

GAUHATI UNIVERSITY

Institute of Distance and Open Learning



Semester- II



Paper - 2036
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS-II

GOPINATH BARDOLOI NAGAR
Guwahati - 781014 (Assam)

**MA in Political Science
(under CBCS)**

GAUHATI UNIVERSITY
Institute of Distance and Open Learning

POL-05-II-2036

M.A. Second Semester
(under CBCS)

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Paper: POL-2036
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS- II



Contents:

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

Block II: Political Economy

- Unit 1: International Political Economy-concept
- Unit 2: Contending theoretical approaches in International Political Economy
- Unit 3: Capitalism and Neoliberalism
- Unit 4: Bretton Woods system
- Unit 5: Global governance

Block III: Peace and Conflict Resolution

- Unit 1: Peace in International Relations
- Unit 2: Peace movements
- Unit 3: Conflict resolution and diplomacy
- Unit 4: UN and peace keeping operations
- Unit 5: Humanitarian Intervention in world politics

Block IV: Global Governance

- Unit 1: Introduction to International Law: concept and growth
- Unit 2: International Organizations and world politics
- Unit 3: Understanding international diplomacy: Theory and practice
- Unit 4: Non-Governmental Organizations: Nature and importance
- Unit 5: Global civil society: concept and importance

UNIT 1

POWER AND POLARITY IN WORLD POLITICS

- 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
- 1.7 Hard Power and Soft Power
- 1.8 Polarity
- 1.9 Unipolarity
- 1.10 Bipolarity
- 1.11 Rise of Multipolarity
- 1.12 Non-Polarity
- 1.13 Summing Up

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 emerging powers such as Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC) 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 answer the following objectives:

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

1.3 Power

Defining 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 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.

SAQ

1. Can you name an 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 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.

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.

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.

SAQ

1. Write an example of Security Dilemma?

1.6: Relational and Structural power

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 (compellence), 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 compellence) and the previous policy of preventing attacks on the Kurds and Shia Muslims by maintaining 'no-fly zones' (an example of deterrence).

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, 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

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 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

Defining 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.

Scholars differ as to whether 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.

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.

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

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, 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

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.

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 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.

1.12: Nonpolarity:

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

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.

1.13: Summing Up:

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.

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

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

Dougherty, James E., Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr Contending Theories of International Relations, Harper&Row, 1981 pp84-132

J. Baylis, S. Smith and P. Owens (eds.) Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations, New York: Oxford University Press,2011,

Viotti P. and M. Kauppi, International Relations Theory : Realism, Pluralism, Globalism. New York, Macmillan:, 2007 pp. 32-73

Wohlforth, William C, The Stability of a unipolar world in *Perspectives on World Politics*, Eds. Richard Little & Michael Smith. Routledge, 2006

MODEL QUESTIONS

- 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?

Unit 2: Hegemony in international relations

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Objectives
- 2.3 Hegemony: The Concept
- 2.4 Hegemony in IR
- 2.5 US Hegemony of World Politics
- 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' presupposes 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

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 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).

Self Asking Questions

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 superpower 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.

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.

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 newfound 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 fullscale 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 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.

CHALLENGE 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.

Growth of Unilateralism

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.

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.

Self Asking Question

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.

The new 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 socio-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.

Over the previous century, the United States has built up a worldwide monetary framework that requirements 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.

Self Asking Questions

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

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

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 poach 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. Adversaries of globalization fight that with organizations, for example, the International Monetary Fund available to its, the U.S. is truly forming and declaring its intensely mobilized outside strategy past its national limits. 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, its 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.

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.

2.6 Summing Up

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

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

Unit 3: State and Nations

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Objectives
- 3.4 State and Nations: the Concept
 - 3.4.1 State
 - 3.4.2 Nations
- 3.5 Summing Up
- 3.6 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 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

3.4 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. (As you can see, the term “international” should really be “interstate”).

3.4.1 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, unit 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 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

States try to form nations within their borders (through symbols, education, 'national interest,' etc.).

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.

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.

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. 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 very 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 entire operate 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. -e 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.

3.4.2 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, states \neq nations: 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.

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.

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.

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 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.

3.5 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, 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.

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.

3.6 References and Suggested Readings

Lake David A., The State and International Relations

Huntington Samuel P. (1973), Transnational Organizations in World Politics, World

Politics, Vol. 25, No. 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>

UNIT 4

GLOBALISATION AND STATE SOVEREIGNTY

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 The notion of Sovereignty
- 1.4 Genesis of Sovereignty
- 1.5 Defining Sovereignty
- 1.6 Challenges to State Sovereignty
- 1.7 Why the state still matters
- 1.8 Globalisation: Meaning and Definitions
- 1.9 History of Globalisation
- 1.10 Three Schools of Thought on Globalisation
- 1.11 Dimensions of Globalisation
- 1.12 Resistance to Globalisation
- 1.13 Summing Up.

1.1: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.

1.2: Objectives:

After going through the entire Unit we will be able to answer the following objectives.

1. To *examine* the concept of state sovereignty.
2. To *provide* basic understanding of globalisation.
3. To *examine* the different dimensions of Globalisation.
4. To *analyse* the impact of Globalisation on State Sovereignty.
5. To *consider* redefining the role of state in the era of globalisation.

1.3 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.

1.4 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 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.

1.5: 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.

Self Asking Question (SAQ)

1. Which is the most essential element of State ?

1.6: Challenges to State Sovereignty:

Impact of Globalisation on 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’ 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.

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

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.

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.

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 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.

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.

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 ?

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.

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.

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 the 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.

1.7 : 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 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.

1.8: 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.

1.9: 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.

1.10: 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.

Alternative Perspectives on Globalization

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 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

1. Do you think globalisation will continue to persist? If so, in what areas?
2. Which is the most visible aspect of Globalisation?

1.11: 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 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, fiancé 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 onr 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.

Check your progress.

1. Explain the political dimension of globalisation ?

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 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.

SAQ

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?

1.12: 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.

1.13: Summing up:

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.

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

Basu, Rumki, *International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues*. Sage Publications 2018, pp-219-230
Global Politics: A New Introduction, New York: Routledge, 2009 pp. 220-243.

