

BLOCK I
POWER, STABILITY AND THE NATION-STATE

Unit 1 : Power and polarity in world politics

Unit 2 : Hegemony in international relations

Unit 3 : State and Nations

Unit 4 : Globalisation and state sovereignty

Unit 5 : Nationalism in world politics

UNIT-1

POWER AND POLARITY IN WORLD POLITICS

Unit Structure:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Power
- 1.4 Measurement of Power
- 1.5 Balance of Power
- 1.6 Relational and Structural Power
 - 1.6.1 Relational Power
 - 1.6.2 Structural Power
- 1.7 Hard Power and Soft Power
- 1.8 Polarity
- 1.9 Unipolarity
- 1.10 Bipolarity
- 1.11 Rise of Multipolarity
 - 1.11.1 Multipolarity and Its Relative Influence
- 1.12 Non-Polarity
- 1.13 Summing Up
- 1.14 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction:

Since the beginning of humanity power has been occupying the central position in human relations. In order to comprehend international politics and relations the study of the concept of power is of utmost importance. The relations between the state and power are very close. In order to attain power, the resources must be used and so used that a nation becomes capable to influence the behaviour of other nations. In the world of international affairs, international actors vie for the power to pursue their interests and stop those actors who are a threat to their interests.

This unit seeks to trace the genesis of power and unravel the structure of power in contemporary international politics. The debate on the rise of

Space for Learner

Space for Learner

emerging powers such as Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC)¹ vis-à-vis the United States' (US) relative decline is common in the literature on polarity. The growing interdependence among states is also explored, as well as multilateralism which manifests particularly in the realms of security, energy, economy and the environment and shapes the relations among states and the great powers' policy options.

1.2 Objectives:

After going through the unit we will be able to :-

- *understand* the idea of power in International Relations.
- *examine* the changing nature of power.
- *examine* the relation between power and polarity.
- *analyse* the rise of multipolarity.

1.3 Power:

Power is one of the words most frequently used in the study of political science, especially in international relations. The absence of adequate institutions and procedures at the international level for resolving conflict compared to those in most domestic political systems makes the power element more obvious. Though the global political system is organised on the principle of sovereign equality of states, in actual practice, there is a hierarchy of states based on their power capabilities.

Realists believe that power is the currency of international politics. Some realists understand power to be the sum of military, economic, technological, diplomatic and other capabilities at the disposal of the state. Others see power as capabilities relative to the capabilities of other states. Thus, the power of United States is evaluated in terms of its capabilities relative to the capabilities of the Soviet Union and other states.

Power is a complex and contested concept. The concept of power, according to Gilpin is “one of the most troublesome in the field of international relations”. Kenneth Waltz states that the concept of power “remains a matter of controversy”. Much of the confusion over these basics stems

from the fact that it means different things to different people. Moreover, the trouble continues that ‘power’ is not a very straightforward concept. According to Nicholas J. Spykman, “Power is the ability to move men in some desired fashion, through “ persuasion, purchase, barter and coercion”. Hans J . Morgenthau defines power as “ man’s control over the minds and actions of other men” and international politics as a “struggle for power”. Thus power has been conceptualized both as a means and an end.

Arnold Wolfers argued that power is “the ability to move others or to get them to do what one wants them to do and not to do what one does not want them to do.” Moreover he made a distinction between power and influence, the first to mean the ability to move others by the threat or infliction of deprivations, the latter to mean the ability to do so through promises or grants of benefits. Power, therefore , is a relationship. If thought in terms of international relations, then the state’s attempt to influence others, to a great extent, is determined by its own capabilities, goals, policies and actions which is similarly affected by the behaviour of those with which it interacts.

Power, in the context of world politics, can be seen as:

- A set of attributes or capabilities
- An influence process
- Ability to control resources, behaviour of other states, events, outcomes of interaction (cooperative or conflictual)

Coulombis and Wolfe put forward an umbrella concept of power that denotes anything that establishes and maintains control of one actor over the other. They conceive power as having three elements-force, influence and authority.

They classified the elements of power into two parts: **Tangible and Intangible Elements**-the former including those elements which can be assessed in quantitative terms and latter including such elements as are ideational and psychological which cannot be quantified. Geography, raw materials, natural resources, population and technology are the tangible elements, whereas ideology, morale, leadership, personality, organisational efficiency and quality of diplomacy are the intangible elements. Power is derived from both tangible and intangible elements. Tangible elements include

Space for Learner

things such as the strength of a state's economy, size, geography, natural resources, the size of its population, its technological level of sophistication, military strength and its wealth. For example, a small country with little technological development and a basic economy tends to have less power than a large technologically-advanced and wealthy country.

As we know that power is derived from intangible elements. Intangible factors that can influence the power of a state on the international stage include things like political culture, nationalism, education of population, credibility in keeping its commitments or threats and overall skill at statecraft, such as diplomacy and use of military force.

As we have already seen, power has been conceptualised to include tangible factors such as military capabilities and intangible elements such as political will. Power, however, as a fungible concept is not necessarily limited to tangible and measurable objects. Ideational power and the potential of culture to influence an opponent cannot be underestimated.

Like several other key concepts in International Relations, scholars have laboured over the explanation of power but no universally accepted definition exists. Nevertheless, power has been agreed upon as the ability of A getting B to do what he may or may not want to do; in other words, power is the capacity, may be, to influence another player. These simple definitions do not capture the complexity of power. Power could be economic or psychological, strategic or cultural.

Thus, Power is the strength or capacity of state to exert its influence on other state or states. The power of a state is generally judged by its military capability, economic strength and its will and capacity to mould international opinion in its favour. Power, in its broadest sense, is the ability to influence the outcome of events, in the sense of having the 'power to' do something. In global politics, this includes the ability of a country to conduct its own affairs without the interference of other countries, bringing power very close to autonomy. However, power is usually thought of as a relationship: that is, as the ability to influence the behaviour of others in a manner not of their choosing, or 'power over' others. Power can therefore be said to be exercised whenever A gets B to do something that B would not otherwise have done. Power is dynamic and ever-changing, meaning that power relations are never fixed or 'given'. Power may shift, for example, due to

economic booms or slumps, financial crises, the discovery of new energy resources, the acquisition of new weapons, natural disaster, an upsurge in ethnic conflict, and so on.

Space for Learner

SAQ

Q. Differentiate between tangible and intangible element of power?

.....
.....
.....
.....

1.4 Measurement of Power:

Mere possession of elements of power does not make a country powerful. Thus, huge deposits of minerals and possession of raw material and having huge manpower does not make for power. The resources must be properly utilised. Secondly, a distinction is sometimes made between Capability and Power. Mere possession of elements of power may be called capability, and mobilisation of this capability for actual use is power. Thus, potential to be powerful is capability and mobilisation of capability is power.

An important question that you may ask is how can we measure the power of a country. It is almost impossible to be able to measure the power. It is to be examined in relative context. Thus, country A may be more powerful than C, but less powerful than B. This is because A cannot get things done according to its wishes, as far as B is concerned, but can have its way in regard to C.

However, Ray S. Cline has suggested a very useful method of measurement of power. For Cline, power is important in the sense that it is perceived both by its wielders and by those over whom it is exercised. He has suggested a formula for measurement of power though it may not give us exact results. If PP is 'perceived power', it can be measured as under :

$$PP=(C+E+M) \times (S+W)$$

Here C means critical mass, which includes population and territory; E stands for economic capability, M for military capability, S for strategic

Space for Learner

purpose, and W means, will to pursue national strategy. Whereas C, E and M are tangible, S and W are intangible elements. Thus Ray S. Cline places very important value on strategic purpose and the will to pursue that purpose.

Robert Dahl offers another suggestion for measurement of power. According to him, "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do". But, even this formula is far from satisfactory and measurement of power remains a very difficult exercise.

Scholars like Hans J. Morgenthau, E.H. Carr, and Reinhold Niebuhr emphasized on the quest of power as the main feature of international politics. It was only after the outbreak of the Second World War that the realist theory became prominent in international politics.

Realists argue that the absence of a central and overriding authority helps to explain why states come to rely on power, seeking to maintain or increase their power positions relative to other states. For one thing, the condition of anarchy is usually accompanied by a lack of trust among states in this environment. Each state faces a **self-help** situation in which it is dangerous to place the security of one's own country in the hands of another. There is no world governmental authority to enforce covenants or agreements among states.

Given international anarchy and the lack of trust in such a situation, states find themselves in what has been called a **security dilemma**. The more one state arms to protect itself from other states, the more threatened these states become and the more prone they are to resort to arming themselves to protect their own national security interests. This anarchical, self-help system obviously makes cooperation among states difficult to achieve.

According to Waltz, the international system has a well-defined structure and has three important characteristics; the ordering principle of the system, the character of the units in the system and the distribution of capabilities of the units in the system. Waltz's says that the relative distribution of power in the international system is the key independent variable in understanding war, peace, alliance politics and the balance of power.

For example, during the cold war from 1945 to 1989, there were two great power-the United States and the Soviet Union and both constituted bipolar international system and after the cold war the international system

changed into unipolar. Thus he put forward the concepts of uni-polar, bi-polar and multi-polar systems in international affairs defined by the number of great powers. In sum, Neo-realists argue that power is a means to security and more importantly for survival in an anarchic system. The broad outcomes of international politics can be best understood as resulting from structural constraints imposed on the states by their system, rather than from unit behaviour.

Space for Learner

Stop to Consider

Measuring Power: Resources versus Outcomes

Power can be measured in two main ways. The most common approach measures power by tallying the wealth and military assets of each country. The logic of this “power as resources” approach is straightforward. Wealth enables a country to buy influence through aid, loans, investment, and bribes and to cultivate soft power, among other things, funding global propaganda campaigns, building huge skyscrapers, and hosting international expositions and sporting events. Military resources (e.g., troops and weapons), on the other hand, enable a country to destroy enemies; attract allies; and extract concessions and kickbacks from weaker countries by issuing threats of violence and offers of protection.

Some scholars, however, reject the power-as-resources approach and instead measure power in terms of outcomes. In their view, power is first and foremost about winning. It is the ability of a country to prevail in a dispute, set the agenda for international negotiations, or alter the preferences of other countries.

Measuring power thus requires a “power as outcomes” approach that involves observing international events—such as wars or diplomatic negotiations—and then determining the extent to which the participants shaped the outcomes in line with their respective interests. Both methods have virtues. The power-as-outcomes approach identifies who got what, when, and how on a specific issue. It also helps explain cases in which the side with fewer resources prevailed.

Space for Learner

1.5 Balance of Power:

The Realist school gives a good deal of importance to the idea and practice of balance of power (BoP) in International Relations. In the absence of world government, every state must ensure its own security and in the extreme circumstances, its own survival. Thus, states are acutely aware of power distribution in the international political system, and would not normally allow a single state to become so powerful as to pose a mortal threat to other states. The term balance of power normally implies existence of a rough equilibrium of power among various nations, which means power should be more or less equally shared by different states.

In International Relations, Balance of Power is defined as the distribution of equal power among nations. When the power is more or less equally distributed, then no one state can dominate others and no state feels threatened. Balance of Power theory says if one state becomes powerful, then it will attack the weaker state thereby providing an opportunity to the threatened states to form a defensive coalition. Sidney B. Fay describes it as just *equilibrium* so that none of the nations become strong to exert its will or force on another state. Inis Claude explains it as “a system in which some nations regulate their power relations without any interference by any big power”.

The logic behind Balance of Power theory is that there is no world government. And each state has to rely on its own resources and strategies to prevent being attacked from another. So when a country faces threat from a powerful country, it either mobilizes its own resources or it gets into an alliance with other states so as to balance the adversary. Sometimes a particular state deliberately becomes a balancer (in its region or the world), shifting its support to oppose whatever state or alliance is strongest. Britain played this role on the European continent for centuries and China played it during the Cold war. But states do not always balance against the strongest actor. Sometimes smaller states “jump on the bandwagon” of the most powerful state; this has been called *bandwagoning* as opposed to balancing. For instance, after World War II a broad coalition did not form to contain US power, rather most states joined the US bloc. States may seek to balance threats rather than raw power, US power was greater than Soviet power but was less threatening to Europe and Japan. (Does not fit in)

SAQ

Q. Discuss a recent example of Security Dilemma?

.....
.....
.....

Space for Learner

1.6 Relational and Structural power:

1.6.1 Relational Power:

Power could be understood to operate at two levels, structural and relational. Most accounts of power portray it as a relationship. In its classic formulation, power can be said to be exercised whenever A gets B to get something that B would not otherwise have done. In other words, the ability of one actor to influence another actor or actors in a manner not of their choosing. Relational power is often understood in terms of actions and outcomes – that is, the effect one actor has on another – rather than in terms of contrasting assessments of capabilities. This is particularly the case because power is about perception. States and other actors deal with one another on the basis of their *calculations* of relative power. This may mean, for example, that reputation can sustain national power despite its decline in ‘objective’ terms. Foreign policy decisions may thus be based on under-estimates and over-estimates of the power of other actors, as well as various kinds of misinterpretation and misperception. Furthermore, especially in military matters, A may exert influence on B in one of two ways: either by getting B to do what B would not otherwise have done (compellance), or by preventing B from doing what B would otherwise have done (deterrence). Generally, the former will be riskier and require the use of greater resources than the latter. This can be seen in the contrast between the 2003 invasion of Iraq to bring about ‘regime change’ (an example of compellance) and the previous policy of preventing attacks on the Kurds and Shia Muslims by maintaining ‘no-fly zones’ (an example of deterrence).

1.6.2 Structural Power:

Susan Strange (1996), who provided an influential account of structural power, defined it as ‘the power to decide how things shall be done, the power to shape frameworks within which states relate to one another,

Space for Learner

relate to people or relate to corporate enterprises'. In other words, the ability to shape the frameworks within which global actors relate to one another, thus affecting 'how things shall be done'. Susan Strange and Stephen Krasner are the most prominent scholars who have argued for structural power as being the most important source of power in International Relations.

Strange further distinguished between four primary power structures:

- The *knowledge* structure, which influences actor's beliefs, ideas or perceptions.
- The *financial* structure, which controls access to credit or investment.
- The *security* structure, which shapes defence and strategic issues.
- The *production* structure, which affects economic development and prosperity.

Of most relevance here of course is the financial structure: 'the sum of all the arrangements governing the availability of credit plus all factors determining the terms on which currencies are exchanged for each other'.

Strange insisted that the same state or states need not dominate each of these structures, but rather that their structural power may vary across the structures. This analysis of power provides an alternative to state-centrism and highlights the important and growing role played by regimes and international organizations.

Nevertheless, structural power operates alongside relational power, providing an alternative way of explaining how outcomes are determined. The issue of structural power also clearly demonstrates how questions about the nature of power are closely linked to debates about the shape of world order.

It is important to remember that the economic preponderance of the US is inseparable from its structural power, which is the power to shape the global economy in a particular way. After all, the Bretton Woods system, set up by US after the Second World War, still constitutes the basic structure of the world economy.

1.7 Hard Power and Soft Power:

Space for Learner

Power is the strength or capacity of state to exert its influence on other state or states. The power of a state is generally judged by its military capability, economic strength and its will and capacity to mould international opinion in its favour.

The idea to distinguish between hard power and soft power was first introduced by Joseph S Nye more than two decades ago (1990). In general, he defines power as the “ability to affect others to get the outcomes one wants” and command or hard power as coercive power wielded through inducements or threats.

Hard power resources are military, economic, technological and demographic resources. These are the tangible resources which provide the capabilities for coercion and command. Hard power is based on military intervention, coercive diplomacy and economic sanctions and relies on tangible power resources such as armed forces or economic means. Thus, the German invasion into Poland in 1939 and the UN economic sanctions against Iraq in 1991 following the first Gulf War are examples for the use of hard power.

Soft power, on the other hand, is the capacity to persuade others to do what one wants. According to Nye, persuasive power is based on attraction and emulation and “associated with intangible power resources such as culture, ideology, and institutions”.

They include, norms, leadership role in international institutions, culture, state capacity, strategy, and national leadership. Soft power is less coercive in nature. Some soft power resources, such as state capacity, strategic or diplomatic strength and quality of national leadership are important in converting a state’s latent capabilities into actualised power.

The dispersion of American culture within the Eastern bloc during the Cold War indicate the existence of American soft power and more recent processes of EU enlargement are indices for soft power possessed by the EU.

