourse. As we draw our conclusions, several key reflections emerge, illuminating pathways towards a more inclusive and equitable IR scholarship. Firstly, it is imperative to acknowledge the entrenched nature of Western intellectual hegemony and its pervasive influence on global academic landscapes. From the foundations laid by Western imperialism to the institutional structures that perpetuate Western-centric paradigms, the dominance of Western perspectives in IR is not merely a matter of academic preference but a reflection of historical power dynamics. Secondly, the Gramscian dynamics of hegemony underscore the complexities underlying the perpetuation of Western dominance. While Western IRT may hold sway not solely due to its inherent accuracy but also due to the historical processes that have bestowed upon it a hegemonic status, this realization prompts a critical examination of the inclusivity of non-Western perspectives within IR discourse. Moreover, the visibility and recognition of non-Western theories remain a persistent challenge, compounded by language barriers, institutional biases, and the uneven distribution of academic resources. The marginalization of non-Western voices within mainstream journals and academic circles highlights the need for concerted efforts to amplify and integrate these perspectives into broader scholarly debates. Furthermore, the local conditions influencing the production of IR theory underscore the diverse array of factors shaping intellectual landscapes across the globe. Historical traumas, cultural nuances, political dynamics, and institutional frameworks all intersect to either facilitate or hinder theoretical inquiry, reflecting the intricate interplay between global power relations and academic discourse. As we navigate these complexities, it becomes evident that the absence of non-Western IRT is not a testament to its non-existence but rather to the systemic barriers that inhibit its recognition and integration into mainstream academic discourse. Therefore, the imperative lies in dismantling these barriers and fostering a more inclusive, diverse, and equitable IR scholarship that truly reflects the complexities and nuances of global politics.

**NOTES**

The journey towards a more inclusive and equitable IR scholarship is multifaceted and ongoing. By interrogating the historical legacies, ideological underpinnings, and systemic barriers that perpetuate Western dominance, we pave the way for a future where non-Western perspectives are not only recognized but celebrated as essential contributions to a truly global understanding of international relations. Through collaborative efforts, dialogue, and solidarity, we can chart a course towards a more inclusive and equitable future for IR scholarship, one that embraces the richness and diversity of human experiences across the globe.

In-Text Questions**Multiple Choice Questions (1-5)**

1. What term describes the belief in the inherent superiority of one's own ethnic group or culture?
 - A) Pluralistic Universalism
 - B) Ethnocentrism
 - C) Sub-systemic
 - D) Agency
2. Which concept emphasizes acknowledging and respecting global diversity?
 - A) Exceptionalism
 - B) Gramscian Hegemony
 - C) Pluralistic Universalism
 - D) World History Perspective
3. Who is a key figure in the development of non-Western IR theories?
 - A) John Hobson
 - B) Martin Wight
 - C) Amitav Acharya
 - D) Barry Buzan
4. What does the term "global IR" aim to achieve?
 - A) The exclusion of Western theories
 - B) The dominance of Eurocentrism
 - C) Integration and respect for diverse global theories
 - D) Promotion of exceptionalism
5. Which of the following is NOT a focus of non-Western IR theories?
 - A) Anti-colonialism
 - B) European integration
 - C) Regionalism
 - D) Anti-racism



NOTES

Fill in the Blanks (6-10):

6. The term _____ refers to the capacity of individuals or groups to act independently and make their own free choices.
7. The study of International Relations has been traditionally dominated by _____ perspectives.
8. _____ is the belief that a particular country or group is inherently different and superior to others.
9. The process of deconstructing colonial ideologies is known as _____.
10. _____ is an approach that integrates histories from around the globe, not just focusing on European or Western history.

7.4 SUMMARY

- The study of International Relations (IR) has been dominated by Western perspectives, often overlooking non-Western viewpoints.
- The concept of non-Western IR questions the assumption that Western history is synonymous with world history.
- The marginalization of non-Western perspectives in IR is partly due to historical power dynamics and academic biases.
- The discourse around non-Western IR aims to challenge the Western-centric paradigms and advocate for a more inclusive IR discipline.
- The focus of non-Western IR theories includes anti-colonialism, anti-racism, development, and regionalism, differing from the Western emphasis on war, peace, and European integration.
- Theories like Realism, Liberalism, and the English School often serve Western interests, while non-Western theories strive to reflect their local realities.
- Scholars like Amitav Acharya and Arlene Tickner have highlighted the neglect of non-Western perspectives in mainstream IR theories.