.Heywood, A *Global Politics*, New York: Palgrave, 2011 pp. 264-281.

Inayatullah N. and D. Blaney, 'Sovereignty' in B. Chimni and S. Mallavarapu ed.
International Relations: Perspectives For the Global South, New Delhi: Pearson. 2012, pp. 124-134.

Jindal, N. & Kumar, K. *Global Politics: Issues and Perspectives*, New Delhi, Sage Publications 2018

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.

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.

Strange, Susan. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge, New York, 1996

Stiglitz, Joseph E. *Globalisation and its Discontents*, New York. 2003

Viotti P. and M. Kauppi, *International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy and Identity*, New Delhi: Pearson, 2007 pp. 238-272

MODEL QUESTIONS:

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?

UNIT 5

NATIONALISM IN WORLD POLITICS

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Nation, Nation-State, Nationalism
- 1.4 Defining Nationalism
- 1.5 Brief History of nationalism
- 1.6 Types of Nationalism
- 1.7 Nationalism and Identity
- 1.8 Nationalism and International Politics
- 1.9 Nationalism and Globalisation
- 1.10 Summing up

1.1: 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.

1.2: Objectives:

After going through the Unit we will be able to answer the following objectives:

1. To *understand* the idea of Nationalism.
2. To *trace* the history of nationalism
3. To *examine* the challenges to Nationalism .
4. To *analyse* the importance of nationalism in world politics.

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

Self Asking Questions.

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?

1.4: Defining Nationalism

Nationalism is a complicated and contested phenomenon in modern political 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 dynastics 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.

1.5: 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, 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 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.

1.6: Types of Nationalism :

Civic nationalism and Ethnic 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.

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 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.

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.

Check your Progress

1. What are the two types of Nationalism ?

1.7: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).

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.

Check your progress

1. What are the elements of Nationalism?
2. How does nationalism impact world politics?

1.8: 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. 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.

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.

1.9: 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 and well. It may be argued that it is possibly a countervailing force to the insidious processes of economic and cultural globalisation.

1.10: 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 a 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’.

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.

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

Anderson, B. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* NLB/Verso, 1983.

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

Gellner, E. *Nations and Nationalism* Blackwell, 1983

Griffin, R. ‘Nationalism’, in R. Eatwell and A. Wright (eds.), *Contemporary Political Ideologies*, Pinter, 1993, pp. 147–68.

Heywood, A. ‘The Nation’, in A. Heywood, *Political Ideas and Concepts: An Introduction* Macmillan, 1994, pp. 56–66.

Heywood, A. ‘Nations and Nationalism’, in A. Heywood, *Politics*, Macmillan, 1997, pp. 103–19.

Ryan, Stephen, *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Issues in World Politics* ed Richard Little and Michael Smith, Palgrave, 2001

Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.

MODEL QUESTIONS.

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.

UNIT1: INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY: THE CONCEPT

Unit Structure:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Meaning and Concept of International Political Economy
- 1.4 Historical Background of International Political Economy
- 1.5 Significance of International Political Economy
- 1.6 Summing Up
- 1.7 Reference and Suggested Readings

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Political economy is an interdisciplinary branch of the social sciences that focuses on the interrelationships among individuals, governments, and public policy. Political economists study how economic theories such as capitalism, socialism, and communism work in the real world. It may also be described as a social science that studies production, trade and their relationship with the law and the government. It studies the role of economic theories in changing socio-political and economy of the world in general and a nation in particular. Here we can cite the example of socialism or communism. On the other hand, International political economy (IPE) or Global political economy (GPE) may be described as the study interactions between the economy on a global level and political and economic actors, systems and institutions. In this unit we shall make an attempt to discuss the concept of international political economy.

1.2 OBJECTIVES

International political economy mainly emphasises on the interrelationship between politics and economics. Moreover, it also discusses problems that arise out of such interactions. After reading this unit you will be able to:

- Explain the concept of International political economy
- Trace the historical background of International Economy
- Discuss approaches of International Economy

1.3 MEANING AND CONCEPT OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY

IPE is a contested term as there is no universally agreed definition of IPE. According to some scholars IPE means primarily to study of the political basis of economic actions, the ways in which government or public policies affect market operations. While few other scholars argue that it is essential to focus on the economic basis of political action, the ways in which economic forces shape government policies. So, basically IPE shows the interplay of economics and politics as the two are complementary as politics and markets are in a constant state of mutual interactions. Based on this definition, the traditional approach to study IPE suggests that there are only two important areas of IPE: Market and State. Markets are the common places where buying and selling of goods and services take place and are composed for self-interested individuals. States are mainly political institutions of the contemporary international political system. So, the traditional approach to study IPE indicated that specific differences exist between economic or market oriented activities and political or state-centered ones.

The Concept of International Political economy includes a wide range of concerns like intersection of politics and economics as goods, services, money as well as ideas move across borders. The three dominant perspectives of IPE are economic liberalism, mercantilism and structuralism.

Stop to Consider:

Some important concepts of IPE:

1. International Trade: In terms of the international trade, IPE seeks to bring economic factors in to the study of International Relations by taking note of economic security concerns and economic foreign policy tools. As a

result, the process has brought political factors into the analysis of international politics.

2. International finance is the other important concept that falls within the scope of IPE. Some of the important elements of International Finance like analysis of exchange rate policies, foreign exchange mechanisms, global capital movements, international and domestic monetary institutions are studied in the IPE.
3. Hegemony is associated with power or dominance, both political and economic, that one social group holds over others. In international relations, hegemony refers to the “asymmetrical interdependence” of political-economic-cultural relations among the nation states. Theory of hegemonic stability became central in the IPE theory of history, it started to decline in the latter part of the 20th century.
4. Globalization is another crucial element to study within the scope of IPE. It also raises questions about the causes and consequences of increasingly global market structures. The questions include politics, business, culture, technology, the environment, global migration, gender relations, and tourism, knowledge, education etc.