The concept of hard and soft power is a continuum with several instruments of different degrees of coercion or persuasion. These instruments are punishment, compulsion, inducement, agenda setting, persuasion and

Space for Learner

attraction. Hard power is coercive power executed through military threats and economic inducements and based on tangible resources such as the army or economic strength. In contrast, soft power is persuasive power deriving from attraction and emulation and grounded on intangible resources such as culture. Overall, it appears that soft power strategies are more effective in the contemporary international system than hard power strategies. The demise of hard power is caused by changes in the world order, whereas the strength of soft power is based on its endurance and sustainability. Nye argues that soft power is as important as hard power in international politics because it enables a change of behaviour in others without competition or conflict.

Although they are oppositional approaches to power, their combination, smart power, has its place in academic debate and policy making. Smart power is a synthesis of traditional sources of hard power, including military and economic resources, and soft power, including institutions, culture, ideas, the perception of legitimacy, and values. As soft power has weaknesses, too, it is worth considering the strength of smart power strategies.

Stop to Consider

Potential and Actual Power

Baldwin (1979) distinguishes between potential and actual power, which is similar to the notions of 'strength' and 'power'.

So, potential power, or 'strength' refers to the ability and means that would potentially allow one country to influence another. Thus, a country might be strong, but not powerful, if it does not use its strength effectively.

Actual, real 'power', on the other hand is 'strength' capable of being used effectively. This is the situation of failure of power that Baldwin (1979) describes as "He had the cards but played them poorly". Power, however is unachievable without strength, which is reflected in the importance of military power for the so-called military states that often put expenditure on guns above the expenditure on development.

1.8 Polarity:

Polarity is the way in which the power is distributed among the states in an international system. It also marks the true characteristics of an international system and can be categorized as **unipolarity, bipolarity and multipolarity** at any given period of time. Polarity also depicts the kind of power and influence a state exerts over others either in a region or on a global scale..

The concept of polarity in the international system is used to describe the distribution of power capabilities across states. Polarity is a descriptive term that illustrates the structure of the system through a portrayal of the concentration of hard power capabilities in the system. The distribution of power capabilities in the international system determines the number of the great powers and, consequently, the polarity of the international system.

Polarity is a system-level concept that relates to the distribution of power, real or perceived, in the international system. Unilateralism and multilateralism are choices about the policies that states adopt within a given international system. Newnham and Evans (1998, 34) argue that ‘polarity implies that within a definable system certain actors are so important that they constitute “poles” against which other actors have to respond by joining coalitions or remaining non-aligned’. Thus, a polar actor is one whose rapid decline would distort the structure of the system. Grevi defines poles as ‘states endowed with the resources, political will and institutional ability to project and protect their interests at the global level, multi-regional or regional level, depending on the size of the power in question’ (Grevi 2009, 19).

For Waltz, polarity is the concentration of power among major states. “Poles” are those states with unusually large concentrations of all underlying elements of power. The US is the only state today- and indeed, the only state in modern international history- that excels markedly and measurably in all the relevant power capabilities: military, economic, technological and geopolitical. Another long running argument in international politics concerns the effect that polarity has on security and stability. A common assumption has been that the more balance there is in the distribution of material power in international politics, the greater likelihood of security and stability.

Space for Learner

Space for Learner

Scholars differ as to whether unipolarity, bipolarity or unipolarity is likely to produce the most stable and peaceful outcomes. Kenneth Waltz and John Mearsheimer are among those who argue that bipolarity tends to generate relatively more stability, whereas John Ikenberry and William Wohlforth are among those arguing for the stabilizing impact of unipolarity. Some scholars, such as Karl Deutsch and J. David. Singer, contend that multipolarity was the most stable structure.

1.9 Unipolarity:

Unipolarity in international politics is a distribution of power in which one state exercises most of the cultural, economic, and military influence. With the end of Cold War and the collapse of Soviet Union many realists argue that unipolarity has arrived which marked the rise of the United States as the largest military and economic power in the world. The USA, in other words, is the sole great power. It has achieved global hegemony, a feat no other country has ever accomplished. Hegemonic governance and the use of a superior unipolar position in the international system are based on both material and ideological power.

Charles Krauthammer and Robert Kagan are what might be called unipolar unilateralists. They see the distribution of power in the international system as essentially unipolar. They also embrace unilateral policies as the means by which the United States must protect its interests and act for the greater good of humanity. Krauthammer identified the “unipolar moment” in his seminal article of 1990 and later came to see unipolarity as an enduring feature of the international order. John Ikenberry and Joseph Nye are similar to Krauthammer and Kagan in that they perceive the international system as essentially unipolar.

For William Wohlforth, unipolarity is, a structure in which one state’s capabilities are too great to be counterbalanced. Once capabilities are so concentrated, a structure arises that is fundamentally distinct from either multipolarity (a structure comprising three or more especially powerful states) or bipolarity (a structure produced when two states are substantially more powerful than all others). Unipolarity is an extremely useful term for capturing the current state of the international system, which is marked by an

overwhelming and unprecedented concentration of power in both the military arsenal and the economic strength of one nation. In other words, the term unipolarity describes a heavily skewed distribution of power in favour of one state.

In unipolar systems, there is only one great power and no real competition. Unipolarity favours the absence of war among great powers and comparatively low levels of competition for prestige or security for two reasons: the leading state's power advantage removes the problem of hegemonic rivalry from world politics, and it reduces the salience and stakes of balance of power politics among the major states.

According to Wohlforth, "Therefore one pole is best, and security competition among the great powers should be minimal." Unipolarity generates few incentives for security and prestige competition among great powers. This idea is based on hegemonic stability theory and the rejection of the balance of power theory. The balance of power theory, by contrast, stipulates that as long as the international system remains in balance (without unipolar power), peace is maintained.

While unipolarity captures the essence of the distribution of power in a system, it does not capture the amount of influence exerted on others in the system. Even in a unipolar system, the dominant state can choose to demonstrate little or no desire to control both the internal and external affairs of states around the globe. In other words, unipolarity is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for the status of global hegemony. The extent to which the international system remains unipolar depends on the exercise of US power. The US has sought to legitimise its primacy in political-military matters through a combination of 'benign hegemony' and 'multilateral rule-making' rather than forceful unilateralism.

Many scholars have proclaimed the unipolarity of the United States. Some, however, have doubted it. For example, Mearsheimer and Huntington suggested that the United States is just one pole among many and that we are already living in a multipolar world. For them, mainly the BRIC states (Brazil, Russia, India and China) account for powers that need to be counted in, with an economically emergent China and a resource strong and militarily strong Russia, they would argue, we are already living in a multipolar world

Space for Learner

where no state solely dominates. They do not consider the European Union as a pole, though.

Kenneth Waltz turns to the question of international politics and provides a realist interpretation to the U.S. unipolar moment, which he believes is fleeting for two reasons. With no great power to check its adventurism, the United States will weaken itself by misusing its power internationally. Secondly, even if the United States acts benevolently, states will still attempt to balance against it because the power asymmetry demands it. In a self-help system, states do not worry about other states' intentions as they do other states' capabilities. He sees China as already beginning to counter U.S. power. In conclusion, the U.S. unipolar moment is fleeting and multipolarity is already materializing.

Check Your Progress

1. Explain the role of tangible elements of power?
2. Bring out the difference between hard power and soft power.

1.10 Bipolarity:

Bipolarity is a distribution of power in which two states have the majority of economic, military, and cultural influence internationally or regionally. Often, spheres of influence would develop and make an impact on stability and security. For example, during the Cold War, most Western and capitalist states would fall under the influence of the US, while most Communist states would fall under the influence of the USSR.

A long-standing debate among realists is whether bipolarity is more or less war-prone than multipolarity. It is generally agreed that the state system was multipolar from its inception in 1648 until the Second World War ended in 1945. It was only bipolar during the Cold War, which began right after the Second World War and ran until 1989.

It is tempting to argue that it is clear from twentieth-century European history that bipolarity is more peaceful than multipolarity. After all, there were two world wars in the first half of that century when Europe was multipolar,

while there was no shooting war between the USA and Soviet Union during the latter half of that century, when the system was bipolar.

Waltz argues that a bipolar system is inherently more stable than a multipolar one and defines stability as changes in the number of poles. (needs elaboration.) Waltz, however, acknowledges that stability is the avoidance of great power war or wars between the poles. His empirical justification for the conclusions relies on the multipolar system that preceded the two world wars and the bipolar Cold War.

Waltz argued that bipolarity tended towards the greatest stability because the two great powers would engage in rapid mutual adjustment, which would prevent inadvertent escalation and reduce the chance of power asymmetries forming.

1.11 Rise of Multipolarity:

Multipolarity is a distribution of power in which more than two nation-states have nearly equal amounts of military, cultural, and economic influence. Many believe that the world is still unipolar with the United States having unmatched global power-projection capabilities with the largest Navy and Air-Force in the world and a huge defence budget which can mask the GDP of many countries. However this does not essentially makes the world unipolar as with the rise of Asian giants like China, India and Japan, the Balance of Power has started tilting in favour of a Multipolar world.

1.11.1 Multipolarity and Its Relative Influence:

The ‘Concert of Europe,’ a period from after the Napoleonic Wars to the Crimean War, was an example of peaceful multipolarity (the great powers of Europe assembled regularly to discuss international and domestic issues). Since the 17th century multi-polarity is more unstable and war-prone than bipolarity or unipolarity. It caused the Thirty Years War, First World War and Second World War; however the dynamics of international relations has changed a lot since then.

In a post-colonial era the pursuit of National Interest and the ever increasing quest for the military and economic excellence has become a norm. Formation of alliances and waging a war is a bit difficult in a multipolar

Space for Learner

arrangement. Due to the highly evolved military, cutting-edge weaponry and the possession of Nuclear-powered ballistic missiles, multipolar systems may be more stable than bipolar systems and it also depicts the assured destruction scenario in case of a war. The recent rise of new powers such as the BRIC countries – Brazil, Russia, India and China– is already marking the rise of a multi-polar international system with considerable influence.

It has been argued that the waning of ‘American hegemony’ has given rise to the regional power centres of Europe and East Asia. However, despite the devolution of US power globally, the shift towards multipolarity may take decades from now. The extent to which post-Cold War international politics remains unipolar will depend on the cautious exercise of US preponderance and its ability to convince other states of its apparent ‘benign intent.

Opinions on the stability of multipolarity differ. Classical realist theorists, such as Hans Morgenthau and E. H. Carr, hold that multipolar systems are more stable than bipolar systems, as great powers can gain power through alliances and petty wars that do not directly challenge other powers; in bipolar systems, classical realists argue, this is not possible.

Thus, one generally distinguishes three main variations in polarity : **unipolarity**, **bipolarity**, and **multipolarity** for two or more centers of power. The type of system is completely dependent on the distribution of power and influence of states in a region or globally.

STOP TO CONSIDER

BRICS:

BRICS is the acronym coined to associate five major emerging economies: Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa. The BRICS members are known for their significant influence on regional affairs. Since 2009, the governments of the BRICS states have met annually at formal summits. India hosted the most recent 13th BRICS summit on 9 September 2021 virtually.

Originally the first four were grouped as “BRIC” (or “the BRICs”) before the induction of South Africa in 2010. The BRICS have a

combined area of 39,746,220 km² (15,346,101.0 sq mi) and an estimated total population of about 3.21 billion, or about 26.7% of the world land surface and 41.5% of the world population. Four out of five members are among the world's ten largest countries by population and by area, except for South Africa which is twenty-fourth in both.

Space for Learner

1.12 Non-polarity:

Finally, a small literature has recently begun to discuss the idea of what is referred to as Non-polarity.

Nonpolarity is an international system which has been postulated by Richard Haass, featuring numerous centers of power but no center dominating any other center. Centers of power can be nation-states, corporations, non-governmental organizations, terrorist groups etc. In 2008, Richard H. Haass challenged the notion of polarity and argued that the world is now nonpolar. According to Richard Haass, a nonpolar world is one which is characterized by “numerous centers with meaningful power”. Of particular interest is the spread of material power to non-state actors such as multinational corporations and international organisations.

He coined the term nonpolarity to describe the current state of international affairs. Haass argued that power is now diffused amongst a plethora of actors – state and non-state alike – in such way, that there are no distinct pole (unipolarity) or group of poles (multipolarity) exerting significant influence on others.

However, on close inspection, nonpolarity fails to explain two key existing conditions in international politics. First, the US' ability to act unilaterally on matters of vital national security interests. Second, the tendency of states to band together to form distinct and influential concentrations of power to advance common agendas. In short, there are different types of power impacting international actors and it is not sufficient to say the international system has a particular polarity.

Space for Learner

Check Your Progress:

1. What is security dilemma and is there a solution to it?
2. Is unipolarity more peaceful than bipolarity or multipolarity?
3. Evaluate the role of tangible and intangible elements of power.
4. Discuss the various dimensions of power.
5. What do you understand by unipolarity?

1.13 Summing Up:

After reading this unit you have learnt that during the 1990s the pundits and scholars of International Relations (IR) proclaimed that the world was rapidly becoming more peaceful and that realism was dead. International politics was said to have been transformed with the end of Cold War. In essence, the world remains a dangerous place, although the level of threat varies from place to place. States still worry about their survival, which means that they have little choice but to pay attention to the and power configurations and balance of power. International politics is still synonymous with power politics, as it has been for all of recorded history. This explains how power remains an enduring element of international politics and why states pursue power.

With the disintegration of USSR in the Post-cold War scenario USA became the dominant power by assuming global leadership in a Unipolar System by virtue of preponderance in economic and military power. Over the years the gradual decline in American hegemony due to imperial overstretch has made the emergence of multiple centres of power in the form BRICS(Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) countries thereby establishing a multipolar world. Multipolarity to some extent can ensure protection of democratic norms and peace in a conflict-ridden world.

1.14 References and Suggested Readings:

1. Basu, Rumki, International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues. Sage Publications 2018, pp-219-230

2. Dougherty, James E., Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr Contending Theories of International Relations, Harper&Row, 1981 pp84-132
3. J. Baylis, S. Smith and P. Owens (eds.) Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations, New York: Oxford University Press,2011,
4. Viotti P. and M. Kauppi, International Relations Theory : Realism, Pluralism, Globalism. New York, Macmillan:, 2007 pp. 32-73
5. Wohlforth, William C, The Stability of a unipolar world in *Perspectives on World Politics*, Eds. Richard Little & Michael Smith. Routledge, 2006

Space for Learner

HEGEMONY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Unit Structure:

- 2.1 Introduction**
- 2.2 Objectives**
- 2.3 Hegemony: The Concept**
- 2.4 Hegemony in IR**
 - 2.4.1 Emergence of Two Power Blocs**
 - 2.4.2 Challenges to Bipolarity**
 - 2.4.3 Growth of Unipolarism**
- 2.5 US Hegemony of World Politics**
 - 2.5.1 Ideological Domination of US**
- 2.6 Summing Up**
- 2.7 References and Suggested Readings**

2.1 Introduction:

The English word hegemony derives from the Greek word Hegemonia, means 'leadership'. In international relations, a hegemon is the 'leader' or 'leading state' of a group of states. But a 'group of states' pre-supposes relations between them. Indeed, leadership by necessity implies some degree of social order and collective organisation. The states which form the group are the units, of which the hegemonic state is but one, albeit the primary one. It is clear, therefore, that when we think about hegemony, we are thinking as much about interstate systems. Hegemony does not exist by itself, but is a unique political phenomenon that exists within a given interstate system, which is itself the product of specific historical and political circumstances.

2.2 Objectives:

After going through this unit you will be able to –

- *understand* the term Hegemony
- *examine* the US hegemony over world politics
- *discuss* the polarisation of world politics

2.3 Hegemony: The Concept:

Space for Learner

Hegemony consists of the possession and command of a multifaceted set of power resources. More importantly, all hegemonic states share one common characteristic: they enjoy ‘structural power’. It is this structural power that permits the hegemon to occupy a central position within its own system, and, if it so chooses, to play a leading role in it. Indeed, the ability to shape other states’ preferences and interests is just as important as the hegemon’s ability to command power resources, for the exercise of structural power makes it far less likely that the hegemon will have to mobilise its resources in a direct and coercive manner. This is also why only some states, with their rich endowment of human and natural resources, have at least the potential to become hegemons.

Hegemony, then, which in any case is backed by a preponderance of material power, may be sustained by a hegemonic transnational culture that legitimates the rules and norms of a hierarchical interstate system. The way in which some scholars (particularly critical theorists) employ the concept of hegemony owes a great deal to the work of the Italian communist writer, Antonio Gramsci. Writing in the 1930s, Gramsci suggested that Marx was correct in arguing that the ‘economic base’ sets the limiting conditions for politics, ideology, and the state.