NOTES

- The dominance of Western perspectives is maintained through factors like language barriers, institutional biases, and the uneven distribution of academic resources.
- The rise of non-Western powers and the process of decolonization challenge the continued relevance of Western-centric IR theories.
- Global IR seeks to integrate and respect diverse theoretical contributions from around the world.
- The concept of pluralistic universalism calls for recognizing global diversity instead of imposing a single universal standard.
- Non-Western IR theories emphasize locality and the importance of regional and cultural contexts in understanding international dynamics.
- The history of non-Western IR highlights the contributions of non-Western scholars and the need for theories that go beyond Western frameworks.
- The concept of global IR includes dimensions like world history perspective, integration with existing theories, and rejecting exceptionalism.
- There is a growing recognition of the importance of including non-Western perspectives to create a truly global IR discipline.
- The historical development of non-Western IR has been slow, gaining significant traction only in recent decades.
- The contributions of scholars like Acharya and Buzan have been pivotal in advocating for non-Western perspectives in IR.
- The dominance of the West in IR theory is partly due to its historical development and the spread of its political structures globally.
- The limitations of Western IR, such as its focus on rational choice theories, have been criticized for neglecting other important factors like identity and tradition.
- The increasing diversity of voices in IR is essential for a more comprehensive understanding of global politics.



NOTES

7.5 GLOSSARY

- **International Relations Theory (IRT):** It is a framework for analyzing and understanding the interactions and relationships between nations.
- **Non-Western IRT:** It is the theories and perspectives in International Relations that originate outside the Western world, often emphasizing different historical and cultural contexts.
- **Gramscian Hegemony:** It is a concept from Antonio Gramsci, referring to the dominance of one group over another, often culturally and ideologically.
- **Eurocentrism:** It is a worldview that prioritizes European culture and history, often marginalizing other regions.
- **Pluralistic Universalism:** It means acknowledging and respecting global diversity rather than imposing a single, universal standard.
- **Sub-systemic:** It is an approach focusing on regional and local perspectives in understanding global issues.
- **Homegrown Theories:** Theories developed from within a specific cultural or regional context, rather than being imported or imposed from outside.
- **Ethnocentrism:** The belief in the inherent superiority of one's own ethnic group or culture.
- **World History Perspective:** An approach that integrates histories from around the globe, rather than focusing solely on European or Western history.
- **Exceptionalism:** The belief that a particular country or group is inherently different and superior to others.
- **Global IR:** A perspective in International Relations that seeks to include and integrate voices and theories from all parts of the world.
- **Teaching Research and International Politics (TRIP) Project:** A survey that assesses the state of the IR field globally, highlighting the dominance of Western/North American perspectives.



NOTES

- **Decolonization:** The process of deconstructing colonial ideologies and gaining political and cultural independence from colonial powers.

7.6 ANSWERS TO IN-TEXT QUESTIONS

1. B: Ethnocentrism
2. C: Pluralistic Universalism
3. C: Amitav Acharya
4. C: Integration and respect for diverse global theories
5. B: European integration
6. Agency
7. Western
8. Exceptionalism
9. Decolonization
10. World History Perspective

7.7 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. What are the main factors contributing to the absence of non-Western International Relations Theory (IRT) in mainstream discourse? How do these factors intersect with historical power dynamics?
2. Critically analyze the concept of Western intellectual hegemony in International Relations (IR) scholarship. How does it shape the dominance of Western perspectives, and what are the implications for inclusivity and diversity within the field?



NOTES

3. Identify and explain the challenges and barriers faced by non-Western theories in gaining visibility and recognition within mainstream academic circles. How do these barriers impact the representation of diverse perspectives in IR scholarship?
4. Evaluate the significance of solidarity and advocacy in dismantling systemic barriers and advancing towards a more inclusive understanding of international relations. What practical steps can individuals and institutions take to promote diversity and inclusivity within the field of IR?