1.4 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY

From the above discussion we have learnt the meaning and concept of International Political economy. Here in this section we shall try to trace the historical origin of the concept. The term International Political economy (IPE) started appearing in scholarly literature in the mid 1960s. This was the period in which problem of economy as well as development of third world gained international attention. However, the term Global Political economy (GPE) was also used sporadically. Mostly, both the terms were used synonymously. Here we must remember that GPE was more holistic placing states and other kinds of actors within larger structure of global system. On the other hand, IPE emphasises individual nation states as the basic unit of analysis. According to Gill, in the 1980s the terminological difference between IPE and GPE came to mark a difference in methodological orientation, mapping onto more or less mainstream and critical approaches respectively. By the end

of 1990s the GPE came to be used by both mainstream and critical scholars.

Hence we can say that International Political Economy (IPE) also known as global political economy is relatively a new addition to the field of International Relations. IPE emerged as a separate field of study during 1970's, over the past 50 years, the subject has underwent a significant resurgence.

According to various historical references, international trade had connected countries together in ancient time. More specifically, during the 15th and 16th centuries, the development of commercial trade and exchanges have made the global market more interlinked and more competitive along with the advancement of transportation and technology. However, the scholars agree that IPE is a sub –discipline of International Relations that developed in parallel with globalization.

The increasing popularity of IPE as a separate discipline of study is the result of the continuing disappearance of disciplinary boundaries between economics and politics in particular and among the social sciences in general. Over the years, the IPE has grown into a multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary approach to various global problems. IPE trains students and scholars to understand the structures, hierarchies, and power struggle that regulate finance and trade, drive globalisation and economic nationalisms, and impact the distribution of wealth and poverty across and within countries, regions, and the world. In simple language, IPE is the study of a *problématique*, or set of related global problems.

Check Your Progress:

1. What is International Political economy?
2. Trace the origin and development of International Political economy.

1.6 SUMMING UP

After going through the unit you have learnt that International political economy mainly emphasises on the interrelationship between politics and economics. Its origin can be traced to the 1960s when the economy of new nation states began to draw

the attention of the scholars of the world. Reading of this unit will also help you learning that that International Political Economy (IPE) also known as global political economy is relatively a new addition to the field of International Relations. IPE emerged as a separate field of study during 1970's, over the past 50 years, the subject has underwent a significant resurgence. Over the years, the IPE has grown into a multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary approach to various global problems. In the next unit of this block you will study about the different approaches of international political economy. After going through the block you will get a holistic idea about international political economy.

1.7 REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

Brin and Williams, *Global Political Economy*, Red Glove Press, UK, 2018

Bromley S., Brown W., Athreya, S, *Ordering the International: History, Change and Transformation*, Pluto Press, London, 2014

Dunne T., M. Kurki, Smith S, *International Relations: Discipline and Diversity*, Create Space Independent Publishing Platform, 2017

Frieden, Jeffry A & Lake, David A, *International Political Economy – Perspective on Global Power and Wealth*, Routledge, London and New York, 2003

Lim, Timothy C, *International Political Economy: An Introduction to Approaches, Regimes, and Issues*, Saylor.org, Saylor URL: <http://www.saylor.org/courses/books>, 2014

Ravenhill J., *Global Political Economy*, (Latest Edition), OUP, UK, 2011

Unit 2

Contending Theoretical Approaches in International Political Economy

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Objectives

1.3 What is International Political Economy?

1.4 Some Important Concepts of IPE

1.5 Approaches to study International Political Economy

1.5.1 Mercantilism

1.5.2 Liberal Economy

1.5.3 Marxist

1.6 Summing up

1.7 References/Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction:

International Political Economy (IPE) also known as global political economy is relatively a new addition to the field of International Relations. In simple terms, IPE is the study of interplay of politics and economy in the international arena. Although IPE emerged as a separate field of study during 1970's, over the past 50 years, the

subject has undergone a significant resurgence. In the contemporary era, the IPE is a popular field of specialisation within the International Relations theory for the university students and scholars around the world. In this particular unit we will focus on the theoretical aspect of IPE and various approaches to study it. This unit will also attempt to define the IPE, summarize major analytical framework in the field and identify several current global debates. A careful reading of this unit will provide the students a better base for understanding and analyzing the concepts, issues and problems that are discussed in this unit.

1.2 Objectives:

As mentioned already, International Political Economy (IPE) attempts to study the interplay and interaction between economics and politics. Now days, a state really needs to take its economy into consideration while making a political decision. International trade and International finance assumed great significance in international politics. After reading this unit you will be able to:

- explain the meaning of the International Political Economy
- discuss the different elements of International Political Economy
- understand theoretical approaches to understanding International Political Economy

1.3 What is International Political Economy?

IPE is a contested term as there is no universally agreed definition of IPE. According to some scholars IPE means primarily to study of the political basis of economic actions, the ways in which government or public policies affect market operations. While few other scholars argue that it is essential to focus on the economic basis of political action, the ways in which economic forces shape government policies. So, basically IPE shows the interplay of economics and politics as the

two are complementary as politics and markets are in a constant state of mutual interactions. Based on this definition, the traditional approach to study IPE suggests that there are only two important areas of IPE: Market and State. Markets are the common places where buying and selling of goods and services take place and are composed for self-interested individuals. States are mainly political institutions of the contemporary international political system. So, the traditional approach to study IPE indicated that specific differences exist between economic or market oriented activities and political or state-centered ones.

Although IPE was recognised as a separate discipline during 1970's, we could still find its references much before. According to various historical references, international trade had connected countries together in ancient time. More specifically, during the 15th and 16th centuries, the development of commercial trade and exchanges have made the global market more interlinked and more competitive along with the advancement of transportation and technology. However, the scholars agree that IPE is a sub –discipline of International Relations that developed in parallel with globalization.

As a subject, IPE is the fast progressing field of study in areas of Social Science that seeks to understand global issues and international problems by applying interdisciplinary tools and theoretical methods. The increasing popularity of IPE as a separate discipline of study is the result of the continuing disappearance of disciplinary boundaries between economics and politics in particular and among the social sciences in general. Over the years, the IPE has grown into a multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary approach to various global problems. IPE trains students and scholars to understand the structures, hierarchies, and power struggle that regulate finance and trade, drive globalisation and economic nationalisms, and impact the distribution of wealth and poverty across and within countries, regions, and the world.