But the underlying thrust of Gramsci’s work is consistently away from simple forms of economic reductionism. What he centrally addressed was the complex nature of relations between structure and superstructure, which, he argued, could not be reduced to a reflection of economic conditions narrowly construed. His theoretical originality lay in the series of novel concepts that he used to expand and transform our understanding of politics.

Gramsci was greatly preoccupied with the character of state and civil society relations prevailing in relatively modern societies, especially capitalist democracies. He challenged the reductionist conception of the state as exclusively a class state, a mere instrument of ruling-class coercion and domination. He insisted on the educative role of the state, its significance in

Space for Learner

constructing alliances that could win support from different social strata, and the state's role in providing cultural and moral leadership. Although the economic structure may be, in the last instance, determinative, Gramsci gave much greater autonomy to the effects of the actual conduct of the struggle for leadership, across a wide front and on a variety of sites and institutions.

He argued that the role of the communist party was to engage and lead in a broad, multi-faceted struggle for hegemony with the capitalist state. A shift in socialist political strategy was necessary, away from an outright frontal assault on the state to the winning of strategic positions on a number of fronts. Socialist struggle was conceived as a 'war of position' in the first instance against the forces of capitalist hegemony in civil society and culture.

Thus hegemony at a global level is not necessarily to be equated with material or military dominance (as in some forms of realism, particularly in the way that realists elaborate hegemonic stability theory); nor is it necessarily to be regarded as a desirable public good (as in some forms of liberal internationalism).

SAQ

Q. What do you mean by hegemony? (50 words)

.....
.....
.....
.....

2.4 Hegemony in IR:

As we know, IR deals with the relationship between nation states, international organisations and other groups. These are the actors in international relations. The most important actors in IR are states. This accounts for the state-centric-view of the international system. The nature of the international system from the realists' perspective is anarchical. This state of anarchy does not imply a complete chaos or absence of structures and rules; rather it portrays a lack of central government that can enforce

rules. In domestic society within states, governments can enforce contracts, deter citizens from breaking rules and use their monopoly on legally sanctioned violence to enforce a system of law. In the case of international relations, the great power system and the hegemony of a superpower can provide relative peace and stability for decades on end but then can break down into costly wars among the great powers.

The agenda of world politics has become like a three-dimensional chess game in which one can win only by playing vertically as well as horizontally. On the top board of classic interstate military issues, the United States is indeed the only super power with global military reach, and it makes sense to speak in traditional terms of unipolarity or hegemony. However, on the middle board of interstate economic issues, the distribution of power is multipolar. The United States cannot obtain the outcomes it wants on trade, antitrust, or financial regulation issues without the agreement of the European Union, Japan, China, and others. It makes little sense to call this American hegemony. On the bottom board of transnational issues like terrorism, international crime, climate change, and the spread of infectious diseases, power is widely distributed and chaotically organised among state and non-state actors. It makes no sense at all to call this a unipolar world or an American empire—despite the claims of propagandists on the right and left. This is among several issues that are now intruding into the world of grand strategy. Yet many political leaders still focus almost entirely on military assets and classic military solutions—the top board. They mistake the necessary for the sufficient. They are one-dimensional players in a three-dimensional game. In the long term, that is the way to lose, since obtaining favourable outcomes on the bottom transnational board often requires the use of soft power assets.

A neo-Gramscian concept of hegemony focuses on the consensual ways in which transnational classes, organisations and international law reproduce capitalism and its inequalities. The transnational capitalist class—dominated by great powers—forms a ‘global civil society’ that universalises liberal ideals rather than imposing itself through more coercive processes of classical imperialism and colonisation, as was the case in earlier times.

Space for Learner

Space for Learner

Stop to Consider

Liberal's Hegemony

For liberals, there is a similar challenge to look beyond American hegemony as the starting point of investigating multilateralism and regionalism and their institutional forms. Liberalism also needs to acknowledge the significant variations in cooperative behaviour that exist in different local contexts, as no single model of integration or interactions can account for all or most of them. For constructivism, taking stock of different forms of agency in the creation and diffusion of ideas and norms remains a major challenge.

2.4.1 Emergence of Two Power Blocs (Bi-Polarisation)

We know that Cold War is the product of ideological differences between USA and USSR. After the Second World war the world was dominated by these two countries and they become super powers. The two superpowers were keen on expanding their spheres of influence in different parts of the world. The world sharply divided between the two alliance systems, a state was supposed to remain tied to its protective superpower to limit the influence of the other superpower and its allies.

The end of the Second World War did not signal a return to normality; on the contrary, it resulted in a new conflict. The major European powers that had been at the forefront of the international stage in the 1930s were left exhausted and ruined by the war, setting the scene for the emergence of two new global superpowers. Two blocs developed around the Soviet Union and the United States, with other countries being forced to choose between the two camps.

The USSR came out of the war territorially enlarged and with an aura of prestige from having fought Hitler's Germany. The country was given a new lease of life by its heroic resistance to the enemy, exemplified by the victory at Stalingrad. The USSR also offered an ideological, economic and social model extending as never before to the rest of Europe. Furthermore, the Red Army, unlike the US army, was not demobilised at the end of the war. The Soviet Union thus had a real numerical superiority in terms of men and heavy weapons.

Again, the United States was the great victor of the Second World War. Its human and material losses were relatively low, and even though the US Army was almost completely demobilised a few months after the end of hostilities, the United States remained the world's leading military power. Its navy and air force were unrivalled, and until 1949 it was the only country with the capacity to produce nuclear weapons. It also confirmed its status as the world's leading economic power, in terms of both the volume of trade and industrial and agricultural production.

Gradually, the conflicts of interest between the new world powers i.e. USA and USSR increasing, and a climate of fear and suspicion reigned. Interestingly, each country feared the new found power of the other. The Soviets felt surrounded and threatened by the West and accused the United States of spearheading 'imperialist expansion'. For their part, the Americans were concerned at Communist expansion and accused Stalin of breaching the Yalta Agreement on the right of free peoples to self-determination. The result was a long period of international tension interspersed with dramatic crises which, from time to time, led to localised armed conflicts without actually causing a full scale war between the United States and the USSR. From 1947, Europe, divided into two blocs, was at the heart of the struggle between the two superpowers. The Cold War reached its first climax with the Soviet blockade of Berlin. The explosion of the first Soviet atomic bomb in the summer of 1949 reinforced the USSR in its role as a world power. This situation confirmed the predictions of Winston Churchill, who, in March 1946, had been the first Western statesman to speak of an 'Iron Curtain' that now divided Europe in two.

Thus it is seen that, after World War II, emergence of USA and USSR as super powers increased tensions in the international field which ultimately divided the world into two power blocks. On the other hand, during that period the Third World countries focused on their economic development and tried to get rid of the traditional distribution of economic resources leading to the establishment of a New International Economic Order. Tension between USA and USSR, marked as Cold War and efforts of the Third

Space for Learner

World countries for the establishment of a new economic order which changed the international scenario and begin a new era of uni-polarism in terms of physical power and multi-polarism in terms of distribution of economic resources.

Check Your Progress

1. What is Hegemony in IR?
2. Define Bi-Polarisation of world politics.

2.4.2 Challenges to Bipolarity

During the cold war period many countries mainly from Asia and South Asia gained their independence and opted for a new International order. Development got much priority than power politics. Therefore a change had been seen in the world politics which has challenged the bi-polar system.

The first challenge to a “bipolar” world came in France under the leadership of Charles DeGaulle, a World War II leader. DeGaulle did not feel that France should depend upon the U.S. to protect it; nor did he wish his country to become embroiled in a dispute between the two superpowers. Thus, France rejected a nuclear test ban treaty signed by the U.S. and U.S.S.R, and in 1964 France detonated its own nuclear device in the Sahara Desert. He later developed a task force capable of defending France. His plan was for Europe to emerge as a third power independent of the two superpowers; however he was not successful in selling his plan to other European nations and when he left office in 1969, his design for a Europe free from superpower domination had vanished. In Yugoslavia, Marshall Tito ruled the country without allowing control from the Soviets, as a result of which Stalin expelled Yugoslavia from the Soviet Bloc. Tito pursued a policy of ties with both East and West.

2.4.3 Growth of Unipolarism

Following the demise of the cold war in 1990s, the United States emerged as the world’s leading power in the international system. This supremacy is partly supported by the global recognition of United States’ position as the most powerful nation on earth. America’s global supremacy is also anchored

on the centrality of its role in global politics and its tremendous influence on the geopolitics of the international system. By referring to the U.S. as the world's super power, there is an implied relational reference and positioning of the United States as the center piece of the international system. It is perceived as the grandmaster of international affairs. The U.S. has significant influence on global political and developmental relations that characterize the ideologically unstable and anarchic international system.

The discourse on unipolar global politics gained momentum during the George Bush era with increased debate on the enhancement of America's super power image. Paradoxically, the world's shift from the bipolar to unipolar power relations also gave rise to the growth of globalization. This shift juxtaposed the imagined world unity after the death of cold war with America's budding thirst for domination of the world system, followed by the America's need for re-asserting themselves as the world's most powerful people on earth. This juxtaposition created a contradiction that is still evident in the divisions that exists within the unipolar international system even as it struggles to remain united in a globalized fashion. These seamless cleavages of the international system exemplify the power imbalances and developmental relations that characterize this unipolarity as the US tries to navigate the minefield of globalization, economic, political and social development.

The USA, as the sole surviving super power began dominating the international system in general and the UN Security Council in particular. The virtual absence of any power capable and willing to challenge the US power, enabled it to play a dominant role in World Politics. Unipolarity came to characterize the international system. Ideological unipolarism gave it further strength.

However, towards the beginning of the 21st century, there appeared several definite indications towards the re-emergence of polycentrism. Russia, China, European Union, India, Japan, EU, all of these the UN, the G-15 and some others began playing a more vigorous role. All of these accepted the objective of ensuring a multipolar international structure. Most of the states declared their resolve to secure and maintain the multipolar character of the international system.

Space for Learner

In June 2005, China, India and Russia decided to forge and develop a common understanding and approach towards problems like terrorism and the need for the protection of their strategic interests. The US dominance, that was witnessed in the first few post cold war years, also came to be somewhat diluted.

After the unfortunate events of 11 September, 2001 (Black Tuesday Terrorist attacks in the USA), the USA also became conscious of the need to involve fully and more vigorously a large number of states in the international war against terror. As such, there came to be present several definite trends towards the re- emergence of a new multi-centrism or multi-polarity in international relations. Contemporary international system is definitely trying to become a multipolar system.

SAQ:

Q. Write a note on Unipolar world order. (100 words)

.....
.....
.....

2.5 US Hegemony of World Politics:

The US is nowadays variously described as the preponderant power, as hegemonic, even as imperial; the differences here are largely semantic. In 1945 the US stood alone as the only major industrial power not devastated individually war – indeed, it has been estimated that the US was at the bottom of over half the world’s total product at that time. In response to Nazi and Japanese military aggression the US had turned this productive capacity into a great and powerful military machine, with the world’s largest navy and air force, a large high-tech army, and sole possession of nuclear weapons. America’s allies in the Second world war were became increasingly dependent on the US to run their own military machines; the Soviet soldiers who won the great battles on the eastern front relied on US lend–lease trucks to keep their supply-lines open, and the British divisions that formed a decreasing proportion of the armies on the Western Front in 1944/45 were spearheaded by American-made tanks.

Space for Learner

The new global organisations formed in and immediately after the Second World war, were shaped, maintained and dominated by the US. All such institutions used to create a congenial international environment, promoting its version of collective security and liberal economic relations as per US guidelines.

At the point when the USSR crumbled into its 15 constituent republics, the Assembled Conditions of America was left as the world's just superpower. Albeit a few different states had atomic weapons – including the four different individuals from the P5 – and others additionally had profoundly focused economies – including Japan and a recently joined Germany – no state could coordinate the USA for its impact over the political, financial and social parts. Its military was the most exceptional, its economy was by a wide margin the biggest, and its social ventures filled motion picture screens and bookshelves around the globe. In spite of these monstrous preferences, the USA was astoundingly limited in its utilization of energy amid the main decade after the finish of the Chilly War. It kept away from coordinate contribution in various provincial emergencies around the globe, and was censured for inaction – as in Rwanda in 1994 – more frequently than it was for unnecessary interventionism. The administration of Bill Clinton (1993–2001) was one in which the Unified States for the most part worked inside the worldwide administration associations of the day. It was a dynamic – if some of the time grudging – member at the Assembled Countries, and effectively tried to console its partners and previous foes of its great expectations. With just a couple of exemptions, its remote strategy concentrated on multilateralism as the favored technique for strife determination and critical thinking – building collusions and expansive coalitions notwithstanding when it could have found a way to address its global objectives.

For a considerable length of time, the United States has been regulating its energy by putting itself at the head different financial and security mechanical assemblies. With numerous countries reliant on the United States for financial and military purposes, America is just winding up more dug in their position of worldwide geopolitical predominance.

Space for Learner

Over the previous century, the United States has built up a worldwide monetary framework that requires them to survive. Coordinate American control over real universal keeping money foundations, for example, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund have made America vital in the current financial framework.

Joined States can manage military activity worldwide as a perpetual individual from the UN Security committee and the Americans have key partnerships keeping in mind the end goal to look after power. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization ensures American military interests in Europe, encompassing Russia and viably killing the once effective Soviet Union. With an exhaustive arrangement of organizations together and the main part in the universal markets, the United States is situated to remain the most intense nation on the planet. Any potential superpower must coordinate with the United States for access to the worldwide market, and any theoretical encounter between the two would see America financially choke its adversary. Through their monstrous military spending and vital union producing, no countries can would like to contend with the United States militarily.

SAQ:

Q. What are the challenges faced by the Bipolar world order.
(50 words)

.....
.....
.....

2.5.1 Ideological Domination of US

The requirement for ideological colonialism by the U.S focuses to the idea of energy relations that exist in the worldwide framework. It likewise features the mastery, intimidation and precariousness that exist on the planet despite the fact that there is a unipolar world request. It likewise outlines the prevailing idea of worldwide governmental issues controlled by the U.S. This is the wellspring of the logical inconsistencies that pooch the globalization model of a brought together world government. It is thusly that the U.S is

considered as an imperialistic domain developer in the more extensive setting of the universal framework and worldwide governmental issues.

The position of the US in the global framework as a super power says a lot about its hunger for settler expansionism. Backers of the matchless quality of the U.S. in the new world request contend that the American nearness and its effect on worldwide governmental issues is a signal of good confidence since it presents and advances majority rule standards in the anarchic problem areas of the global framework. While this is contestable, they likewise place that the world has turned out to be more tranquil with mediations of the U.S. military peacekeeping missions. In any case, with the expanded militarization of help particularly in Africa, it isn't hard to recognize the imperialistic qualities of the U.S in worldwide governmental issues. It is along these lines unquestionable that ideological thought processes underlay the proposed military guide sent to the battling countries of the world, which brings up issues about the intentions of the U.S altruism in its intercession systems. At this point, we get at the intersection of matchless quality and geopolitics of the global framework and the inquiry regarding the route forward.

It is in this way along these topics that we finish up by rehashing that the U.S matchless quality and control of the universal framework is both a decent and awful thing. While it keeps on fortifying the great view picture through its vital military mediations to re-state itself, it proceeded with contradictions of good norms past its boondocks and the waning financial assets may debilitate its position as the sole driving force. It is sheltered to contend that unless we see a consolidated mix of techniques, the position and matchless quality of the United States of America in the worldwide framework is confronting challenges that are probably going to cause a power move that will tilt the unipolarity of the present force to be reckoned with relations into an alternate point and adequately modify connections universal framework.

Space for Learner

Check Your Progress

1. How US control the world politics?
2. Discuss the world politics in the post cold war era.
3. Write a note on unipolarisation of world politics.

Space for Learner

2.6 Summing Up:

After reading this unit you have learnt that the collapse of the socialist U.S.S.R. as well as the other socialist countries of Europe gave a serious and fatal blow to the ideology of communism. Further, the acceptance and adoption of liberalisation, liberalism, democracy, decentralisation and market economy by almost all the states gave a further blow to the popularity of communism in the world. Even China had to abandon the socialist economic system even while retaining the socialist-political authoritarianism of the past. It found itself isolated. The case of Vietnam and Cuba also came to be similar. Along with this, the ideological principles of liberalism, liberalisation of politics and economy, human rights, democratisation, decentralisation and peaceful co-existence, received a universal recognition. Ideological unipolarism came to characterize the post-USSR era of international relations. In part, the survival of regimes rests on their embedding in permanent institutions such as the UN, NATO, and the International Monetary Fund. These institutions become the tangible manifestation of shared expectations as well as the machinery for coordinating international actions based on those expectations. In international security affairs, the UN and other IGOs provide a stable framework for resolving disputes.