7.8 REFERENCES/SUGGESTED READINGS

- Acharya, A. & Buzan, B., *Why is There No Non-Western International Relations Theory? An Introduction*. International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, 7(3), September 2007, pp. 287–312.
- Bilgin, P., *Thinking Past Western IR*. Third World Quarterly, 29(1), 2007, pp. 5–23.
- Blaney, D.L. & Inayatullah, N., *International Relations from Below*. In Reus-Smit, C. & Snidal, D. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008, pp. 663-674.
- Capan, Z., *Decolonising International Relations?* Third World Quarterly, 38(1), 2016, pp. 1-15. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01436597.2016.1245100> [Accessed 10 Nov. 2018].



LESSON 8

INDIAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Shaitan Singh

Assistant Professor
School of Open Learning
University of Delhi, Delhi

STRUCTURE

- 8.1 Learning Objectives
- 8.2 Introduction
- 8.3 Indian Contribution to International Relation
 - 8.3.1 Understanding Indian Contribution to IR
 - 8.3.2 Interrogating the State-centric Ontology
 - 8.3.3 Challenging the Inside-Outside Binaries
 - 8.3.4 India ‘and’ the World
- 8.4 Summary
- 8.5 Glossary
- 8.6 Answers to In-Text Questions
- 8.7 Self-Assessment Questions
- 8.8 References/Suggested Readings

8.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to:

- Analyze the impact of historical contexts, including post-independence challenges and the Cold War era, on India’s foreign policy paradigms and the development of IR discourse within the country.
- Evaluate the influence of Western academic traditions, particularly realism, on early Indian IR scholars, and discern the shifts in theoretical frameworks over time, including the resurgence of post-positivist theories in the post-Cold War era.



NOTES

- Investigate the role of NGOs, civil society groups, and social movements in shaping India's approach to international relations, including their impact on policy formulation, advocacy, and grassroots mobilization.
- Reflect on the challenges posed by the 'inside–outside' binary in Indian IR literature, exploring recent trends in studying domestic determinants of foreign policy and the political dynamics shaping India's global engagements.
- Evaluate India's rising global stature and its implications for international politics, including debates surrounding India's grand strategy, quest for great power status, and contributions to global stability.

8.2 INTRODUCTION

The landscape of International Relations (IR) scholarship in India is a captivating narrative woven through distinct phases, each marked by its unique intellectual currents and historical contexts. From the post-independence era characterized by a quest for identity amidst global upheavals to the contemporary age of nuanced global engagements, Indian contributions to IR have evolved significantly, mirroring the nation's journey on the world stage. In tracing the trajectory of Indian IR, two pivotal phases emerge, delineating the scholarly landscape and shaping India's foreign policy paradigms. Initially, the echoes of British tradition reverberated in the minds of the first generation of IR scholars, who grappled with immediate foreign policy challenges amidst the backdrop of decolonization and the Cold War. Rooted in Hans Morgenthau's realism, their pragmatic approach mirrored India's intricate foreign policy landscape post-1947. However, the emergence of a new breed of scholars, trained in Western universities, heralded a transformative phase in Indian IR discourse. Institutions like the School of International Studies (SIS) became crucibles of intellectual exchange, nurturing a fusion of area studies and disciplinary-focused IR. Yet, the dominance of realism persisted, underscored by the state's emphasis on sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The turning point arrived with the dawn of the post-Cold War era, catalyzing a surge in post-positivist theories and a renaissance of sorts in IR scholarship. The

**NOTES**

subsequent decades witnessed a blossoming of diverse perspectives, challenging traditional frameworks and expanding the horizons of Indian academia. Today, as India assumes a more proactive role on the global stage, the contours of Indian IR continue to evolve, reflecting the nation's burgeoning economy and its aspirations for global leadership. Yet, amidst this transformation, the interrogation of state-centric ontology has emerged as a crucial frontier, unravelling the complex interplay between state and non-state actors in shaping India's foreign policy dynamics. From the rise of non-state actors to the reimagining of India's global role, this lesson delve deep into the multifaceted tapestry of Indian contributions to IR. They traverse through the corridors of power, dissecting India's diplomatic manoeuvres, while also peering into the realms of academia, where theoretical inquiries shape the contours of future discourse.

8.3 INDIAN CONTRIBUTION TO INTERNATIONAL RELATION

It can be understood through the sub sections given below.