In simple language, IPE is the study of a *problématique*, or set of related global problems. The important concepts analysed by the traditional IPE *problématique* are international trade and commerce, international finance, multinational and transnational corporations, hegemony and North- South relations. However, the scopes are broadened in the recent years as many scholars have aimed to launch a new and revised IPE, which is less focused on International Politics and the problems of the nation-state and less interested on economic policy issues.

Important definitions of IPE are:

According to Benjamin Cohen, “IPE is the study of the complex interrelationship of economic and political activity at the level of international affairs.”

According to American Political Scientist Helen Milner, “IPE is the interaction of economic and political variables in the international system.”

Stop to Consider:

- International Political Economy (IPE) is the mutual interaction between International Politics and International Economics.
- The political decisions of nation-states clearly influence international trade and monetary flows, which in turn affect the environment in which nation-states make political choices and entrepreneurs, make economic choices.
- IPE emerged during 1970s as number of events like oil embargoes and the breakdown of Bretton Woods monetary system showed that how tightly International Economics and International Politics are connected.
- The oil embargo revealed the complex interdependence

between and among domestic politics, domestic economics, international politics, and international economics.

1.4 Some Important Concepts of IPE:

International Trade: International trade is a crucial element of study or *problématique* in IPE. However, politics and economics as a discipline view international trade from different perspective using almost opposite analytical parameters. International trade could be defined in simple term when trade within a market involves buyers and sellers in different countries, which becomes the object of political scrutiny. IPE considers international trade as primarily different from domestic economic activities. Various activities within the international trade like exchange of commodities, services and resources with another country raises number of political questions of national interest.

In terms of the international trade, IPE seeks to bring economic factors in to the study of International Relations by taking note of economic security concerns and economic foreign policy tools. As a result, the process has brought political factors into the analysis of international politics. So, IPE seeks to answer the important questions like what should be the state's policy be towards international trade? Many liberal economists agree that if countries pursue free trade, it would result in the proper allocation of resources and increase the value of the resources globally. Free trade reduces the waste that happens when goods and services are produced carelessly.

After the Second World War, the international trade institutions that emerged were mainly influenced by the free trade views of economists and specific interwar trade policies which created an environment of intense competition and retaliation. In order to counter such

environment, organizations like the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and later World Trade Organization (WTO) emerged to reduce the barriers to free trade increasingly through multilateral negotiations. However, the countries continued to use trade tools to achieve their foreign policy goals whenever necessary. So, in the post-war environment, we could see that political and economic viewpoints of international trade competed for attention. Numbers of international organizations emerged like the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA) and the European Union that supplemented the political economy of the international trade. Both the organizations used economic measures frequently to achieve political goals. Therefore, majority of scholars agree that international trade is at the key concept of IPE analysis.

International Finance:

International finance is the other important concept that falls within the scope of IPE. Some of the important elements of International Finance like analysis of exchange rate policies, foreign exchange mechanisms, global capital movements, international and domestic monetary institutions are studied in the IPE. It also deals with the political implications for technical matters of international economic institutions. For example: the Bretton Woods System created as international monetary system based on a dollar-gold standard. The system made the United States mainly responsible for looking after the international monetary systems as dollar became the key reserve currency. The system was managed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) by providing a multinational institution. The changes brought out by the Bretton Woods system for the US was mixed. As the US had the choice of spending any amount without consequences due to dollar's central position in the international monetary system, it was confronted with the tough choice between its domestic political worries and its international responsibilities. The Bretton Woods

system finally collapsed on 15th August 1971 as the US discontinued the fixed link between the dollar and gold.

In the economic history of the world, it is challenging to introduce a new monetary system. The economic and political systems are complex and likely to have undesired political consequences. Also, in order to follow international agreements, states sometimes need to sacrifice their domestic requirements. A strong international and global authority also sometimes acts as barrier to domestic economy. Therefore, many scholars view international finance as less political and more purely economic than international trade.

Stop to Consider:

- Money is crucial to conduct trade as it allows people to buy goods.
- Political involvement in economic activities revolves around on enacting measures to regulate the money supply, as well as the flow of trade.
- Issues were raised with the rise of international trade regarding monetary exchanges as there was no international currency. The 'Exchange Rate' between any two currencies is likely to vary on a regular basis and create challenges for traders.
- So, the idea of the Gold Standard emerged with a value in gold for conducting international trade.
- The leading trading countries of the world agreed to have their currencies given a set value in reference to gold and so avoid competitive devaluations.
- The gold standard became a key feature of the trading system of the nineteenth century, upheld by Great Britain as hegemon.
- The Gold Standard collapsed as Mercantilism reemerged in the twentieth century.

Hegemony:

Hegemony is associated with power or dominance, both political and economic, that one social group holds over others. In international relations, hegemony refers to the “asymmetrical interdependence” of political-economic-cultural relations among the nation states. It is the technique of maintaining dominance and subordination in the areas of power relations and ways of gaining and maintaining power. The theory of hegemonic stability got popular during the Cold War era. The theory basically explained the motives and intentions of a hegemonic state. The hegemon was referred to a strong and a rich country that undertook the task to supply public goods like money, security and a mechanism of free trade to the international system. Only a hegemon had the capacity to bear the expenses alone due to its dominant position in the world system. It could basically regulate the world economic system. According to this theory, the world system gets richer and affluent whenever a hegemon undertakes the task to organize the international political and economic system and manage the provision of international public goods.

In the world economic history, we could witness emergence hegemon – Dutch (1620 – 72), British (1851-73) and the US (1945-1971). Whenever hegemon weakens, the international system also suffers and falls into conflict. It disturbs the peace and prosperity in the world. The theory of hegemonic stability supports and advocates the dominance of the hegemon and the maintenance of efficient hegemonic policies. The US hegemony was visible during the Bretton Woods System was functional. The Bretton Woods system was mainly interpreted as a system of economic governance invented to support U.S. hegemony in the postwar era. Each of the main Bretton Woods institutions, the World Bank, the IMF, and the GATT, made the US to play a central leadership role. In addition, the American dollar became the unofficial currency of the capitalist world as it established a monetary system in which values of other currencies of the world were tied to the value of

US dollar. The US also became the biggest lender of the world as it did not need to worry about the exchange rates.