2.7 References and Suggested Readings:

1. Keohane, R.O. & Nye, J.S. (2012). *Power and Interdependence* (4th ed.). New York: Longman Pearson Education Inc.
2. Keohane, R.O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton.
3. Krasner, S.T. (1983). (Ed.). *International Regimes*. Cornell University Press.
4. Taylor P. & Groom, A.J.R. (1988). (Eds). *International Institutions at Work*. St Martin's.

UNIT - 3
STATE AND NATIONS

Space for Learner

Unit Structure:

- 3.1 Introduction**
- 3.2 Objectives**
- 3.3 State and Nations: the Concept**
- 3.4 State**
 - 3.4.1 Role of Sovereign States in International Relations**
 - 3.4.2 The Role of the State in the International Economy, Politics and Climate**
- 3.5 Nations**
 - 3.5.1 Nation-State**
 - 3.5.2 Characteristics**
- 3.6 Summing Up**
- 3.7 References and Suggested Readings**

3.1 Introduction:

Nation-state, a territorially bounded sovereign polity—i.e., a state, that is ruled in the name of a community of citizens who identify themselves as a nation. The legitimacy of a nation-state’s rule over a territory and over the population inhabiting it stems from the right of a core national group within the state (which may include all or only some of its citizens) to self-determination. Members of the core national group see the state as belonging to them and consider the approximate territory of the state to be their homeland. Accordingly, they demand that other groups, both within and outside the state, recognize and respect their control over the state. As the American sociologist Rogers Brubaker put it in *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (1996), nation-states are “states of and for particular nations.”

As a political model, the nation-state fuses two principles: the principle of state sovereignty, first articulated in the Peace of Westphalia (1648), which recognizes the right of states to govern their territories without external interference; and the principle of national sovereignty, which recognizes the

Space for Learner

right of national communities to govern themselves. National sovereignty in turn is based on the moral-philosophical principle of popular sovereignty, according to which states belong to their peoples. The latter principle implies that legitimate rule of a state requires some sort of consent by the people. That requirement does not mean, however, that all nation-states are democratic. Indeed, many authoritarian rulers have presented themselves—both to the outside world of states and internally to the people under their rule—as ruling in the name of a sovereign nation.

3.2 Objectives:

After going through this unit you will be able to—

- *understand* the concept of nation state in international relations,
- *understand* the concept of nation,
- *discuss* the role of state.

3.3 State and Nations: the Concept

State is a large social system with a set of rules that are enforced by a permanent administrative body (government). That body claims and tries to enforce sovereignty. That is, the state claims to be the highest source of decision-making of the social system within its jurisdiction, and it rejects outside interference in making or enforcing its set of rules. The many smaller systems within the state are not sovereign, nor are large international organizations like the United Nations, since states routinely reject their authority. The state is a political concept that refers to the exercise of power or the ability to make and enforce rules.

On the other hand, nation is a group of individuals who feel that they have so much in common (interests, habits, ways of thinking, and the like) that they should all become a particular state. Unlike the term state, the term nation refers to the subjective feelings of its people. By this definition almost all the present nations would like to become nation-states, but many nations are actually parts of other states, and many states are not nation-states. On the whole, nation-states can count on much greater loyalty from their citizens than states that contain many nations, and this gives them greater strength in their international dealings.

3.4 State:

Already we have an idea of the concept state. Now let us explain the concept in brief. The state is central to the study of international relations and will remain so into the foreseeable future. State policy is the most common object of analysis. States decide to go to war. They erect trade barriers. They choose whether and at what level to establish environmental standards. States enter international agreements, or not, and choose whether to abide by their provisions, or not. International relations as a discipline is chiefly concerned with what states do on the world stage and, in turn, how their actions affect other states. This article first reviews the rationales behind state-centric theories of international relations. The second section examines criticisms and probes the limits of state-centric theories. The third section identifies three promising areas of research within state-centric theory: state structure, heterogeneity, and international hierarchy.

Similarly, states are a common unit of analysis in theories of international relations. Many analysts focus on states and their interactions to explain observed patterns of world politics. The state is fundamental to neorealism (Waltz 1979) and neoliberal institutionalism (Keohane 1984). It is also key in many constructivist and English school theories (Bull 1977, Reus-Smit 1999, Wendt 1999). Even critical, post-modern, or feminist theories, which have arisen in opposition to existing forms of social power, often focus on problematizing states and state practice.

State-centric theories of international relations assume that states are the primary actors in world politics. Theorists working in this tradition do not deny the existence of other political actors. As Kenneth Waltz (1979, 93-94) writes, "states are not and never have been the only international actors....The importance of nonstate actors and the extent of transnational activities are obvious." Rather, the claim is that states, and especially great powers, are sufficiently important actors that any positive theory of international relation must place them at its core.

As sovereign entities, states possess ultimate or final authority over delimited territories and their inhabitants. Once a policy is enacted, the decision is binding on all citizens. If a state raises a tariff, all of its citizens are affected by the higher price for imports whether they support the tax or not. Just as

Space for Learner

Space for Learner

states pass laws that bind their citizens at home, they also act authoritatively in ways that bind their own citizens in relations with other states. This is the analytic foundation of adage that “politics stops at the water’s edge.” Given their internal hierarchy, it is again reasonable to treat states as unitary actors when interacting with other similarly hierarchical states.

Thus from the above discussions we come to conclude that,

A State is an independent, sovereign government exercising control over a certain spatially defined and bounded area, whose borders are usually clearly defined and internationally recognized by other states.

1. States are tied to territory

- Sovereign or state as absolute ruler over territory
- Have clear borders
- Defends and controls its territory within those borders
- Is recognized by other countries (diplomatic recognition, passports, treaties, etc.)

2. States have bureaucracies staffed by state’s own personnel

- Has a national bureaucracy staffed by government personnel (legal system, educational system, hierarchical governmental units, etc.)

3. States monopolize certain functions within its territory (sovereign)

- Controls legitimate use of force within its territory
- Controls money at national scale (prints currency; collects taxes)
- Makes rules within its territory (law, regulations, taxes, citizenship, etc.)
- Controls much information within its territory

3.4.1 Role of Sovereign States in International Relations

The world community is organized into over 185 sovereign states. The organization of humankind into sovereign states is now called the state system. Palmer and Perkins define what is variously described as

Western State System, the nation-state system or (sovereign) state system as: “It is the pattern of political life in which people are separately organized into sovereign states that must manage to get along together.” Sovereignty and a definite territory are two of the essential attributes of a state. Of course, there should always be, as Garner said, a community of persons, having an organized government. Each state acquires coercive power to ensure compliance. The state system has evolved during the last three and a half centuries. It is the dominant pattern today. International Relations, in fact, are relations and interactions among the states who constitute the state-system.

The state is central to the study of international relations and likely to remain so into the foreseeable future. State policy is the most common object of analysis. States decide to go to war. They erect trade barriers. They choose whether and at what level to establish environmental standards. States enter international agreements, or not, and choose whether to abide by their provisions. Even scholars who give prominence to non-state actors are typically concerned with understanding or changing state practice (for example, Keck and Sikkink 1998). International relations as a discipline is chiefly concerned with what states do and, in turn, how their actions affect other states.

Similarly, states are a common unit of analysis in theories of international relations. Many analysts focus on states and their interactions to explain observed patterns of world politics. The state is fundamental to neorealism (Waltz 1979) and neoliberal institutionalism (Keohane 1984). It is also key in many constructivist and English school theories (Bull 1977, Reus-Smit 1999, Wendt 1999). Even critical, post-modern, or feminist theories, which have arisen in opposition to existing forms of social power, often focus on problematizing states and state practice. Both as objects and units of analysis, international relations is largely about states and their interactions.

Space for Learner

Stop to Consider

Features of the State System:

Certain features of the state system are essential conditions, without which the state system cannot exist. These features have been described by Palmer and Perkins as corollaries. They are the concepts of nationalism, sovereignty and power. Nationalism is that psychological or spiritual quality which unites the people of a state and “ gives them the will to champion what they regard as their national interest.” Sovereignty is the concept of unlimited powers. A group of people who are territorially organized are called sovereign when they possess both internal and external freedom to do what they wish to do. National power is the might of a state which enables the state to get things done as it would like them to be done. Power is a complex of many tangible and intangible elements.

In determining if States are still the most important players in International politics, it is important to examine theories related to this argument

- 1. Realism:** Realism portrays the political system of the world as an anarchic struggle for power and security among competing states. Per realism, there is at all no higher authority than that of the states. Due to this, states in alliance with other states or individually, make provision for their own defence. Power therefore is the only means of achieving security. Security also follows from the willingness to act prevent any state from achieving a preeminent and threatening position in International politics.
- 2. Radicalism:** this school of thought view International politics as organized in line with capitalist imperatives. International relations are structured, conceptualised and dominated by the unequal relationship between the developed and developing worlds. Therefore, a Radical systematic change is important to achieve security on a global platform, security here is understood as a factor of the satisfaction of basic needs for the population of the world irrespective of their national identity.
- 3. Liberal Internationalism:** The liberal Nationalist view suggests that there are certain reasons to believe that the dominant identity of states

might be weakening. International institutions, international law, International trade and international commerce have all contributed tremendously to the developing global community. So therefore, we should describe the world not just in terms of state interaction only but also in terms of an increasing community.

Space for Learner

3.4.2 The Role of the State in the International Economy, Politics and Climate:

The question of whether the advent of Globalization can lead to extinction of State importance in the International hemisphere would be examined. Cristopher Clapham believes that the globalization is at the core of human existence such that it can be found in every sphere of importance such as the economy, politics and climate.

The influence on globalization on the economy from State level to the world stage cannot be overemphasised but the State still has legitimate power on certain levels. If a company is to establish its organization in a State, it is under the jurisdiction of that State. The state wield the authority to allow, suspend or close down any operating company within its territory. This point tends to the State the most important actor in international politics as it has the right to determine the scope of a company's operations.

States are the components of International politics and it(international politics) is significant in fostering international cooperation, conducting business and ensuring world peace among States.

The peace of the world is of grave importance in international politics. The world peace is not attainable by just a state. This goal of peace is only brought out by the endeavour of the whole world. International organizations are making great deal of efforts to prevent any form of chaos that can be caused by war, but still the mantle rests on the shoulders of the state to play the major role in international Politics. Global warming is another issue gradually become a significant in the world due to climate globalization. The negative effects of global warming could have adverse effects on the climate such as the rising of sea levels which affects the world as a whole. States have taken it upon themselves to eradicate this problem by drafting policies.

Space for Learner

An example of an international agreement called the 'Kyoto Protocol' has been formulated to ensure States take actions necessary to cut down pollution and prevent greenhouse effect. It is worthy to note that such policies can only be drafted by States and International organizations can only support them in actualising these goals. This further proves the importance of states in the international hemisphere.

After reviewing the more general treatment of actors in different theoretical perspectives, and if non-state actors are a factor to be reckoned with in the study of world politics, it is important to conceptualize these types of actors.

Non-State Actors are most times seen as having little influence on world politics especially from the perspectives of the realist and other state centric, according to them, it is predominantly states that retain power in international relations but this assumption has been faulted because when realism and liberalism were developed as consistent theories, the influence of non-state actors was indeed very limited and close to non-existence Second, by focusing on the state as main actors, state-centric theories overlook the importance of indirect influence of Non State actor.

However, as per the traditional perspective, states play the major role in international Politics but after the World War, communications technology has been on the rise, international division of labor and the expansion of global trade, a great number of international organizations have also established. The international scene has changed due to the forces of globalization. It is now of importance that states communicate with one other, which influence international political, economic, military and culture to a great degree. The increasing number of these organizations is parallel to the increasing levels of political, economic, military and cultural transactions between individuals, societies and states. These kinds of non-state actors challenge the "state- centric" perception. There are two prevailing theories about the role of the state in international relations. Neorealism emphasizes the state plays the most important role in international arena. On one hand, the state possesses sovereign power to insure domestic security. On the other hand, neorealism also stresses the state influence economy in international relations. Neoliberalism not only indicates that the state is the main behavior body in international system, but also affirms the role of non-

states, such as international organization, transnational organizations and other kinds of social organizations. As a by-product of intensified globalization process, these kinds of organizations have become more significant determinants of foreign policies of the state.

By looking at globalization, the proliferation of non-state actors is gaining international influence and position. Non-state actors can be divided into international intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and transnational or international non-governmental organizations (NGOs). International intergovernmental organizations are created by states. They have official document of government agencies. On the contrary, transnational or international non-governmental organizations are established not by the state, but by some group of businessmen, individuals and other societal units. They have no legal connection with the state, so they are genuinely transnational. But the state can restrain the activities of these kinds of organizations.

There are several powerful organizations such as the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the United Nations. Though these organizations own strong power in the international relations, they are entirely operated by states.

Along with the intensification of globalization the growth of so many kinds of non-state actors is bound to influence the status of the state in international relations. But they cannot substitute for the state. The state is still the most important actor in international relations.

Stop to Consider

International institutions:

International relationships will be based on new dynamics derived from multipolarity and the higher diversity of players. Emergence of a supranational sovereignty will remain highly unlikely. In addition to factors potentially favouring a community of interests, such as globalization, growing economic interdependence, major shared challenges, different regional dynamics and continuing rivalry will clash, notably with the emergence of new poles.

Space for Learner

3.5 Nations:

A nation is a group of people who see themselves as a cohesive and coherent unit based on shared cultural or historical criteria. Nations are socially constructed units, not given by nature. Their existence, definition, and members can change dramatically based on circumstances. Nations in some ways can be thought of as “imagined communities” that are bound together by notions of unity that can pivot around religion, ethnic identity, language, cultural practice and so forth. The concept and practice of a nation work to establish who belongs and who does not (insider vs. outsider). Such conceptions often ignore political boundaries such that a single nation may “spill over” into multiple states. Furthermore, not every nation has a state (e.g., Kurds; Roma; Palestine). Some states may contain all or parts of multiple nations.

In other words, a nation, in the modern political sense, is a community of individuals who are linked socially and economically, share a given territory and recognize the existence of a common past - even if they differ about aspects of this past. the community has a common vision of the future and believes that this future will be better if they remain united than if they separate - even if some aspire to change the social organization of the nation and its political system, the state.

The idea that the state was born with the nation does not correspond to reality in the majority of cases, because the nation was in fact a posterior ideological construction, very often “constructed” by the state. The natural emergence of nations in reality was impossible because of the ignorance of the masses, the diversity of ethnicities and religions, the absence of real, effective traditions, the late fixation of languages and the diversity of oral traditions. therefore, the emergence of a nation only became possible after the rise of the modern state, which organized an administrative center for the state and as a consequence, gave rise to public education, military service and the will of the leaders to unify the populations. nevertheless, if this took place, that is, if nations were built by states, it is necessary to clarify how the state arose.

3.5.1 Nation-State:

The concept of a nation-state is notoriously difficult to define. Anthony Smith, one of the most influential scholars of nation-states and nationalism, argued that a state is a nation-state only if and when a single ethnic and cultural population inhabits the boundaries of a state, and the boundaries of that state are coextensive with the boundaries of that ethnic and cultural population. This is a very narrow definition that presumes the existence of the “one nation, one state” model. Consequently, less than 10% of states in the world meet its criteria. The most obvious deviation from this largely ideal model is the presence of minorities, especially ethnic minorities, which ethnic and cultural nationalists exclude from the majority nation. The most illustrative historical examples of groups that have been specifically singled out as outsiders are the Roma and Jews in Europe. In legal terms, many nation-states today accept specific minorities as being part of the nation, which generally implies that members of minorities are citizens of a given nation-state and enjoy the same rights and liberties as members of the majority nation. However, nationalists and, consequently, symbolic narratives of the origins and history of nation-states often continue to exclude minorities from the nation-state and the nation.

According to a wider working definition, a nation-state is a type of state that conjoins the political entity of a state to the cultural entity of a nation, from which it aims to derive its political legitimacy to rule and potentially its status as a sovereign state if one accepts the declarative theory of statehood as opposed to the constitutive theory. A state is specifically a political and geopolitical entity, while a nation is a cultural and ethnic one. The term “nation-state” implies that the two coincide, in that a state has chosen to adopt and endorse a specific cultural group as associated with it. The concept of a nation-state can be compared and contrasted with that of the multinational state, city-state, empire, confederation, and other state formations with which it may overlap. The key distinction is the identification of a people with a polity in the nation-state.