8.3.1 Understanding Indian Contribution to IR

The evolution of International Relations (IR) in India can be understood through two significant phases. Initially, the first generation of IR scholars was steeped in the British tradition. This period, post-independence in 1947, saw a focus on India's foreign policy concerns intertwined with broader global issues such as decolonization, disarmament, and the dynamics of the Cold War. However, the theoretical foundations of this era were somewhat fragile due to limited scholarly resources and the urgency of addressing immediate foreign policy challenges. During this phase, Indian scholars, despite their British academic connections, leaned more towards Hans Morgenthau's realism rather than embracing Hedley Bull's classical realism, which would later shape the English school of realism. This preference reflected the practical nature of India's foreign policy landscape at the time.



NOTES

The second phase of Indian IR literature emerged with scholars trained in American and British universities. These academics, who later became educators in Indian universities like the School of International Studies (SIS), significantly influenced the discipline's trajectory. A hallmark of Indian IR during this period was the amalgamation of area studies with disciplinary-focused IR studies. This integration, termed International Studies, sometimes overshadowed disciplinary IR, leading to a neglect of theoretical development in favour of narrative historical accounts. Moreover, the dominance of realist thought was pervasive, shaping research agendas and intellectual discourse. The state's emphasis on sovereignty and territorial integrity further entrenched realist perspectives, marginalizing normative traditions in IR. However, the late 1980s marked a turning point with the end of the Cold War and the subsequent failure of realist predictions regarding the Soviet Union's collapse. This period witnessed a surge in post-positivist theories and methodologies within IR. Additionally, the emergence of new think tanks and research institutes in the 1990s, along with the expansion of IR courses in universities, broadened the intellectual landscape.

Today, Indian IR is undergoing significant transformation. With a burgeoning economy and increased global engagement, India is assuming a more proactive role in global governance. The past two decades have seen a shift in IR literature, characterized by a departure from traditional realist frameworks towards a more diverse and nuanced approach to understanding global dynamics. This evolution reflects not only changes in global geopolitics but also the maturation of the Indian academic landscape, marked by a more diverse and dynamic discourse within the field of International Relations.

8.3.2 Interrogating the State-centric Ontology

In recent times, there's been a notable shift within the Indian international relations community's perception of the state, moving away from seeing it solely as a 'national-territorial totality' to recognizing its dynamic socio-political nature. This evolution is unfolding in three key ways, each with its own significance.

- 1. The Rise of Non-State Actors:** There's a growing acknowledgment of the significant influence exerted by various non-state actors on India's global engagements. These actors span a wide spectrum, including corporate entities,

**NOTES**

media houses, civil society organizations, and social movements, as well as the Indian diaspora. The liberalization of India's economy in the early 1990s marked a pivotal moment, highlighting the pivotal role of the corporate sector in shaping foreign policy. This was evidenced by shifts in India's stance at international forums like the World Trade Organization, the increasing global footprint of Indian companies, and the booming IT and software sector. Moreover, Indian Prime Ministers have strategically leveraged business leaders to advance diplomatic objectives.

- 2. Media's Influence on Foreign Policy:** The media landscape in India has undergone a significant transformation, moving away from being perceived as a mere mouthpiece of the government to becoming a powerful influencer in foreign policy discourse. Factors such as the media's expansion, reliance on corporate advertisement revenue, and the growing influence of the middle and business classes have contributed to this shift. Since the early 2000s, the media has emerged as a primary arena for debates and discussions on Indian foreign policy direction. Its role in shaping public opinion and influencing government responses to crises or international negotiations has become increasingly pronounced.
- 3. Role of NGOs and Social Movements:** Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society groups, and social movements have also emerged as significant players in shaping India's approach to international relations. Their involvement in issues such as human rights, environmental conservation, and gender equality has led to partnerships with governmental bodies and global networks. These organizations operate both at the policy level, engaging in informal discussions with government officials, and at the grassroots level, mobilizing public support for peace-building initiatives and advocating for policy change.