Although the theory of hegemonic stability became central in the IPE theory of history, it started to decline in the latter part of the 20th century. The critiques pointed out that while the hegemon took the responsibility to organize the international system and supplying public goods, meanwhile, poor or free-rider states flourish, expand and increase the burden on the hegemon. So, the hegemon will be overwhelmed and will fail to bear the costs of the system it has created. So, finally hegemony will collapse until a new one replaces it by restoring the order. After the decline of the British Colonial Empire, the US emerged as a new hegemon and created the Bretton Wood system, which was viewed as the mechanism of American hegemony. However, the US hegemony declined as the American President suspended the link between the US dollar and gold on 15th August 1971, a critical feature of the Bretton Woods financial system. However, the decline of US hegemony and the emergence of Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) broke down the Bretton Woods era.

As a sub-discipline of International Relations, theories of hegemony are the central to IPE. According to some International Relations experts, IPE is actually a hegemony theory as it is a state-centered concept that includes security as a critical element. However, it also relies on international trade and international finance to explain critically the rise and fall of great powers.

Globalization:

Globalization is a multi-dimensional concept. The term globalization refers to the integration of economies of the world through uninhibited trade and financial flows, as also through mutual exchange of technology and knowledge. Ideally, it also contains free inter-country movement of labour. Globalization is another crucial element to study

within the scope of IPE. According to many scholars, the *problématique* of globalization starts with the global expansion of production and finance. It also raises questions about the causes and consequences of increasingly global market structures. The questions include politics, business, culture, technology, the environment, global migration, gender relations, and tourism, knowledge, education etc.

The globalization also raises the questions about the sovereignty of the state. According to many scholars, the nation –states are not able to address many global issues, which impacts local ones alone. The state basically exists in the “missing middle” of the complex global/local geometry of human society. Globalization also creates opportunities for new areas of economic and social relations by destroying the old ones.

1.5. The major approaches to study IPE:

IPE is a contested subject as there is no definitive approach and theory. However, there are few agreements among the scholars of IPE regarding theoretical approaches that are used to characterize the politics of the international economy. We could find three broad theoretical approaches or schools to study IPE – Mercantilism, liberal economy and Marxism.

1.5.1 Mercantilism:

Among the three approaches Mercantilism is the oldest. It is a traditional and still relevant approach to study IPE. Its origin could be traced to as early as the 16th century Europe. According to many scholars, Friedrich List (1789-1846) could be regarded as the intellectual father of mercantilist school. Friedrich List wrote his views about mercantilism as a response to writings on classical economics by Adam Smith. The traditional mercantilists assume that a country’s economic wealth came from its stocks of precious metals. They further believed that the best way to increase these stocks was to limit imports through tariffs and

other protectionist policies, while maximizing exports, thus creating a trade surplus.

The main assumptions of Mercantilism are:

a) The government must involve itself in the international trade

One of the main assumptions of Mercantilist school is that governments must engage themselves in the international trade in order to protect the interests of the citizens and the states. Like Realism, they believe that world is dark and anarchic, and states are selfish and inward looking entity struggling for power only. So, one state cannot trust another state to follow their part of comparative advantage bargain. Therefore, states always have the choice to switch their trade to another country. It considers state's economic resources as primary source of power and therefore, should not be made vulnerable or dependent on international market place. The main responsibility of the government is to secure as many resources as it can protect them. According to Mercantilist school, imports must be limited compared to exports to earn more profit.

b) International Trade is competitive rather than cooperative:

Similar to realist thinkers, Mercantilist assumes about the pessimistic human nature and types of government. So, they reject the notion of comparative advantage. They believe the international political system is highly competitive, so the fruits of the collective good will never consumed. Therefore, the government must focus on domestic production. Free trade will create an unequal world as the weak states will be weakened further by not being able to compete with the strong states. Similarly strong countries could be weakened by cheap products from poorer countries with lower salary. So many governments are unwilling to take these risks.

C) Self Sufficiency

Based on the same assumptions on human nature and government, Mercantilist school advocates that governments must stock goods and reduce reliance on other states. They believe in complete self-reliance. It is not possible for every country to be self-reliant. So the responsibility lies with the states driven by ultra –nationalist ideologies. Sometime countries exploit resources of other countries and become self reliant. Currently, Mercantilism is associated with accumulation of resources allied with implementation of measures to protect domestic production.

d) Protectionism:

The most important feature of mercantilism is the protectionism. Many countries pursue protectionism through variety of economic policies to protect their domestic industries from foreign competition. Various forms of protectionism used by the governments are tariffs, export subsidies, currency devaluations, quotas, government subsidizing of industry and red tape.

Neo- Mercantilism:

Mercantilism was discontinued during the free trade era; however, it was revived in the latter part of the 20th century. A new variation of mercantilism emerged which put emphasis on holding foreign exchange reserves rather than precious metal. It also put more emphasis on developing a country's domestic manufacturing capacity. It also advocated a more sophisticated and interventionist role of the national economy. States were encouraged to use strategies to help targeted industries by variety of policies like revised tax policy, subsidization, banking, regulation, interest-rate management, labour control etc. State could also exercise a disciplinary action to protect domestic economy by ensuring adequate amount of competition. Japan was the example where all these policies were followed and achieved tremendous economic prosperity.

Liberal Economy:

The most popular and strongest approach to study IPE is the liberal economic approach. However, there is no single liberal economic theory as there are number of variations of it. Market is a central theme in a liberal economy approach. A market could be defined as a common place where economic transaction happens between buyers and sellers. Liberal approach endorses free market where economic transactions happen without any restrictions or state's interference. So, one of the principle assumptions of the liberal economic view is that the exchanges between individuals or between the countries in a free market bring mutual benefit. The free market works in a self-regulating fashion and resolves problems by itself.