Space for Learner

Space for Learner

Stop to Consider

Origins of Nation-State:

The origins and early history of nation-states are disputed. Two major theoretical questions have been debated. First, “Which came first, the nation or the nation-state?” Second, “Is nation-state a modern or an ancient idea?” Some scholars have advanced the hypothesis that the nation-state was an inadvertent byproduct of 15th century intellectual discoveries in political economy, capitalism, mercantilism, political geography, and geography combined together with cartography and advances in map-making technologies. For others, the nation existed first, then nationalist movements arose for sovereignty, and the nation-state was created to meet that demand. Some “modernization theories” of nationalism see it as a product of government policies to unify and modernize an already existing state. Most theories see the nation-state as a modern European phenomenon, facilitated by developments such as state-mandated education, mass literacy, and mass media (including print). However, others look for the roots of nation-states in ancient times.

Most commonly, the idea of a nation-state was and is associated with the rise of the modern system of states, often called the “Westphalian system” in reference to the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). The balance of power that characterized that system depended on its effectiveness upon clearly defined, centrally controlled, independent entities, whether empires or nation-states, that recognized each other’s sovereignty and territory. The Westphalian system did not create the nation-state, but the nation-state meets the criteria for its component states.

3.5.2 Characteristics:

Nation-states have their own characteristics that today may be taken-for-granted factors shaping a modern state, but that all developed in contrast to pre-national states. Their territory is considered semi-sacred and nontransferable. Nation-states use the state as an instrument of national unity, in economic, social, and cultural life. Nation-states typically have a more centralized and uniform public administration than their imperial predecessors because they are smaller and less diverse. After the 19th-century triumph of the nation-state in Europe, regional identity was usually

Space for Learner

subordinate to national identity. In many cases, the regional administration was also subordinate to central (national) government. This process has been partially reversed from the 1970s onward, with the introduction of various forms of regional autonomy in formerly centralized states (e.g., France).

The most obvious impact of the nation-state, as compared to its non-national predecessors, is the creation of a uniform national culture through state policy. The model of the nation-state implies that its population constitutes a nation, united by a common descent, a common language, and many forms of shared culture. When the implied unity was absent, the nation-state often tried to create it. The creation of national systems of compulsory primary education is usually linked with the popularization of nationalist narratives. Even today, primary and secondary schools around the world often teach a mythologized version of national history.

SAQ:

Q. How does a state function in a Nation State?

.....
.....
.....

Check Your Progress

1. What do you mean by State?
2. Discuss the role of state in International Relation.
3. Define Nation.
4. Discuss the concept Nation-state.
5. The realist theory believes that there is no higher authority than that of the state. (True/False)

3.6 Summing Up:

Thus from the above discussion we come to conclude that, the state in some form has existed since urbanised and complex societies arose in Egypt, China, India and Mesopotamia over five thousand years ago. Since then, the more ‘civilised’ members of humanity have never been without the state. States have also always existed in an ‘international society’ with trade,

Space for Learner

diplomacy, law, morality and, inevitably, war, shaping their relations. The modern state arose from the break-up of European Christendom during the early sixteenth century. The Reformation instigated a century of religious wars between Catholics and Protestant powers. By the end of the century the modern state had been established in Western Europe: a centralised power with exclusive law-making and law-enforcing authority over a territory. Conventionally, however, the modern state and state system is dated from the Treaty of Westphalia, which ended both the Thirty Years' War (1618–48) and the wars of religion. Westphalia established the key principle of modern statehood: sovereignty. Neither is the state the same thing as the 'nation', as suggested in the term 'nation-state'. The nation and the state are very different concepts, very different aspects of social and political life. It is rare, very rare, for a nation to correspond exactly to a state. The UK, for example, is not a nation-state. It is a state that comprises several clearly identifiable nations. The Kurds, meanwhile, are a nation spread across parts of the territories of several states. Essentially, the state is a legal concept that defines a structure of power. The nation on the other hand is composed of a people who share certain characteristics, among which are culture, ethnicity and history.

The state claims the loyalty and support of its population, or at least the vast majority of its population. Many states, while dominated by a particular nation, include national minorities who sometimes feel an affinity to conational members residing in other states or demand their own state. Such cross-border allegiances can undermine the practical sovereignty of a state and, under certain circumstances, lead to its failure or break-up. The violent end to the Yugoslav Federation and the peaceful break-up of Czechoslovakia in the 1990s are both examples of this.

Nevertheless, the state plays a vital role in 'nation-building' – the creation of a sense of national identity on the part of its population. This can be seen in the USA, where oaths of allegiance, displays of flags and the veneration of the Constitution are closely associated with building up and reinforcing a sense of 'American' national identity.

3.7 References and Suggested Readings:

1. Lake David A., The State and International Relations
2. Huntington Samuel P. (1973), Transnational Organizations in World Politics, World Politics, Vol. 25, No. 3
3. UKEssays. (November 2018). State and Non-state Actors in International Politics. Retrieved from <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/politics/nonstate-actors-international-politics-1781.php?vref=1>

Space for Learner

GLOBALISATION AND STATE SOVEREIGNTY

Unit Structure:

- 4.1 Introduction**
- 4.2 Objectives**
- 4.3 The notion of Sovereignty**
- 4.4 Genesis of Sovereignty**
- 4.5 Defining Sovereignty**
- 4.6 Challenges to State Sovereignty**
- 4.7 Why the state still matters**
- 4.8 Globalisation: Meaning and Definitions**
- 4.9 History of Globalisation**
- 4.10 Three Schools of Thought on Globalisation**
- 4.11 Dimensions of Globalisation**
- 4.12 Resistance to Globalisation**
- 4.13 Summing Up**
- 4.14 References and Suggested Readings**

4.1 Introduction:

For centuries, the idea of sovereignty has shaped the world. It has important domestic and international implications. Sovereignty is the right to have absolute and unlimited power, either legal or political, within the territory of a state. Sovereignty has provided a central organizing principle that is at the heart of modern international relations and it is a blueprint of many global institutions, laws and norms. Globalisation, on the other hand has emerged as a catch phrase in recent decades, attracting attention of academicians worldwide. Globalization is a term used to describe the increasing connectedness and interdependence of world cultures and economies. It is understood as a multi-layered phenomenon which has manifested itself into political, economic, cultural, military and ideological sphere of human existence. Owing to the progress in information and communication technology, the forces of globalisation have helped in transforming the world into a global village.

This unit explores the concept of the state sovereignty and globalisation and analyses how globalisation impacts on sovereignty of state. Moreover, it examines the issue of whether the state is still as fundamental a political institution as it has been over the past four centuries.

4.2 Objectives:

After going through the entire unit you will be able to:–

- *examine* the concept of state sovereignty.
- *provide* basic understanding of globalisation.
- *examine* the different dimensions of Globalisation.
- *analyse* the impact of Globalisation on State Sovereignty.
- *consider* redefining the role of state in the era of globalisation.

4.3 The notion of Sovereignty:

Sovereignty is the central attribute of the state as a form of political organization. Sovereignty as an attribute of the state is at the heart of the discipline of international relations (IR) and plays a fundamental role as an organizing principle of modern states. It is generally taken to mean absolute authority of a state over a defined territory and population and recognition of this independent, absolute authority, internally and internationally. State sovereignty is to be both internal and external. Internal in the sense that it has the right and the power to maintain its own laws and regulations within nations and external sovereignty gives the state the power to maintain relations with other states or to protect them from any external pressure. This has been the traditional notion of sovereignty which is an essential element of the state. Among the various attributes of the state, sovereignty has traditionally been considered as the foremost, so much so that these two terms sovereignty and state are often considered inseparable.

4.4 Genesis of Sovereignty:

The modern theory of sovereignty arises from the reaction of the European states to the doctrine of the Holy Roman Empire (created in 962 AD) according to which the emperor was superior to all governments, monarchies

Space for Learner

or republics of Christian countries This reaction was also directed against the doctrine of the Pope's superiority over all Christian leaders. In addition to reacting against these two external factors, the theory of state sovereignty was also designed to combat the fissiparous tendencies and centrifugal forces of feudal barons.

The more modern doctrine of sovereignty emerged in Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries. For the Italian political scientist, Niccolo Machiavelli, the safety of the prince and the stability of the state constituted an end, which justified all means for its attainment. The French jurist Jean Bodin was the first to argue at length that the sovereignty was an essential attribute of the body politic, and to define its characteristics. Thomas Hobbes provided a more refined and systematic exposition of the concept. These writers were primarily concerned with the need or desire to preserve and to strengthen unity of the state against the very real dangers of religious civil war. They favoured a monarchical sovereign as being the most "indivisible". However, for John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau, the people as a whole constituted the sovereign.

As a modern concept, sovereignty has been at the centre of Western political thought for nearly five centuries. It was at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 that Europe consolidated its long transition from the Middle Ages to a world of sovereign states.

Scholars believe that the Peace of Westphalia ushered in the sovereign state system in Europe, which in due course spread to the rest of the world. The emphasis on Westphalia was so pervasive that modern states around the world have come to be called Westphalian states and modern international relations is supposed to have begun in 1648. Diplomats, foreign policy analysts, political commentators have almost all of them used and continue to adopt Westphalian line.

4.5 Defining Sovereignty:

Despite a long and rich history in western political philosophy and European interstate politics, contestations over the concept never seem to exhaust.

Sovereignty has been defined variously by various scholars. The first author to develop a comprehensive theory of sovereignty was Jean Bodin(1530-

1596). He maintained that sovereignty is “ the absolute and perpetual power of a republic”.

According to Francis Harry Hinsley, “ the idea of Sovereignty was the idea that there is a final and absolute authority in the political community and no final and absolute authority exists elsewhere”. Alan James, however, identifies sovereignty as the objective feature entitling states to engage in international relations; he underlines the element of “ Constitutional independence” which implies three main features: It is a legal, absolute and unitary condition”. For James, sovereignty is defined in terms of constitutional independence, an authority derived from a state’s constitution, ‘which exists in its own right’ After going through the varied opinion, we can say that the main elements of sovereignty is embedded in following characteristics. Sovereign state is a full subject of international law. Secondly, it is not under the control of any state and thirdly, it is in fact able and free to exercise a fair amount of state power.

4.6 Challenges to State Sovereignty:

Today the state as a sovereign entity is facing myriad of challenges. The challenges to state as a rational and sole actor came from both above and below. From below, within the state mainly from its own people regarding legitimacy, identity and capability. It comes also in the form of threat to its security finding expression in secessionist movements like in Ireland, changing face of nationalism, local autonomy signifying functional usurpation, etc.

The challenges comes from above as a supranational authority signified by Multinational corporation, Non Governmental Organisation, International and Regional Organisations, Non-state Actors, Transnational Crime Organisation, Technological changes marked by change in warfare making territorial boundaries permeable, linking people together in ecological and environmental degradation and many more.

With the advent of globalization, there is a gradual erosion of national sovereignty. Globalization tends to undermine the three core elements of the Westphalian system, i.e., territoriality, sovereignty and autonomy. With these developments, the world politics is becoming less state centric. States are losing their autonomy to decide on many matters within their own territory. The emergence of supra-national actors and international NGOs has ‘eroded’

Space for Learner

Space for Learner

the sovereignty of nation states. The newly emerging international regimes and supra- International national institutions are making rules and regulations, which are binding upon nation states. In fact, today many matters are decided by international institutions, which are not directly accountable to people. This eventually leads to a larger threat to democratic values and processes. Internationally, violations of sovereignty and disputes over what constitutes a violation happens from time to time. Recent examples include Russia's annexation of Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula in 2014, Iraq's 1990 invasion of Kuwait. Countries can also decide to give up or delegate certain aspects of their sovereignty for example, many European countries choose to be a part of the European Union, a group with many political and economic advantages. However, joining meant following European Union rules and allowing those rules to supersede national laws.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Peace of Westphalia or Treaty of Westphalia, 1648:

The Treaty of Westphalia was an international covenant among European states that was agreed upon after the end of the Thirty Years War over religious issues. This peace settlement is widely known to have provided the foundational principles of the modern state system in international politics. The treaty recognised the principle of a 'sovereign state' with fixed geographical boundaries and equal respect for other sovereign states. The underlying idea is that all states are equal and have an equal right to exist and that the authority of a government that personifies the state is supreme and accepted as legitimate and lawful. These sovereign states are to conduct their inter state relations through diplomacy and international law in the form of treaties and agreements.

We will look here at the major challenges to state sovereignty in the modern world:

A. Transnational Corporations (TNCs):

The nation-state has been undermined by the transnational forces of economic globalization. The interrelationships between markets, finance,

goods and services and the networks created by transnational corporations are the most important elements of economic globalization.

With the advent of transnational corporations (TNCs), first-wave of Globalism thinkers such as Susan Strange makes three proposals. First, the nature of competition between states in the international system has changed dramatically. In the past, the state competed for control of the territory and the wealth that created resources in the territories. They are now increasingly competing for market share in the global economy. Second, the form of competition between states has changed. Now they are looking for allies based on economic rather than military interests. Third, the state's authority over society and the economy is going through another period of diffusion. Now the state is coming to share authority in economic and corporate terms with other entities such as transnational corporations including accounting and legal firms, the WTO, international institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank. Within the state, the authority of central government is necessarily increasingly shared with local and regional authorities. The proposition in short, is that state authority has leaked away, upwards, sideways and downwards. In some matters it even seems to have gone nowhere, just evaporated.

B. Scientific Innovations and permeability of Territorial borders:

Globalization reflects several technological advances that have increased international interactions. With scientific and technological innovations, high-tech weapons have changed the contours of the security structure. There is a total change in armed warfare. The advent of nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) has meant that territorial borders are no longer impregnable. The state's failure to provide external security has undermined the Hobbesian rationale for the state as an agency built to provide security.

New technology of disseminating information have revolutionised communication across national boundaries and checked state monopolies of information where they exists. The computer revolution and relatively easy availability of internet and e-mail around the world has intensified the impact of other information technology to a degree that is certainly

Space for Learner

Space for Learner

undermining the strict copyright and commercial patent laws. IBM's introduction of the personal computer in 1981 and the subsequent evolution of the modern internet are two examples of technology that helped drive international communication, commerce and globalization.

With hundreds of satellite rotating round the earth orbit, the secrecy of the state is no longer intact. As for example, USSR did not conceal from the world the Chernobyl disaster because it was photographed and transmitted by a French commercial satellite. Neither China was able to prevent Tiananmen Square issue to be figured in the media. Computerised currency transactions make the state control of fiscal and monetary policy vulnerable. The states are generally inept in tackling issues of refugees arising from socio-economic factors. This implies that territorial border is no longer impregnable. Ideas like "human rights" and "self-determination" of small communities are manipulated and became handmaid of insurgents and this gave respectability to terrorists in many parts of the globe.(How it is relevant here?)

C. Multinational Corporations (MNCs):

One of the driving forces of the globalization process has been the rapid growth of foreign direct investment through transnational corporations. The sense of identity associated with national companies and the loyalties that flow from that identity are disappearing. The idea of multinationals as 'stateless' was spurred by the claims of Robert Peich and others that companies not only outsource production to maximize the global economy and minimize costs, but also relocate. "research, design and development" structures and even corporate headquarters in "global networks".

Due to massive investments in host countries, MNCs are often able to modify state policies to favour their own prospects. The assets of MNCs also exceeds the GNP of many smaller nations and these are seen as a potential invaders of state sovereignty and territory.

It is undeniable that most states today face increasing pressures on their economic policies, as freer capital has been the standard of economic globalization. It is recognized that the private sector is today the main body

that promotes globalization, but this does not imply an atrophy of state interest or authority.

Space for Learner

D. International Organizations:

Globalization has prompted the rise of international organizations (IOs) as a key new actor in international relations. International organizations are legal entities established by more than one nation-state pursuant to an international agreement. The recognition of this special status in the years following World War II represents a significant shift from the Westphalian sovereignty. International organizations have acquired their own identity and act as a supranational authority that violates the sovereignty of states. There is a plethora of international organizations such as the UN, regional associations such as the EU, ASEAN, SAARC and many other organizations. Regimes are designed as tools for states to pursue their own interests, created and maintained in response to international demand for rules governing mutually beneficial international transactions, institutions to influence political issues.