8.3.3 Challenging the Inside–Outside Binaries

The landscape of international relations (IR) literature in India has traditionally been framed by an 'inside–outside' dichotomy, with a predominant focus on the external dimensions of India's foreign policy in relation to other global actors. However,



NOTES

exceptions to this norm emerged in the early decades, with scholarly works delving into the domestic determinants of India's foreign policy, its decision-making mechanisms, and the influence of leaders like Nehru. Over the past two decades, there's been a noticeable expansion within these areas of study, with an increasing number of texts exploring the domestic aspects of India's foreign policy formulation. This includes analyses of various stakeholders such as the military, academia, diaspora, and middle class, shedding light on their roles in shaping Indian politics and its foreign relations. What sets this recent wave of literature apart is its willingness to challenge the established conventions of Indian foreign policy and critically evaluate the Nehruvian legacy. Scholars like Raja Mohan contest the notion of a cohesive 'Nehruvian consensus,' highlighting the historical absence of such unanimity and emphasizing the leadership-driven nature of Indian foreign policy. Moreover, there's a growing acknowledgment of the inherently political nature of foreign policy formulation, with a recognition that understands the state's political character and internal dynamics which is crucial for comprehending its global engagements. This is evident in the increasing polarization between the government and opposition parties on key foreign policy issues, as illustrated by the Indo-US nuclear deal. The influence of regional political parties on India's foreign policy, particularly towards neighbouring countries, has also gained prominence. The 'municipalization' of foreign policy, wherein local forces acquire significant stakes in federal power structures, presents both opportunities and challenges in shaping India's external relations.

Globalization has introduced new complexities to the Indian state, prompting debates among scholars regarding its impact. While some argue that globalization has empowered the state, others view it as undermining national sovereignty and exacerbating inequalities. Critical social movements in India perceive globalization as a hegemonic project that delegitimizes democratic governance and exacerbates social exclusion (Behera, 2013).

Problematizing the State

The landscape of Indian international relations (IR) scholarship has long been dominated by a neo-realistic perspective, painting the Indian state as a fixed, singular entity beyond scrutiny. This conventional view has largely overlooked the complex historical legacies

**NOTES**

and internal dynamics shaping the Indian state. Even movements seeking to break away from the existing state structure often find themselves trapped in replicating the same model. However, a growing recognition acknowledges the stark divergence of South Asian states from the neo-realist European nation-state model. Factors like contested legitimacy, societal fragmentation, and differing historical experiences challenge the simplistic view of a unified sovereign state. State formation in India, distinct due to its colonial past and diverse social structures, has resulted in a state perpetually embroiled in internal power struggles and identity conflicts.

Critiques from scholars like Vanaik further dismantle the realist notion, emphasizing the state's sociological complexity beyond mere cartography. They argue that foreign policies are inherently influenced by social and class dynamics, debunking the notion of a neutral state pursuing a universal "national interest." Further insights from thinkers like Nandy shed light on the troubling nexus between the modern nation-state and state-sponsored violence, often legitimized through scientific and technological advancements. Das extends this discourse to encompass broader forms of violence perpetuated by global forces, underscoring the intricate web of power dynamics at play. This re-evaluation calls for a recalibration of the balance between area studies and disciplinary IR, challenging the entrenched focus on historical narratives at the expense of theoretical depth. While much literature delves into India's bilateral relations with major powers like the US, China, and Pakistan, there's a burgeoning interest in dissecting specific issue areas within these relationships. From strategic partnerships to nuclear diplomacy, scholars are increasingly examining the nuances beyond traditional geopolitical rivalries. Moreover, there's a growing body of literature exploring India's interactions with its smaller neighbours, albeit with varying levels of depth. Issues ranging from border disputes to regional cooperation are gaining traction, reflecting a broader interest in understanding India's role in shaping South Asian geopolitics.

8.3.4 India 'and' the World

Over the past two decades, scholarly literature on the complexities of International Relations (IR) has flourished, reflecting a diverse array of perspectives and thematic concerns. This volume, while not exhaustive, offers valuable insights from Indian scholars on various themes such as terrorism, power dynamics, multilateral diplomacy, security



NOTES

and strategy, environmental governance, human rights, and regionalism. Despite the breadth of topics covered, there are inevitable gaps due to practical constraints. However, the contributions included here touch upon several of these crucial themes.

One significant area of focus is multilateral diplomacy, which is approached from three distinct angles within Indian IR scholarship. Firstly, there's an examination of various domains within multilateral diplomacy, such as climate change negotiations, global economic governance, non-proliferation regimes, and international law. Secondly, scholars delve into India's perspectives and negotiating strategies in these forums, pondering whether its stance should align more with ideological positions or pragmatic internationalism. Finally, there's a growing interest in understanding the emergence of 'new multilateralism' from grassroots movements and epistemic communities, highlighting alternative avenues for global engagement.