Economic Liberalism came into existence in Western Europe and North America during era of industrialization and the enlightenment. Immediately, it got popular as a political and philosophical liberal movement. The liberal economic approach is based on the common liberal assumptions that people are good and naturally inclined to cooperate with each other. So, the government must encourage the free enterprise and maintain law and order in the society. Following are the main elements of liberal economy:

a) Free Trade:

The core element of economic liberalism is the free trade. In order to support free trade, the government must minimize their involvement in the activities of the free trade so that businesses are done without any restrictions and not interrupted by protectionist measures. Free trade is associated with the capitalist economies.

b) Invisible Hand:

First coined by Adam Smith, the term "invisible hand" refers to as "market forces, which means how the business and trade operates in the government non interference. Unlike the assumptions made by the Mercantilists, the advocates of invisible hand accepts that society would

function better without government interference because too much state interference has a negative impact on human's cooperation, business and making money. So government must only protect its citizens and maintain law and order. Too much of protectionism is harmful as own citizens are left to pay more on goods which are available on much cheaper price at open world market. So free trade with invisible hand is desirable.

c) The Comparative Advantage:

The theory of comparative advantage is another popular theory advocated by the liberal economists. It simply means a country or economy's ability to produce a particular good or service at a lower opportunity cost than its trading partners. So the theory provides an opportunity to the producer to sell goods and services at much lower price compared to its rivals and earn profit. The theory supplements the invisible hand by supporting the assumptions of the liberals that free trade produces more trade and wealth for all nations. It believes that due to availability of natural resources and climate, some countries enjoys advantage over others in the production and growth of certain crops. This advantage could be used for benefit for all if allowed to flourish without government's non interference. State can concentrate more on what they specialize in producing rather than on producing everything if there is a free trade. Under system, the states could import whatever they desire from anywhere in the world. Specilization works for all the countries within the system of comparative advantage. The main advocates of the comparative advantage are Adam Smith and David Ricardo.

f) Peace comes with Free Trade:

According to the economic liberals, there are political advantages along with economic advantages while adopting free trade. Democracy is the form of government in the liberal economic states, so the supports agree that democracy brings by providing economic incentives. It was proved historically as the Second World War brought the Western European democracies together to fight against fascist.

Stop to Consider:

- The collapse of the Communist rule in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe confirmed the victory and relevance of liberal economic principles, meaning laissez-faire, comparative advantage, free trade, and competition.
- Even Communist country like China also adopted market reform, beginning in 1979, followed by liberalization and fast economic growth.
- Although Mercantilism reemerged based on the success of Japan's economy, liberals point out that the success was more mirage than reality.
- Liberal scholars argue that the free market has not only proven, again and again, to be the only rational basis for countries, both individually and collectively, to flourish, but it has also proven to be tremendously flexible and adaptable.

Marxist:

Marxist is the youngest and third most important approach to study IPE. It is based on the writings of Karl Marx and Engels. Karl Marx published his most famous work – *Das Capital* – 1867, which was a critique of classical liberal economy. According to the Marxist approach, IPE is synonymous with IR. This approach assumes that international economic structures are the main determinants of the political behavior and events of the countries. They reject the liberal's idea that free trade is a beneficial to all. Later, dependency theory came out from the Marxist school which pointed out that the government of the poor countries follows protectionist measures to save themselves from the exploitation.

Many scholars questioned the reliability of the Marxist approach as the Soviet Union collapsed and surviving Communist states China and Vietnam adopted liberalism and market capitalism in their

international policies. But in reality structuralist narrative of the global economy as a whole become very popular in academic field, which was based on Marxist assumptions about industrialized countries. After the start of globalization, Neo – Marxist school appeared who advocated that the competition in the global economy as not being between states rather than between global “haves” and “have-nots.” According to the Neo- Marxist, IPE is based on a system where the global bourgeoisie exploits the global proletariat class. Even some of the bourgeoisie are from the poor countries that turn the economies profiting only to them by exploiting their country’s resources to the richer countries.

Despite the arguments about its decline, we must note that Marxist school is still relevant as it has raised concern on number of important issues like global and national income inequality, exploitation of labour, child labour etc. Child labours are still an issue of great concern in African countries as many of them are forced to work without payment. Marxist school also point out the damage caused to world environment by the big Multinational Corporations. The advancement of capitalist system all over the world has dangerous impact on the planet and the environment. In addition, capitalist system is not stable as the global financial crises are the example of it. These crises showcase the inherent instability and volatility of the capitalist system as it is based fundamentally on profit making. Only few actors are benefitted from such an unequal system. However, according to Marxist scholars such systems face crisis due to excessive production, investment and competition.

Check your Progress

- What is invisible hand?
- What is the role of hegemon in international trade?
- Compare Liberal and Mercantilist theories of international

political economy and find out which approach is most relevant in the contemporary world.

- Is the Marxist approach to study International Political Economy still relevant?

1.6 Summing Up:

This unit is helpful for you to understand the correlation between economic and political decision making of a state. You may be in a position to understand how and in what ways interaction takes place between economics and politics. **So**, International Political Economy is the study of the complex interrelationship of economic and political activity at the level of international affairs. You have also learnt about the various concepts of the IPE like international trade, International finance, hegemony and globalization. Each of these concepts contributed towards the development of IPE as a separate subject. The process of globalization has brought the states of the world closer together than ever before into a single economic system. Those states, however, are still tends to act unilaterally in economic policy and where international cooperation has thrived it has tended to be at the regional rather than global level. This unit also helps you to understand the liberal's interpretation of free trade and its relevance.

This unit also discusses in details about various theoretical approaches to study IPE. There are mainly three approaches to study IPE – Mercantilism, Liberal Economy and Marxism. Mercantilism, which is equivalent with protectionist policy, continues in the Liberal International Economic Order and remains a popular alternative for governments at times when the global economy does not appear to be delivering collective goods. However, the most popular and relevant approach is the liberal economic approach. Liberal approach continued through the Bretton Woods system and practice of US hegemony. Liberals support greater political intervention rather than pure market solutions and

through the mechanism of global governance. According to the critiques, Liberal approach is not viable as the financial crisis of 2008 had challenged assumptions and encouraged to look for an alternative approach to study the nature of IPE. Marxist approach basically pointed out the global structures and the divisions of the world into rich and poor countries. They also pointed out the global distinction between South and North as poverty still continues in the Global South. So the Marxist school calls for systematic change rather than mere reform. For many, Marxist school has no relevance now as majority of the Communist countries have adopted market model of development. But this approach is still relevant as Marxist scholars pointed out the global imbalance and number of important issues. After reading this unit, you may assume that the future of IPE is far from certain with very different predictions and prescriptions about how the role of the state will be impacted by globalization and the exceptional complexities and dilemmas that it continues to produce for governments.