Environmental threats to the state are diverse, pervasive and, due to their cross-border nature, have undermined the concept of territorial defence. Ecological challenges have reopened questions about the nature and limits of state sovereignty. Claims of sovereignty are called into question by the limited capacities of States in dealing with environmental problems. It is argued that international regimes and international institutions are forming new centres of authority that challenge the authority of the national government and impose constraints on the sovereignty of states.

Check Your Progress

1. How does MNCs influence government policies in the host country?
2. Explain the challenges to State Sovereignty.
3. What did Westphalian Treaty brought about in the International sphere?
4. Which is the most essential element of State ?

Space for Learner

E. International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs):

NGOs have acquired significant authority in the eyes of many as transnational actors. NGOs have proven to be powerful advocates of positive change and staunch opponents of restrictive policies. As groups of experts, they have been increasingly effective in “influencing the policies and programmes of national governments and international governmental organizations”. In the second half of the 20th century, NGOs multiplied. For example, Amnesty International and Oxfam. Amnesty International, by applying general human rights and principles, interferes with and holds governments accountable for human rights violations. Likewise, a growing network of environmental NGOs are working to hold the government accountable for international environmental laws. Others, like Oxfam, have set up an economic development project and administer economic and humanitarian aid with funding from private contributors. Commenting on NGOs Kathryn Sikkink observes that “international NGOs do not only cross formal national borders, but have also created a direct and independent form of non-governmental diplomacy through their own networks.”

What is often forgotten is that non-state actors perform limited functions and are generally confined to one specific area. These can in no way replace the conventional model. They remain no more than normative attempts which try to influence state centric system.

F. Weapons of Mass Destruction

Before the advent of nuclear weapons, a foreign power had to destroy the armed forces of an enemy state in order to inflict total destruction of the economic and demographic resources available to that state. Today, the existence of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction at the disposal of states and, potentially, terrorist organizations, means that even the most powerful state is vulnerable to devastating military attacks, without warning, which would inflict enormous damage on political, economic and social structures. As a result, the military basis of sovereignty has been reduced. In the absence of this key element of sovereignty, the Westphalian state lost its main feature - the monopoly of organized political violence, and its main function, the use of military power to promote the political objectives of the State.

However, the state remains the primary organizer of military power in the world. Most sovereign states retain considerable military power. Nuclear weapons can strengthen relations between nuclear weapon states by developing concepts of “nuclear deterrence” to ensure peacekeeping, and prudence is a hallmark of crisis management between these armed states.

Space for Learner

STOP TO CONSIDER

The Role of the Bretton Woods Institutions:

The Bretton Woods Institutions—the IMF and World Bank—have an important role to play in making globalization work better. They were created in 1944 to help restore and sustain the benefits of global integration, by promoting international economic cooperation. Today, they pursue, within their respective mandates, the common objective of broadly-shared prosperity. The World Bank concentrates on long-term investment projects, institution-building, and on social, environmental, and poverty issues. The IMF focuses on the functioning of the international monetary system, and on promoting sound macroeconomic policies as a precondition for sustained economic growth.

The greatest asset that the Bretton Woods Institutions have in fulfilling these objectives is their culture of consensus-building, which is based on trust and mutual respect among more than 180 countries—and their governments—that make up their membership. However, both institutions also recognize the need for change and internal reform. The IMF has implemented many reforms in recent years, designed to strengthen its cooperative nature and improve its ability to serve its membership.

4.7 Why the State still matters?

There is a physical reason for the dominance of state in International Relation. Since states control almost the entire habitual surface of the earth any other organism must operate somewhere. It must either acquire control of a state or become subject to one while the former option is not practically feasible in near future, the latter only clearly establishes the primacy of state. A replacement of state centric by other actor would certainly signify a change

Space for Learner

of the system. Mostly forces tend towards inertia and favours status quo as costs of change can be enormous.

What has buttressed and reinforced the state and perhaps remains like the invincible Brahmastra is the force of nationalism. Ever since the French revolution nationalism has been the main spiritual and emotional force cementing all the elements of statehood in nation-states making them the primary unit in international relations. It remains the basis for government to claim legitimacy and demand loyalty from their citizens. The nationalist sentiments even supersede primordial identities of caste, religion or race. It offers stringent opposition to forces of alien domination and one can see that any transnational force seeking to upstage or challenge nationalist identity faces massive repulsions.

Even movement for national self-determination within multinational states represent, on the one hand, a negative psyche of deprivation and on a positive plane, a quest for recognition of nation states. It represent the desire on the part of community to claim the status of a state. These sub nationalist movements , in fact, tend to promote and reinforce the process of nation-state building.

The nation state remains extremely resilient as a focus of human loyalties and as a structure for the exercise of political power. As long as no effective rival or successor to nationalism arises, state is likely to remain the basic entity. International system may be a multi-actor system but states are the leading players.

As a preferred form of political community, the nation-state has no serious rival. There are a number of important powers retained by the state despite globalisation, including monopoly control of the weapons of war and their legitimate use, and sole right to tax its citizens. Only the nation state can still command the political allegiances of its citizens or adjudicate in disputes between them. And it is the nation state which has exclusive authority to bind the whole community to international law. As Krasner argues, not all the constituent parts of a nation-state's sovereignty are equally vulnerable to globalisation.

International organisations designed to deal with international problems are still either state-based, such as the United Nations, or, if non-governmental

organisations (NGOs), they have to act through power structures created and maintained by states. State sovereignty remains the *practical* feature of political activity. States remain by far the greatest donors of international aid, the most important actors in international affairs, and, of course, are the major military players in conflicts. The state remains the central feature of the international system.

Many new international actors, such as the European Union, the United Nations or international courts, are created by states themselves and exist to reflect state interests. Indeed, the European Union and the United Nations, among many such bodies, exist only as state-created structures and can only be understood in relation to legal and practical state sovereignty. The state, therefore, remains a major factor in the calculations of most new actors.

4.8 Globalisation: Meaning and Definitions:

Globalization in simple terms refers to free flow of goods and services, labour, capital, and movement of people across the countries. Another understanding of globalisation is integration of a country's economy with global economy. In fact globalisation meant a borderless world with increasing connectedness and marked by Information Technology(IT) and shrinking space.

Anthony Giddens has defined 'Globalization as 'the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happening are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa'

Robert. O. Keohane. describes globalization as 'a trend of increasing transnational flow and increasingly thick networks of interdependent (people)'.

The World Bank has defined. globalization as ' the growing integration of economies and societies around the world' .

From the above mentioned definitions globalization can be understood thus as a multidimensional process wherein social, political and economic relations are increasingly integrated.

Space for Learner

4.9 History of Globalization:

Although many people consider globalization to be a twentieth century phenomenon, the process has been going on for millennia. Examples include the following:

- **The Roman Empire:** Going back to 600 B.C., the Roman Empire spread its economic and governing systems through significant portions of the ancient world for centuries
- **Silk Road Trade:** These trade routes, which date back to 130 B.C. to 1453 A.D, represented another wave of globalization. They brought merchants, goods and travellers from China across Central Asia and the Middle East to Europe.
- **Before the First World War:** European countries made significant investments abroad in the decades leading up to the First World War. The period from 1870 to 1914 is called the golden age of globalization.
- **After the Second World War:** The United States has led efforts to create a global economic system with a set of widely accepted international rules. Multinational institutions such as the United Nations (UN), the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization have been established to promote international cooperation and trade freedom.

In addition to the aforementioned historical trajectory of globalization, Roland Robertson provided a five-step timeline of globalization which is as follow:

- **The Germanic Phase (1500s-1750s):** This phase lasted from the early 15th century to the middle of the 18th century and witnessed the simultaneous expansion of national communities and the Catholic Church, and brought into focus the ideas about the individual as well as humanity.
- **The Incipient Phase(1750s-1870s):** This phase saw the crystallization of nation states and the emergence of an international order. Industrialization also changed processes of production and consumption, therefore, shaping a new type of economy.

- **The Take-off Phase (1870s-1920s):** Emergence of a powerful international society albeit mediated by the state. This phase was quite Eurocentric, politically. It also saw the development of newer technologies of transport and communications.
- **The Struggle-for-Hegemony Phase (1920s-1960s):** Decolonization resulted in the inclusion of several new countries into the international order, but the Cold War divided the world into two camps in a struggle for hegemony.
- **The Uncertainty Phase (1960s-1990s):** With the end of Cold War, this phase saw the heightening of global consciousness. There was a sharp increase in technologies of communications, especially with the advent of Internet and mobile telephony. Societies became more polyethnic, and issues such as gender, sexuality, and race were rendered more nuanced.

For Robertson, the most interesting aspect of the modern (or postmodern) era is the way in which a global consciousness has developed. He lays down a progression of “phases” that capture the central aspects of different eras in global history, asserting that the fifth phase, Global Uncertainty, has been reached.

4.10 Three Schools of Thought on Globalisation:

After analyzing the various perspectives of globalization, David Held and his colleagues took three standpoints that can be roughly divided into three schools of thought: the hyperglobalists’ thesis, the skeptics’ thesis, and the transformationalists’ thesis .

- **Hyperglobalists:**

The hyperglobalist thesis treats globalization as a novel phenomenon in human history. For them, globalization and the subsequent world economy have profound effects on politics, markets, ideas and the world as a whole. According to them, with the growing global market and technological advancement the importance of the nation state is declining. They argue that the phenomenon of globalization creates the conditions for a global

Space for Learner

civilization in which markets are globally integrated, multinational corporations become vehicles for economic growth, ideas are globalized and dominant hierarchical structures are deconstructed. Under these conditions, the role of the state as the highest decision-making body at both national and international level is now being performed by international institutions. They indicate that the intensity of interstate penetration is unprecedented, making the world “borderless”. It simply means that states are reduced in their authority and become institutions that enable this exchange of the “borderless” economy as well as of culture, society and politics. National and international politics will change drastically and the future will get better which will manifest itself in human emancipation and peace.

• Sceptics:

Unlike the hyperglobalists, the sceptics view globalization as a great myth; To them, the hyperglobalists’ arguments about the future of globalization are simply exaggerated, and the expansion of world trade has been uneven and centered in the large developed economies of the United States, Europe, Asia Pacific and North America.

Held and his colleagues say that the sceptical perspective on globalization regards current international processes as fragmented and regionalized rather than globalized. In fact, according to sceptical authors, the “golden age” of globalization arrived at the end of the 19th century. Current process show, at best is regionalization.

Sceptics point out that globalization is far from making nation-states superfluous, but rather depends on both the nation-state and the regulatory powers of governments. In other words, globalization does not have much of an impact on states. Globalisation may reinforce state power rather than derogate power. Indeed, globalization has in some ways strengthened the state, as China and Russia have demonstrated, which has taken on a new meaning as a mediator of modernization.

• Transformationalists:

Transformationalists are neither extreme advocates of globalization nor vehemently against it, but the transformation thesis tries to find itself in the middle. This school sees globalization as a force with enormous potential

for transformation and argues that it will lead to a reorganization of societies, economies, government institutions and the world order itself. While it is claimed that “globalization is a good thing” and will produce good results, it does not necessarily mean the best results. There may be the occasional setback in the globalization process, but its ability to change the world outweighs its small flaws. It believes that contemporary globalization has no historical precedent.

Held and his colleagues say that the transformationalist perspective is fundamentally different from the other two perspectives:

- There is no single cause (i.e the market or economic logic) behind globalization,
- The outcome of processes of globalization is not determined .

Therefore, in contrast to the hyperglobalist and sceptical schools of thought, it does not make any statements about the future direction of globalization.

This framework of the three theses have subsequently been debated. They are definitely not the last words in the conceptualization of globalization. However, it is a useful multidisciplinary framework that helps us in thinking further about globalisation.

SAQ

Q. Do you think globalisation will continue to persist? If so, in what areas?

.....
.....
.....

4.11 Dimensions of Globalization:

Globalization is a multifaceted phenomenon which encompasses economic, social, political, technological and cultural dimensions.

Waters argues that there are at least three different forms of globalization - economic, political and cultural - and that they are able to act as global forces largely because they are mediated by symbols; the more symbols there are, the more easily they spread around the world. These three

Space for Learner

dimensions of globalization are closely related to each other because one dimension affects another.

• Economic Dimension:

This is undoubtedly the supreme form of globalization. Economic globalization refers to transactions of goods, services, finance and labour across state borders. Under economic globalization, the entire world is seen as a single economic market. An important example of this singular market is the multinational corporations (MNC) that have their entire production process located not in one place, but distributed across different parts of the world. The economic globalization of recent years is marked by the dominant roles of certain developed countries like the USA and Japan and of large transnational companies like Yamaha, Microsoft, McDonald's, etc. and international organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Bottery (2003) argues that economic globalization is best characterized by the convergence of three different factors. The first characteristic is the increasing movement of capital around the world, inside and outside a country, thanks to information and technology. The second characteristic is the existence of supranational bodies such as the WTO, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. These organizations have the role of facilitating the flow of capital in a global free market scenario. They come with conditions and in some developing countries the conditions can be very severe. The last characteristic is the greater influence of transnational corporations (TNCs).

The impacts of economic globalization then translate into deeper integration and faster interaction of economies through production, trade and financial transactions of banks and multinationals, with an increasingly important role for the World Bank and International Monetary Fund as well as the new World Trade Organization bringing various impacts to the world.

• Political Dimension:

The political dimension of globalisation basically deals with questions relating to state sovereignty and citizenship. With globalization the traditional ways of understanding the polity definitely stands to be reassessed. Michael Mann

(1997) identifies four separate threats to the nation-state-global capitalism, environmental danger, identity politics and post-nuclear geopolitics. These threats impact the nation state in varying ways. Some of these threats do weaken the state, but some of them can lead to the strengthening of state-power. Therefore, it might be premature to declare the demise of nation-state.

The rise of transnational solidarities, as seen in civic movements around issues of gender, sexuality, race, class and environmental issues reflect a politics that is not bound by allegiance to a single state but to a broader notion of global community or humanity. Moreover, increased economic flows, labour mobility has led to the development of the notion of 'global citizen'.

States are no longer the only key players. International policy is centered on international organizations such as the IMF, the World Bank, the WTO, NGOs, etc. rather than on interstate relations. Giddens (1999) thinks the era of nation states is over. Political leaders have less influence over people and the old form of geopolitics is gone. Singer argues that international organizations are not the only factors to blame for this situation. According to him, even without the WTO, the growth of the world economy is enough to mark a decline in the power of the nation-state. This is because there are fewer barriers to trade and investment and the accelerated pace of technological change; they have injected unprecedented energy into world trade.

Political globalization has in fact partly referred to a growing trend towards multilateralism, in which the United Nations plays a key role, national non-governmental organizations act as watchdogs over governments and international NGOs are increasing their activities. Some researchers have called this the creation of a global civil society. Some political scientists also study trends towards democratic consolidation in terms of the process of global democratization.

- **Cultural Dimension:**

Cultural globalization is the process whereby information, commodities and images that have been produced in one part of the world enter into a global

Space for Learner

flow that tends to ‘flatten out’ cultural differences between nations, regions and individuals. It is often associated with the worldwide spread of consumerism and the rise of individualism.

Cultural globalization refers to the transmission of ideas, meanings and values throughout the world in order to extend and intensify social relations. So when can a culture become a global phenomenon? There is a great deal of intermingling of cultures and exchange of ideas that has occurred as a result of globalisation, opening of borders and dissemination of information. This can be seen in arenas as different as political cultures to musical and culinary cultures. Critics of globalisation equate it with Westernization.

Many commentators portray cultural globalization as a ‘top-down’ process. From this perspective, cultural globalization amounts to a form of cultural imperialism, emphasizing that cultural flows are between unequal partners and are used as a means through which powerful states exert domination over weaker states. This cultural standardization is often described as McDonaldization- a reference to the fast food company which provides exactly the same type of items on their menu in outlets all across the world. Some therefore portray cultural globalization as ‘westernization’ or, more specifically, as ‘Americanization’. Globalisation, is in fact closely linked to a specific worldview that is ‘Western’. It involves the diffusion of a certain culture (Hollywood, McDonald’s, MTV), a certain form of economic organisation(Capitalist) and a European conception of human rights(individualistic rather than collective). Such globalisation can threaten groups whose culture does not fit in with dominant values and may, in fact, promote rather than reduce ethnic tensions.

The fear or threat of homogenization, especially when it is perceived to be imposed ‘from above’, or ‘from outside’, provokes cultural and political resistance.

Check Your Progress:

1. What examples of globalisation can you identify in your life?
2. Do you think globalisation has more positive attributes or more negative attributes?