A pivotal aspect of IR discourse is the notion of power, particularly India's ascent as a significant global player. Scholars have dissected India's rise through various lenses, including material, normative, and discursive perspectives. While some view India as a rising or emerging power, others analyze its quest for great power status or the complexities of its geopolitical ambitions. However, there's a lack of consensus regarding India's grand strategy and its implications for global politics. Questions linger about India's willingness and capacity to contribute to global stability and whether its cautious pragmatism will hinder or facilitate its rise to power. Moreover, there's a notable shift in IR literature towards theoretical inquiries, marking a departure from previous neglect. Theoretical frameworks are increasingly shaping discussions, signalling a maturation of the discipline within Indian academia (Bajpai et al, 2019).

Conclusion

The exploration of India's rich contributions to International Relations (IR) unfolds a narrative of evolution, resilience, and intellectual vibrancy. From the nascent post-independence era to the contemporary landscape of global engagement, Indian IR scholarship has traversed diverse terrains, navigating through historical currents and theoretical crossroads. As we conclude this lesson, it becomes evident that the trajectory of Indian IR is a tapestry woven with threads of tradition and innovation. The early

**NOTES**

influences of British academic traditions and realism shaped the foundational pillars of Indian IR, setting the stage for subsequent intellectual endeavors. However, it was the convergence of Western academic influences with indigenous perspectives that catalyzed a renaissance in Indian IR, marking a departure from traditional frameworks and opening new vistas of inquiry.

The interrogation of state-centric ontology emerges as a central theme, challenging conventional narratives and unravelling the complex interplay between state and non-state actors. The rise of non-state actors, the transformation of media dynamics, and the growing influence of NGOs and social movements underscore the dynamic nature of India's engagement with global affairs, transcending traditional state-centric paradigms. Moreover, the re-evaluation of India's global role and the recognition of its sociological complexity beyond traditional realist perspectives illuminate the contours of a maturing IR scholarship landscape. As India navigates the complexities of a rapidly changing global order, its contributions to IR scholarship serve not only to enrich academic discourse but also to inform policy debates and shape future trajectories of global governance. The journey through Indian IR scholarship offers not just a retrospective glance but also a forward-looking perspective on the role of emerging powers in shaping the future of international politics.

In-Text Questions**Multiple Choice Questions (1-5)**

1. What was a significant factor influencing early Indian IR scholars?
 - A) American academic traditions
 - B) Soviet economic models
 - C) British academic traditions
 - D) Chinese political theories
2. Which concept challenges the state-centric view in International Relations?
 - A) Realism
 - B) State-centric ontology
 - C) Post-positivist theories
 - D) Sovereignty



NOTES

3. What marks the turning point in Indian IR towards more diverse theories?
A) Post-World War II era B) The Cold War
C) Post-Cold War era D) Pre-independence period
4. Which institution played a crucial role in the development of Indian IR?
A) Harvard University
B) Indian Institute of Technology (IIT)
C) School of International Studies (SIS)
D) London School of Economics
5. What term describes India's strategy of engaging with multiple international organizations and countries?
A) Bilateral diplomacy B) Multilateral diplomacy
C) Isolationism D) Non-alignment

Fill in the Blanks (6-10):

6. The end of the _____ marked a shift towards post-positivist theories in Indian IR.
7. Non-state actors, such as _____, have increasingly influenced India's foreign policy.
8. Indian scholars have increasingly questioned the _____ consensus in recent years.
9. The concept of _____ emphasizes attracting and co-opting rather than coercing in international relations.
10. The process of _____ has introduced new complexities to the Indian state, impacting sovereignty and social equity.

8.4 SUMMARY

- Indian contributions to International Relations (IR) have evolved significantly, beginning with influences from British academic traditions.