1.7 References/Suggested Readings

Brin and Williams, *Global Political Economy*, Red Glove Press, UK, 2018

Bromley S., Brown W., Athreya, S, *Ordering the International: History, Change and Transformation*, Pluto Press, London, 2014

Dunne T., M. Kurki, Smith S, *International Relations: Discipline and Diversity*, Create Space Independent Publishing Platform, 2017

Frieden, Jeffrey A & Lake, David A, *International Political Economy – Perspective on Global Power and Wealth*, Routledge, London and New York, 2003

Lim, Timothy C, *International Political Economy: An Introduction to Approaches, Regimes, and Issues*, Saylor.org, Saylor URL: <http://www.saylor.org/courses/books>, 2014

Ravenhill J., *Global Political Economy*, (Latest Edition), OUP, UK, 2011

Unit 3

Capitalism and Neo- liberalism

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Objectives

1.3 What is Capitalism?

1.4 Marxist Interpretation of Capitalism

1.5 Features of Capitalism

1.6 Origin of Capitalism

1.7 Forms of Capitalism

1.8 Stages of Capitalism

1.9 Capitalism and Class Conflict.

1.10 Neo-Liberalism

1.10.1 Introduction

1.10.2 Meaning

1.10.3 Characteristics

1.11 Summing Up

1.12 References.

1.1 Introduction:

There is no doubt that the capitalism has brought vast rise in human wealth and living standard. Capitalism is one of the most dominating and relevant form of social formation in the world. In simple terms, capitalism is an economic system in which private actors own and control property or capital in accord with their interests, and demand and supply freely set prices in markets in a way that can serve the best interests of society. The main feature of capitalism is the motive of the people to make profit. In a capitalist economy, important assets like factories, mines, roads, railroads are privately owned and controlled. In addition, labour is purchased in exchange for money wages, capital gains increase to private owners, and prices allocate capital and labour between competing uses. In this unit we will focus on the definition of capitalism, its origin and evaluation and various approaches to study it. This unit will also attempt to highlight the attributes of the capitalism, summarize major analytical framework in the field and identify several current global debates. A careful understanding of this unit will provide the students a better base for understanding and analyzing the concept of capitalism and neo-liberalism, issues and problems that are discussed in this unit. Also, special focus is given on neo-liberalism as a theory alternative to liberalism/capitalism.

1.2: Objectives:

Today, although some form of capitalism is the basis for nearly all economies, for much of the last century it was but one of two major approaches to economic organization. Other major approach was socialism. The term Capitalism denotes free markets, understood as systems of free exchange among persons with well-defined, legally secure, and transferable rights in scarce resources, is a necessary

condition for the wealth of the modern world. After reading this unit you will be able to understand:

- What is capitalism?
- To understand capitalism as an important mode of production.
- discuss the different stages of capitalism
- Understand theoretical approaches to understanding neo-liberalism.

1.3: What is Capitalism?

The 21st century is the century of capitalism, globalization, industrialization, privatization and liberalization all over the world. It is one of the dominant political and social ideologies, which is still relevant. Simply, it is an economic system in which human beings have to undergo for a series of events. Capitalism deals with social, political, educational, cultural and economic changes in a political system.

The term capitalism does not have a specific meaning. The term is defined and interpreted differently by a number of scholars around the world. Simply, it is an economic system in which the means of production and distribution are privately or corporately owned and development is proportionate to the accumulation and reinvestment of profits gained in an open market. Capitalism establishes a social and economic contract that makes it possible for individuals to do their business. It gives people the ability to be secure in themselves and their possessions and, having provided security, it also enables people to assume risk that they were previously unwilling to assume. Capitalism creates necessary conditions for people to escape from poverty and generate wealth for themselves and for others. It also helps to reduce poverty, unemployment, oppression, sufferings and exploitation. Many liberal

scholars agree that Capitalism plays important role in the development of any nation.

The term capitalism does not confined only to economics but also draw attention towards logic, history, religion, philosophy, literature, and many other disciplines. It does refer not just to the markets for the exchange of goods and services, which have existed since immemorial. There is no doubt that capitalism has brought a vast rise in human wealth and living standards. It is the system of innovation, improvement, wealth creation, and social change that has brought to billions of people prosperity. Capitalism is a socio political-economic system based on the principle of individual rights. It is the system based on freedom which is an all encompassing theme. Nowadays capitalism has invaded all the human fields such as agriculture, construction, oil, gas, road, health, education, industry, trade. The word has very close relation with life and development. The fact is that capitalism plays a vital role in a market economy than any other mode of production.

Joseph A. Schumpeter defined capitalism as “that form of private property economy in which innovations are carried out by means of borrowed money, which in general...implies credit creation”.

1.4 Marxist Interpretation of Capitalism:

The root word *capital* goes back to the 1100s, where the Latin term *capitale* was used for stocks of cattle, and later, for goods or money; *capitalist*, meaning simply an owner of capital, appears in the 1600s. However, by 1867, despite the enrichment that the Industrial Revolution had brought, the German political thinker Karl Marx (1818–83) was the main critique of the ‘capitalist mode of production’ – what today we call *capitalism* – in his book *Das Kapital*. Marxist interpretation of capital mode of production is one of the pioneering works in history.

Many people still regard capitalism as rooted in antisocial or immoral motives, such as selfishness, greed and a lack of concern for others. Often, capitalism is even defined in terms of such motives – with the presumption that no social good can ever come from them. The word capital stands for a concept – the abstract idea of the totality of particular capital goods. Just as we use the word animal to describe an idea that actually exists only in particular hawks, so the abstract idea of capital has reality only in particular capital goods, such as tools, machines and finance. But the idea is not confined to the massive factories, mills and production lines of big businesses. Capital goods are available around us – in every household (washing machines, vacuum cleaners), office (computers, phones), shop (cash registers, display cases), theatre, school and hospital in the developed world.