3. Do you think Globalization has altered the role of the state?
4. Explain the political dimension of globalisation ?
5. Which is the most visible aspect of Globalisation?

Space for Learner

4.12 Resistance to Globalization:

Globalisation has met with a great deal of resistance across the world. Large-scale social movements to demand rights such as labour movements and protests against various trade agreements were witnessed during the last many years. After the 1980s, a number of collective protests and demonstrations took place throughout the Western world and a novel phase of ‘new social movements’ sometimes also called ‘transnational social movements’ or global social movements emerged. By the 1990s, the social movements had acquired a ‘global’ character to address emerging global issues and problems resulting from the uneven and exploitative globalised world order. The institutions for global economic governance such as the World Bank, IMF and the WTO became synonymous with exploitative practices and inequality. In 1999, outside the venue of the WTO Ministerial Conference in Seattle and more recently the Occupy Wall Street movements that erupted in US were against the neoliberal policies and crony capitalism. The latter movement found echoes across the world, encouraged especially by social media networks.

Check Your Progress:

1. What do you understand by globalisation?
2. Discuss the impact of globalisation on state sovereignty?
3. Do you agree that state sovereignty has historically been changing?
4. Explain the cultural dimension of Globalisation and its implications?
5. Does globalisation lead to the Western cultural hegemony?
6. Discuss the alternative perspectives of understanding globalisation?

Space for Learner

4.13 Summing Up:

After reading this unit you have learnt that despite the advent of globalisation states will continue to matter significantly as the defining feature of the world politics. Thus globalisation has changed the way states are to frame, regulate and implement their national policies. This does not indicate that the states are becoming weak; neither the sovereignty of the state is withering away, it only suggests that the role of the state has become multi dimensional as it has to look after the international standards, regulations and the needs of the global community while catering plans and policies for their national economies.

Technological advances, particularly block chain, mobile communication and banking, are fuelling economic globalization. Nonetheless, rising levels of protectionism and anti-globalization sentiment in several countries could slow or even reverse the rapid pace of globalization. Nationalism and increasing trends toward conservative economic policies are driving these anti-globalization efforts.

4.14 References and Suggested Readings:

1. Basu, Rumki, *International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues*. Sage Publications 2018, pp-219-230
2. *Global Politics: A New Introduction*, New York: Routledge, 2009 pp. 220-243.
3. Heywood, A *Global Politics*, New York: Palgrave, 2011 pp. 264-281.
4. Inayatullah N. and D. Blaney, 'Sovereignty' in B. Chimni and S. Mallavarapu ed.
5. *International Relations: Perspectives For the Global South*, New Delhi: Pearson. 2012, pp. 124-134.
6. Jindal, N. & Kumar, K. *Global Politics: Issues and Perspectives*, New Delhi, Sage Publications 2018
7. McGrew, A (2011) 'Globalization and Global Politics', in J. Baylis, S. Smith and P. Owens (eds.) *Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 14-31.

8. R. Keohane, 'Sovereignty in International Society', in D. Held and A. McGrew (eds.) *The Global Trans-Formations Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000. pp. 109-123.
9. Strange, Susan. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge, New York, 1996
10. Stiglitz, Joseph E. *Globalisation and its Discontents*, New York. 2003
11. Viotti P. and M. Kauppi, *International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy and Identity*, New Delhi: Pearson, 2007 pp. 238-272

Space for Learner

**UNIT- 5
NATIONALISM IN WORLD POLITICS**

Unit Structure:

- 5.1 Introduction**
- 5.2 Objectives**
- 5.3 Nation, Nation-State, Nationalism**
- 5.4 Defining Nationalism**
- 5.5 Brief History of nationalism**
- 5.6 Types of Nationalism**
- 5.7 Nationalism and Identity**
- 5.8 Nationalism and International Politics**
- 5.9 Nationalism and Globalisation**
- 5.10 Summing Up**
- 5.11 References and Suggested Readings**

5.1 Introduction:

Nationalism has arguably been the most powerful ideological force in world politics over the last 200 years. This could be gauged from its influence as being truly global and more sustained than ‘classical’ ideologies such as liberalism and socialism. As an ideology, nationalism involves creating a ‘world view’ – a *Weltanschauung* – a set of coherent ideas and values that gives meaning to the past for a social group, explains the present, and offers a programme for possible future action.

There is little agreement among writers on what exactly one means by the term ‘nationalism’. One can begin by defining nationalism as the belief that a group of people are united by a common history, tradition, language and culture and hence that they should establish a sovereign political community of their own-the nation. The word ‘nation’, thus refers to a close-knit political community with a culturally, linguistically, ethnically or even racially homogenous population, and a shared history. Although no country in the

world today qualifies these criteria strictly, the idea of a nation has been a powerful force in the history of most countries.

This Unit seeks to understand nationalism in the wider context of world politics through the interpretation of different types of nationalism and identity politics. It will also delve into the history and challenges of nationalism in the 21st century.

5.2 Objectives:

After going through this unit you will be able to:—

- *understand* the idea of Nationalism.
- *trace* the history of nationalism
- *examine* the challenges to Nationalism .
- *analyse* the importance of nationalism in world politics.

5.3 Nation, Nation-State and Nationalism:

➤ Nation:

The terms ‘nation’; ‘nationality’ and ‘nationalism’ are used most commonly but not always with a clear understanding of their meanings. The word ‘nation’ has been used since the thirteenth century and derives from the Latin *nasci*, meaning to be born. In the form of *natio*, it referred to a group of people united by birth or birthplace. In its original usage, nation thus implied a breed of people or a racial group, but possessed no political significance. It was not until the late eighteenth century that the term acquired political overtones, as individuals and groups started to be classified as ‘nationalists’. The term ‘nationalism’ was first used in print in 1789 by the anti-Jacobin French priest Augustin Barruel. By the mid-nineteenth century, nationalism was widely recognized as a political doctrine or movement; for example, as a major ingredient of the revolutions that swept across Europe in 1848.

As Carlton J.H. Hayes said : “So much is nationalism a common place in the modes of thought and action of the civilised populations of the

Space for Learner

Space for Learner

contemporary world that most men take nationalism for granted.”People imagine that it is the “most natural thing in the universe.” But, the concept of nationalism is far from being clear to most of us who use this term.

Every state considers its national interest as paramount; and all the struggle for power is for protection and promotion of national interest. Nationalism usually promotes patriotism. For dependent peoples, as we were before 1947, nationalism is the spirit which enables struggle for freedom against foreign rulers. But, sometimes nationalism takes precedence even over moral beliefs as was the case in Hitler’s Nazi Germany. Nationalism in Germany was interpreted to mean expansion of the Third Reich and expulsion of Jews; in Israel it meant struggle for survival in the face of Arab opposition; and Pakistani nationalism is essentially confined to anti-India tirades particularly on Kashmir.

➤ **Nation-State:**

Since modern state is a ‘nation-state’, it seeks to promote nationalism as its leaders might interpret. As Palmer and Perkins point out. “In its most virulent form it has commanded virtually the total allegiance of men and some of the most inhuman acts of this age have been wrapped in the mystical and religious trappings of nationalism”. Thus, nationalism may be used as a tool for noble cause to unite a people for common good or it may be misused, as by some of the dictators to commit even the most inhuman acts like genocide. Namibian nationalism against South Africa’s imperialism prior to 1990 falls in the first category whereas Hitler’s policy towards Jews can be safely put in the second category.

The state and the nation are not identical, even though the two terms are often used interchangeably by politicians, historians and political scientists. The terms ‘nation’ and ‘state’ are sometimes used synonymously; however, they are two separate entities. The confusion arises from one of the most fundamental beliefs of nationalism –that every community of people that think of themselves as a nation should also have a state of their own. Thus, the hyphenated term ‘nation-state’. According to Hans Kohn, ‘Nationalism

demands the Nation-State; the creation of the Nation-State strengthens nationalism.’ The state is a legal entity that is directed by a government. The nation, on the other hand, may or may not be closely associated with the state. A nation is composed of a people that share certain characteristics and have a *sense* of belonging to that nation. Perhaps the most powerful of all political concepts to motivate human beings is that of the ‘nation’. But the concept is an elusive one. While the ‘nation-state’ is a term commonly used, many ‘nations’ do not have states, and there are states comprised of many nations. Important elements in national identity include language, religion, government and common historical and cultural ties.

Some analysts see ‘nations’ as modern ideas, largely created by intellectuals and rulers to unite, or fool, the people. Benedict Anderson, in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (1983), powerfully argues that nations are ‘imagined communities’, artificially constructed and sustained, and are not deeply rooted in history or some ‘natural’ cultural identity. Eric Hobsbawm, in *Nations and Nationalism since 1780* (1990), sees nations as constructed around myths of age-old identity and linked to capitalist economic development with the intention of constructing an identity capable of countering the emerging class identity of the proletariat. Ernest Gellner, in *Nations and Nationalism* (1983), believes that a sense of belonging to a nation, in the cultural sense, is not enough. Nationhood, to have meaning, must be closely associated with the desire for self-government

and the creation of state to express that desire. Thus ‘nation’ defies a clear definition. There is no single definition of the term nation; however it can loosely be described as a community or group of people who share a homeland and a feeling of solidarity over such factors as culture, language or territory. Indeed, since the concept of ‘national self-determination’ was announced in 1919 at the Versailles Peace Conference the creation of ‘nation-states’, as an expression of national identity, has been seen as a political ideal and a desirable objective. In reality very few ‘nation-states’ can be identified in any clear sense of the term. All these ‘nation-states’ have ‘national’ minorities of various sizes that challenge the actuality of the idea. The political reality is far more complicated, especially as national

Space for Learner

self-determination can generate dangerous political tensions within a state, potentially leading to its demise.

Check Your Progress:

1. How would you define a 'nation'?
2. Which comes first: nation or nationalism?
3. How can the concept of national identity both unite and divide people?

5.4 Defining Nationalism:

Nationalism is a complicated and contested phenomenon in modern politics and cultures. At its most basic level, it is a sense of identity felt by individuals and groups. This sense of belonging links the individual to a group of people on the basis of certain shared characteristics. Most important among these are a common language, a common history, and common customs or cultural traditions. When this sense of identity becomes a political force, it generally justifies independence for the national group. This quest for political independence, often called "self-determination" is based on perceived right of every nation, or people, to rule itself. Theoretically, this means that all the various countries, or states of the world would become "nation-states", once their populations have nationalist feelings.

Making the borders of countries and national congruent, however, is a very complicated procedure, since most empires and countries have historically contained many different ethnic or national groups and have been based on dynastic or religion or conquest or other factors instead of nationalism.

According to Ernest Gellner: 'Nationalism is political principle that holds that national

and political units should be congruent.' He argues that it is not nations that create nationalism but rather, that nationalism creates nations, a fact that certainly seems to be true for the history of most recent nation-states.

Prof. Hans Kohn (1965:9), a well-known authority on nationalism defines the concept as 'a state of mind, in which the supreme loyalty of the individual

is felt to be due to the nation state'. Kohn further adds : 'It is living and active corporate will. It is this will which we call nationalism, a state of mind inspiring the large majority of people and claiming to inspire all its members. It asserts that the nation-state is the ideal and the only legitimate form of political organization and that the nationality is the source of all cultural creative energy and economic well-being'. Kohn's argument includes both eastern and western types of nationalism which refer to Eastern and Western Europe. "Eastern nationalism conceived the nation as an organic community, united by culture, language and descent (McGregor 2010)."

Today, this state of mind, a common bond coupled with patriotism, an act of consciousness is the core of the concept of nationalism.

Anthony Smith states that nationalism is simply "an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity for a population which some of its members deem to constitute an actual or potential "nation" (Smith, 2001)." In this definition, Smith reveals what he believes the three main goals of nationalism are: autonomy, national unity, and national identity.

The concept of nationalism implies a feeling of oneness among a large group of section of people. Professor Snyder wrote that it was not easy to define nationalism in simple language, yet he describes the following explanation of nationalism as the least objectionable. He wrote: ". . . nationalism, a product of political, economic, social and intellectual factors at a certain stage in history, is a condition of mind, feeling, or sentiment of a group of people living in a well-defined geographical area.

Nationalism can thus, broadly be defined as the belief that the nation is the central principle of political organization. As such, it is based upon two core assumptions: first, that humankind is naturally divided into distinct nations, and second, that the nation is the most appropriate, and perhaps only legitimate unit of political rule.

5.5 Brief History of Nationalism:

Throughout the course of history people have been attached to their native soil, to the traditions of their parents, and to established territorial authorities,

Space for Learner

but it was not until the end of the 18th century that nationalism began to be a generally recognized sentiment moulding public and private life and one of the great, if not the greatest, single determining factors of modern history. Because of its dynamic vitality and its all-pervading character, nationalism is often thought to be very old; sometimes it is mistakenly regarded as a permanent factor in political behaviour. Actually, the American and French Revolution may be regarded as its first powerful manifestations. It was the French revolution which introduced the concept of popular democracy resting on the will of the people and of the “rights of man and of the citizen.” It became a general European movement in the nineteenth century particularly after the Napoleonic era. The nationalism which Napoleon generated among his enemies has been described by Hayes as “traditional nationalism”. Appeals to popular sovereignty can be seen in revolutionary documents such as the American *Declaration of Independence* (1776) and the French *Declaration of the Rights of Man* (1789).

Modern nations and the idea of nationalism were born in the late eighteenth century; some commentators see them as a product of the French Revolution of 1789 (Kedourie 1966). Nationalism, as we have seen, developed in its modern form during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. The most important factor for the rise of nationalism, however, was the rise of the centralized modern state in Europe around the 16th and 17th centuries. After penetrating the new countries of Latin America, it spread in the early 19th century to central Europe and from there, towards the middle of the century, to eastern and south eastern Europe. By 1815 almost all the nations of Europe had become carriers of ideological nationalism. Thus, the 19th century has been called the age of nationalism in Europe as it was the major formative era of modern nationalism while the 20th century witnessed the rise and struggle of powerful national movements throughout Asia and Africa. Palmer and Perkins wrote nationalism during “greater part of nineteenth century” was linked with other movements such as democracy, romanticism, industrialism, imperialism and liberalism. Liberal nationalism declined by the beginning of the twentieth century as great power rivalry became common and eventually resulted in the First World War. It was argued that nationalism was both cause and product of the First World War.

Evidently, by the end of the nineteenth century it was a powerful political force in the politics of the emerging European democracies, the German and Austro-Hungarian empires, and the autocracy of the Russian Empire. Much of international history since 1800 has been concerned with nationalism, and in Europe it forced the break-up of the multinational Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman Empires, the separation of Norway from Sweden and of Ireland from Britain. Also in Europe, nationalism unified Italy and Germany, so that each formed a 'nation-state', even if many 'ethnic Germans' still live outside Germany. All governments appealed to national images and national identity as means of building political legitimacy for their governments. During the twentieth century, the doctrine of nationalism, which had been born in Europe, spread throughout the globe as the peoples of Asia and Africa rose in opposition to colonial rule.

Indeed, in a sense, nineteenth-century European imperialism turned nationalism into a genuinely global creed by generating anti-colonial or 'national liberation' movements across much of the developing world. The importance of nationalism in international relations is recognised in the fact that 'nationalism' caused both World Wars in the twentieth century.

The independence movements that sprang up in the inter-war period gained new impetus with the end of World War II. The over-stretched empires of the UK, France, the Netherlands and Portugal crumbled in the face of rising nationalism. After 1945 nationalism greatly increased the number of states in the world when the colonised peoples of the European empires in the Third World fought their way to independence. India was granted independence in 1947. China achieved genuine unity and independence only after the 1949 communist revolution. During the 1950s and early 1960s, the political map of Africa was entirely redrawn through the process of decolonization. Africa's last remaining colony, Southwest Africa, finally became independent Namibia in 1990.

Then, after 1989, the European state system was transformed with the collapse of communism. Eighteen new European states appeared at the UN, and several more from Asia, all carved out of the USSR, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. Conversely, one state (the German Democratic Republic, or East Germany) disappeared in 1990, to be merged with the

Space for Learner

Federal Republic of Germany to form Germany. This was another triumph for nationalism. Thus the whole shape of the international system today is largely derived from nationalism and the effects of nationalist movements.

Stop to Consider:

Nationalism:

Nationalism is an ideology based on the premise that an individual's loyalty and devotion to one's country should come above the interests and opinions of other citizens or the interests of a certain group of citizens. Nationalism is contemptuous toward the virtues of other countries. It wants to be and proclaims itself to be "the greatest". Question to be asked here is - should such self-proclaimed greatness be above rational thinking and goodness?