NOTES

- Early Indian IR was characterized by a focus on state-centric and realist approaches, influenced by figures like Hans Morgenthau.
- Post-independence, Indian scholars grappled with foreign policy issues related to decolonization, disarmament, and the Cold War.
- The establishment of institutions like the School of International Studies (SIS) played a pivotal role in shaping Indian IR discourse.
- The end of the Cold War marked a shift towards post-positivist theories, challenging the dominance of realism in Indian IR.
- Non-state actors, such as corporate entities, media, NGOs, and social movements, have increasingly influenced India's foreign policy.
- The media has transitioned from being a government mouthpiece to a significant player in foreign policy discussions.
- Civil society groups have contributed to India's international relations, particularly in areas like human rights and environmental conservation.
- There has been a growing critique of the 'inside–outside' binary in Indian IR, with more attention given to domestic factors influencing foreign policy.
- Indian IR literature has begun to explore the political dynamics and regional influences within India's foreign policy.
- Scholars challenge the idea of a monolithic Indian state, highlighting internal divisions and the complex socio-political landscape.
- The globalization process has introduced new challenges and opportunities, with debates on its impact on state sovereignty and social equity.
- The rise of India as a global player has sparked discussions on its quest for great power status and contributions to global stability.
- Indian academia has increasingly embraced theoretical diversity, moving beyond traditional geopolitical analyses.
- The role of India in multilateral diplomacy has been examined, particularly in areas like climate change, economic governance, and international law.



NOTES

- There is a growing interest in the role of grassroots movements and epistemic communities in shaping global governance.
- The narrative of India's foreign policy is shifting towards a more nuanced understanding of its global engagements.
- Indian scholars have begun to question and move beyond the Nehruvian consensus, reflecting a more diverse and critical approach.
- India's strategic partnerships and nuclear diplomacy are areas of growing academic focus.
- The literature is expanding to include India's relations with smaller neighbours and regional geopolitics.
- Indian IR is undergoing a transformation, marked by a departure from traditional realist frameworks and an embrace of diverse perspectives.

8.5 GLOSSARY

- **Post-positivist Theories:** These are approaches in International Relations that critique the positivist emphasis on observable, empirical data, and instead focus on the subjective and interpretive aspects of global politics.
- **Neo-realism Perspective:** It is a theory in International Relations that views the international system as anarchic, with states acting primarily to ensure their own survival.
- **State-centric Ontology:** It is a viewpoint in International Relations focusing on the state as the primary actor in international politics.
- **Inside–Outside Binary:** It is the division between domestic (inside) and international (outside) spheres in International Relations theory.
- **Hegemony:** It is the leadership or dominance of one group or state over others.
- **Diaspora:** The dispersion of people from their original homeland.



NOTES

- **Nehruvian Consensus:** It is a set of political and economic principles attributed to India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, emphasizing socialism, non-alignment, and state-led development.
- **Normative Traditions:** These are approaches in International Relations that focus on ethical, moral, and normative issues.
- **Epistemic Communities:** These are networks of professionals with recognized expertise and authority in a particular domain.

8.6 ANSWERS TO IN-TEXT QUESTIONS

1. C: British academic traditions
2. C: Post-positivist theories
3. C: Post-Cold War era
4. C: School of International Studies (SIS)
5. B: Multilateral diplomacy
6. Cold War
7. NGOs
8. Nehruvian
9. Soft power
10. Globalization

8.7 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the two significant phases in the evolution of Indian contributions to International Relations (IR), highlighting key characteristics and influences shaping each phase.



NOTES

2. How did early Indian IR scholars navigate the influence of British academic traditions and realism in shaping India's foreign policy paradigms post-independence?
3. Critically analyze the challenges posed by the 'inside–outside' binary in Indian IR literature, examining recent trends in studying domestic determinants of foreign policy and the political dynamics shaping India's global engagements.
4. Evaluate India's rising global stature and its implications for international politics, discussing debates surrounding India's grand strategy, quest for great power status, and contributions to global stability.

8.8 REFERENCES/SUGGESTED READINGS

- Ramakrishnan, A.K., *The Gaze of Orientalism: Reflections on Linking Postcolonialism and International Relations*. In Bajpai, K. & Mallavarapu, S. (eds.), *International Relations in India: Bringing Theory Back Home*. Orient Longman, New Delhi, pp. 223-274.
- Behera, N.C., *Introduction*. In *India Engages the World*. (Political Science: 4.) Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2013, pp. 1-55.
- Bajpai, K. & Mallavarapu, S. (eds.), *Introduction*. In *India, the West and International Order*. Orient Black Swan, New Delhi, 2019, pp. 1-52.

Notes

Notes



**DEPARTMENT OF DISTANCE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
CAMPUS OF OPEN LEARNING, SCHOOL OF OPEN LEARNING
UNIVERSITY OF DELHI**

20CUS01380