Patriotism:

Patriotism is an attachment to a homeland. The love and adoration for the place where an individual is born, brought up, and the nation that place belongs to. These attachments can be related to ethnic, cultural, political or historical. Patriotism is also being proud of a country's virtues but with an eagerness and readiness to correct its deficiencies to be better. Patriotism acknowledges the patriotism of citizens of other countries and respects their virtues. It encompasses a set of concepts closely related to those of nationalism. An excess of patriotism in the defence of a nation is called chauvinism or jingoism.

5.6 Types of Nationalism:

It is clear by now to see how the various loyalties and attachments regarding these beliefs, customs and symbols create different forms of nationalism. These different forms can broadly be categorised into-ethnic (or cultural forms) which include linguistic and religious forms of nationalism, and civic (or political forms) which include liberal and socialist forms of nationalism (Smith, 2010).

The distinction between civic and ethnic nationalisms is attributed to Hans Kohn who argued that Western forms of nationalisms were based on a rational association of citizens bound by common laws and a shared territory. Therefore to Kohn Western nationalism is voluntaristic, whereas in contrast, Eastern forms of nationalisms were based on a belief in common culture and ethnic origins, therefore having a more organic structure.

Anthony Smith writes that “every nationalism contains civic and ethnic elements in varying degrees and different forms. Sometimes civic and territorial elements predominate; at other times it is the ethnic and vernacular components that are emphasized (Smith, 2001).” Smith’s most popular argument features civic and ethnic types of nationalism as opposed to eastern and western types.

Nationalism is, therefore, not a straightforward ideology. It can wear many faces, display many forms. It can be conservative, fascist, liberal, socialist, even Marxist. All political ideologies have used nationalism for their ends. Nevertheless, nationalism is characterised at a fundamental level by the believe, that each nation should be governed by its own sovereign state.

A. Civic Nationalism:

The first, and oldest type of Nationalism was initially associated with Western European or North American politics and with countries elsewhere that followed them. It is usually called “civic” or political nationalism and it is seen above all as a “legal-political concept”. Although there are competing theories regarding the origin of civic nationalism, it is Napoleon Bonaparte who ruled France after the French Revolution who is usually credited with introducing this modern concept of nationalism. In theory, civic nationalism assumes that citizenship and nationality are identical. Most scholars who deal with nationalism believe that the growth of nationalism is a fundamental aspect of modernization. This was as true of European history in the nineteenth century as it was of the decolonizing world—mostly Africa and Asia—in the twentieth century. Therefore the growth of nationalism involves two processes: its appearance in people’s minds as a sense of identity, belonging and loyalty; and its growth into a political force, which ultimately works to

Space for Learner

create a sovereign state. This “people” or nation will embrace cultural diversity and try to rule itself by increasing civil liberties and democratic credentials.

Civic nationalism is the basis of American, French or British nationalism. It identifies the common historical ties that exist between the people in the nation, ties that can easily be extended to other people through citizenship and the loyalties and obligations associated with acquiring that citizenship.

There is no ethnic limitation on who can potentially be a member of the nation. However, one should not forget the difficulty of attaining this form of nationalism in practice. Existing members of the nation may have very strong objections to large-scale additions of people to the nation by acquisition of citizenship.

Civic nationalism has been defended on the grounds that it is open and voluntaristic: membership of the nation is based on choice, not on any predetermined ethnic or historical identity. It is a form of nationalism that is consistent with toleration and liberal values and compatible with a substantial degree of cultural and ethnic diversity.

Critics, however, have questioned whether civic nationalism is meaningful (Kymlicka 1999). Most citizens, even in a ‘civic’ or ‘political’ nation, derive their nationality from birth, not choice. Moreover, in the absence of the bonds of ethnicity, language and history, political allegiances and civic values may simply be incapable of generating the sense of belonging and rootedness that gives nationalism its power.

B. Ethnic Nationalism:

The other type of nationalism, “ethnic” nationalism, was originally associated with countries in Eastern and Central Europe. This nationalism is based on “ancestral association” as compared to civic nationalism, which can embrace diverse people who live within shared borders. Ethnic nationalism requires a common culture, way of life, and above all a perceived sense of genetic links among the members of the ethnic community. It should be remembered that all types of nationalism are in some way exclusionary. But ethnic nationalism, due to its emphasis on the “blood line” or racial connections

among citizens, is far more exclusionary than civic nationalism and pays less attention to political boundaries.

The historical differences between these types of nationalism are huge and remain relevant to this day. Western European nationalism arose in societies that were already modernizing, while the peoples of Eastern Europe were neither independent nor economically modern. In short, Eastern Europe became nationally conscious before it had experienced economic development, representative government, and political unity. A common result was the desire to alter the political boundaries to coincide with national or cultural boundaries; another result was to embrace a greater sense of exclusivity in determining who was “in” and who was “out” of the nation.

This form of nationalism is often criticized for having a closed or fixed character: it is difficult, and perhaps impossible, for non-citizens to become members of the nation. Nationalism therefore acquires a homogenizing character, breeding a fear or suspicion of foreigners and strengthening the idea of cultural distinctiveness. Ethnic nationalism is thus considered irrational and tends to be tribalistic, even bloodthirsty. On the other hand, its capacity to generate a closed and fixed sense of political belonging may lead to high levels of social solidarity and a strong sense of collective purpose.

Ethnic nationalism, thus, identifies a close connection between national members linked by race, language or other cultural attributes that persist over centuries.

5.7 Nationalism and Identity: Idea of Self-Determination:

Nationalism acquired a considerable degree of legitimacy after the First World War through the concept of ‘national-self determination’. President Woodrow Wilson had, at the Paris Peace Conference (1919), used American power and prestige to establish the principle of ‘national self-determination’. This principle stated that ‘all peoples are equal in their right to govern themselves as a nation’ and was incorporated into both the Covenant of the League of Nations (1920) and the Charter of the United Nations (1945).

Space for Learner

Space for Learner

The preamble to the UN Charter claims that its members ‘... reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small’.

Drawn up in 1918, these were proposed as the basis for the reconstruction of Europe after WWI, and provided a blueprint for the sweeping territorial changes that were implemented by the Treaty of Versailles (1919).

Nations, unlike other social groups, seek the right to govern themselves and determine their future development. They seek, in other words, the right to self-determination. In making this claim a nation seeks recognition and acceptance by the international community of its status as a distinct political entity or state. Nationalism encourages the view that ‘nations’ should be governed by a ‘state’ made up of members of that nation.

National self-determination really strengthens the validity of the state as an expression of ‘nationhood’. The idea of one culture one state was employed while reordering state boundaries after World War I. The Treaty of Versailles established a number of small, newly independent states, but it proved virtually impossible to satisfy all the demands for self determination which were made at the time. Besides, re-organisation of state boundaries to satisfy the demands of one culture - one state, led to mass migration of population across state boundaries. Millions of people as a consequence were displaced from their homes and expelled from the land which had been their home for generations. Many others became victims of communal violence.

Indeed most states had more than one ethnic and cultural community living within its boundaries. These communities, which were often small in number and constituted a minority within the state were often disadvantaged. Hence, the problem of accommodating minorities as equal citizens remained. The only positive aspect of these developments was that it granted political recognition to various groups who saw themselves as distinct nations and wanted the opportunity to govern themselves and determined their own future. The right to national self-determination has also been asserted by national liberation movements in Asia and Africa when they were struggling against colonial domination. Virtually every state in the world today faces the dilemma of how to deal with movements for self-determination and this

has raised questions about the right to national self-determination. More and more people are beginning to realise that the solution does not lie in creating new states but in making existing states more democratic and equal. That is, in ensuring that people with different cultural and ethnic identities live and co-exist as partners and equal citizens within the country. This may be essential not only for resolving problems arising from new claims for self-determination but also for building a strong and united state. After all, a nation-state which does not respect the rights and cultural identity of minorities within the state would find it difficult to gain the loyalty of its members.

Space for Learner

Check Your Progress:

1. What are the elements of Nationalism?
2. How does nationalism impacts world politics?
3. What are the two types of Nationalism?

5.8 Nationalism and International Politics:

Nationalism is commonly regarded as posing a challenge to international stability and regional and global order more generally. Arguably, nationalism encourages narrowly defined and zero-sum security policies; it works against compromises and consensus; it undermines international trust and cooperation. Nationalist movements and states are considered to pose serious challenges to existing states and international order. Nationalism played a crucial role in the overthrow of the European empires. Canada, the USA, Australia, New Zealand, all nurtured a sense of national identity even when they were part of the British Empire, eventually leading to their independence. In Africa and Asia, Western-educated nationalist elites sought the creation of new nations, but there was usually the lack of a strong sense of 'national' identity in these European colonies, compared with religious, ethnic, linguistic or other identities.

The rise of nationalism has had adverse effects on international relations. As states turn inward, the global landscape becomes economically and politically fragmented. This has led to concerns for international security and stability.

Space for Learner

At the same time, the ability of international institutions to foster peace and cooperation is eroding under the pressures of nationalism. These effects are especially significant at a time where the world faces challenges that require international cooperation and coordination to overcome.

As nationalism heightens tensions between states, it also undermines the ability of institutions to foster cooperation and peace. Today, the rise of nationalism is forcing leaders across the world to confront the tension between domestic politics and foreign policy. More often than not, they are opting for domestic politics. A consequence of rising nationalism across nation-states is that it is forcing leaders to act only domestically, as they perceive that far-flung, ambiguous foreign policy is not a priority for their electorates. In a world full of competing nationalisms, the landscape for interstate cooperation and global governance is deeply fractured. This damaged environment for international cooperation has grave ramifications for the international institutions that lie at the heart of global governance.

While nationalism across nation-states is compelling states to look more inward than in the past, a new technological revolution is on its way. Technologies like artificial intelligence, robotics, automation, autonomous weapons, and cyber warfare are not limited to one sovereign state. Their proliferation and impact is likely to be transnational in nature. Unfortunately, the absence of such cooperation in setting up institutions to develop the regulatory framework raises massive risks of disruption, inter-state conflict regarding these technologies and at worse, misuse by non-state actors.

Nationalism has had an immense impact in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, especially in undermining empires and multi-national states. However, nationalism also contributed to increasing rivalry and suspicion between the Great Powers during the years before 1914. It promoted conflict by stressing the differences between nations, and stimulated arms races and the building of alliances. It also made peaceful resolution of differences by diplomacy increasingly difficult. Nationalism did not make war inevitable, but it made war more difficult to avoid.

Even more destructive was the Second World War. Fascists and Nazis used nationalism to strengthen their idea of the world being made up of

nations struggling for survival. The 1930s experienced the world steady drifting towards conflict, and after 1939, the Second World War was on a scale of destruction unimaginable even after the 1914–18 War.

The defeat of the Axis powers by 1945 was not the end of nationalism as a powerful motivating ideology. The ideological conflicts of the Cold War, the struggles between Western democracy and communism, were given an edge by nationalism. Almost all of the many wars and conflicts in the developing world during the Cold War and afterwards were impelled by nationalism and national aspirations. Nationalist ideology continues to shape global politics today, and yet twenty-first-century nationalism is faced with a unique set of challenges. For example, migration and diaspora create cultural, economic and social networks which now bind people across entire continents, let alone countries.

Space for Learner

Stop to Consider:

Distinction between ethnic nationalism and civic nationalism:

- Ethnic nationalism links nation with race and language and birth, and ‘civic nationalism’ links nation with citizenship, with no ethnic limitation on who is potentially a member of the nation.
- Ethnic nationalism is far more exclusionary than civic nationalism and pays less attention to political boundaries.
- Civic nationalism is based primarily on shared political allegiances and political values.
- Civic nationalism has been defended on the grounds that it is open and voluntaristic: membership of the nation is based on choice and self-definition, not on any predetermined ethnic or historical identity. It is a form of nationalism that is consistent with toleration and liberal values.

By contrast, ethnic nationalism is rooted in ethnic unity and a deep sense of cultural belonging. This form of nationalism is often criticized for having a closed or fixed character: it is difficult, and perhaps impossible, for non-citizens to become members of the nation. Nationalism therefore acquires a homogenizing character, breeding a fear or suspicion of foreigners and strengthening the idea of cultural distinctiveness.

Space for Learner

5.9 Nationalism and Globalization:

Nationalism is still a major force in world affairs. Nevertheless, there are powerful economic and cultural forces undermining nationalism, usually described as ‘globalisation’, developing around multi-national corporations, banks, insurance companies, global communications, the dominance of the English language. Nationalist ideology continues to shape global politics today, and yet twenty-first-century nationalism is faced with a unique set of challenges. For example, migration and diaspora create cultural, economic and social networks which now bind people across entire continents, let alone countries. The onset of globalisation, together with regional integration, has also pushed governments to revise their nation-building rhetoric.

Globalisation creates new identities and new loyalties by its cultural and economic processes, but it also creates a potential resistance to the ‘threats’ to national identity that it produces by its international, Westernised, homogenised character. Many people appeal to nationalist sentiments for an ideological basis to resist the ‘McDonaldisation’ of their culture.

Nationalism is used in a very broad sense to support the claims of ‘identity’ politics. Political claims are asserted by groups acutely aware of their identity African-Americans constitute a fairly clearly delineated group with identifiable political goals. Such groups may polarise around language, race and religion.

Nationalism and national identity were taken up by many on both the left and the right as ideological instruments to resist globalisation and assert the positive claims of cultural diversity in an increasingly homogenised world. . Nationalism have demonstrated remarkable resilience. Indeed, nationalism has revived in the post-Cold War period. It has also re-emerged in the forms of cultural and ethnic nationalism, and it has provided a vehicle through which the transformations brought about through globalization can be challenged and resisted. Increased globalization is undermining the legitimacy of the nation-state, but one of the major consequences of globalisation is an increasing identification with an ethnic community which may lead to the development of even more groups seeking national self determination. To complicate matters even further, the internationalization of ethnic conflict is part of the process of globalization.

Even in Europe some forms of nationalism are clearly alive. It may be argued that it is possibly a countervailing force to the insidious processes of economic and cultural globalisation.

Space for Learner

SAQ:

Q. Nationality is a sentiment of oneness. Explain.

.....
.....
.....

Check Your Progress:

1. Why do some countries have civic nationalism and others ethnic nationalism?
2. What do you understand by national self-determination?
3. Do you think nationalism will be replaced by other allegiances in the next few decades?
4. Discuss the different types of nationalism.
5. Why does nationalism still seem to be a powerful influence in the twenty first century?
6. Discuss the impact of nationalism in world politics.

5.10 Summing Up:

Nationalism is a complex and deeply contested political phenomenon. This stems from the fact that all nations comprise a blend of cultural and political, and objective and subjective, characteristics. Nationalism has also been an ideology, associated with a wide range of doctrines, movements and causes. Andrew Heywood rightly said that ‘Nationalism is a chameleon-like ideology, capable of assuming a bewildering variety of political forms. At different times, it has been progressive and reactionary, democratic and authoritarian, liberating and oppressive, aggressive and peaceful, and so on’.

Space for Learner

For over two hundred years, nationalism has helped to shape and reshape history in all parts of the world, making it perhaps the most successful of political creeds. It has inspired intense loyalties as well as deep hatreds. It has united people as well as divided them, helped to liberate them from oppressive rule as well as been the cause of conflict and bitterness and wars. Finally, since the end of the Cold War, new and often highly potent forms of nationalism have emerged, often linked to cultural, ethnic or religious self-assertion. Nationalism has also re-emerged as a reaction against the homogenizing impact of globalization and as a means of resisting immigration and multiculturalism. Thus, nationalism has proved to be one of the most powerful of all political ideologies over the last two centuries and seems likely to remain a potent force well into the present century.

5.11 References and Suggested Readings:

1. Anderson, B. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* NLB/Verso, 1983.
2. Breuilly, John, Nationalism, in J. Baylis, S. Smith and P. Owens Eds. *Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011 pp. 403-414
3. Gellner, E. *Nations and Nationalism* Blackwell, 1983
4. Griffin, R. 'Nationalism', in R. Eatwell and A. Wright (eds.), *Contemporary Political Ideologies*, Pinter, 1993, pp. 147–68.
5. Heywood, A. 'The Nation', in A. Heywood, *Political Ideas and Concepts: An Introduction*, Macmillan, 1994, pp. 56–66.
6. Heywood, A. 'Nations and Nationalism', in A. Heywood, *Politics*, Macmillan, 1997, pp. 103–19.
7. Ryan, Stephen, *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Issues in World Politics* ed Richard Little and Michael Smith, Palgrave, 2001
8. Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