Capitalism works best if capital goods are privately owned and controlled, whether by individuals or close-knit groups. Though private ownership may not be exclusive to capitalism, therefore, it is normally associated very strongly with the concept. Capitalism is also commonly associated with the distribution of goods through markets. But markets are not the same as capitalism. Capitalism is about the production of economic goods; markets are about their distribution. Capitalism is also associated with market exchange. Other ways of distributing economic goods are possible, but market exchange provides an efficient way of distributing the bounty that capitalism's producers can create.

According to Marx, the capitalist mode of production comes into being when capital moves into the sphere of production, when it gets hold of the means of production and starts controlling and directing production itself. This is a long historical process, which started in Medieval Europe. Karl Marx stated that economic activity and the economic structure is the basis on which social life rests. The economic base or infrastructure comprises a certain mode of production and certain forces and relations of production. The mode of production is not the

same everywhere and at all times; it changes during the course of human history.

Stop to Consider:

Marx and Engels outline certain stages of world history each characterised by a distinctive economic formation. It is this economic formation that shapes other social sub-systems, which are termed as superstructure like the political structure, religion, values and culture. In German Ideology, Marx and Engels broadly outline four stages of history.

- (i) the primitive communal stage
- (ii) the ancient stage based on slavery,
- (iii) the feudal stage,
- (iv) the capitalist stage.

The study of human history in terms of stages each with its own distinct mode of production forms the basis of the Marxian theory of historical materialism.

According to Marx, the basic features of capitalism are:

- a) The separation of the producer from his means of production;
- b) The concentration of the means of production in the hands of one class - the bourgeoisie;
- c) The formation of another class, which has no means of subsistence other than the sale of its labour power - the proletariat.

The result of this process of separation is the formation of two contradictory classes, which form the two poles of capitalist society.

On the one side we find the bourgeoisie as the class of owners in whose hand the means of production are concentrated. On the other side we find the proletariat as the class who has to find its subsistence by the sale of its labour power. Bourgeoisie and proletariat are the basic classes of capitalist society but not necessarily the only ones. Other classes such as intermediate sections, in various forms may exist as well. But capitalism is possible only if there is a class of owners on the one hand, and a class of non-owners on the other hand.

Secondly, it is the relationship to the means of production, which characterises these classes: ownership/control and non-ownership. It is not simply a question of rich and poor. Not all poor people are workers or vice versa. They may be petty artisans, or hawkers, or peasants who still own some piece of land. An industrial worker may earn more, and yet he is a member of the working class whereas the poor peasant-owner is not. So, the working class is not homogeneous. It consists of various sections, skilled and unskilled, on daily wages or on monthly pay, under the poverty line and well above it. They constitute a common group as they are all forced to sell their labour power, be it under different conditions.

A first characteristic of capitalist economy is that it is a form of commodity production i.e. production for sale, production for the market. That is why Marx starts his analysis of the capitalist mode of production with the analysis of “commodities”. But not all commodity production is already capitalist production. Commodity production emerged thousands of years back in human history whereas capitalism is only a few hundred years old. Production of commodities, of goods for exchange, developed slowly. For a long time, it plays only a subordinate role. Only in capitalist society commodity production becomes the completely dominant form of production, it becomes generalised.

Capitalism is founded on the following pillars:

- **Private property**, which allows people to own tangible assets such as land and houses and intangible assets such as stocks and bonds;
- **Self-interest**, through which people act in pursuit of their own good, without regard for sociopolitical pressure.
- **Production for sale rather than for self-use** - this actually means a shift from a subsistence economy. In most precapitalist economies, production is undertaken for direct consumption. For example, in agricultural economies, farmers grow crops for their own use, only a small surplus is available for sale. This is because technology is not so advanced and domestic or family labour is used for farming. This is not the case in a capitalist economy. Here, a large number of workers gather together in a factory. With the help of machines and through division of labour, goods are produced on a large scale. Commodities are produced for sale in the market. For instance in a factory producing candies, the final product is not for the self-use of the producers. It is for sale in the market.
- **The existence of a market where labour-power is bought and sold:** According to Marx, workers are regarded only in terms of their labourpower. The capitalist or owner hires their labour-power by paying them wages. Workers can sell their labour power or withhold it because they are legally free. Unlike in the earlier stages of human history, workers are not forced to work like slaves or serfs. Sheer economic need forces them to work. They must either work or starve. So, although they are legally free to enter or not enter into contracts with the capitalist, they are not free from hunger and basic needs, which forces them to sell their labour.
- **Exchange takes place through money:** money is an integral part of capitalism. Production is undertaken for sale, and sale is transacted through the use of money. Money is the social bond that ties together the various elements in the capitalist system.

Hence the role of banks and financial institutions becomes important in the system.

- **The capitalist controls the production process:** capitalist class controls the production process as they decide how production is to be carried out. They decide what is to be produced, the composition of raw materials and machines, and the manner in which the output is to be marketed.
- **The capitalist controls financial decisions:** Decisions regarding pricing of the product, wages of the workers, and the amount of financial investment and so on are taken by the capitalist.
- **Competition:** Since the whole idea of capitalism is production for sale, there is bound to be competition between capitalists. It also permits firms' freedom to enter and exit markets, maximizes social welfare, that is, the joint welfare of both producers and consumers; decentralized manner through interactions between buyers and sellers—prices, in return, allocate resources, which naturally seek the highest reward, not only for goods and services but for wages as well; Competition could also result in the formation of 'monopolies' or 'cartels', where a single producer or group of producers try to dominate the market by pushing or forcing out competitors.
- Freedom to choose with respect to consumption, production, and investment—dissatisfied customers can buy different products, investors can pursue more lucrative ventures, workers can leave their jobs for better pay;
- Limited role of government, to protect the rights of private citizens and maintain an orderly environment that facilitates proper functioning of markets. The extent to which these pillars operate distinguishes various forms of capitalism.

In free markets, also called laissez- faire economies, markets operate with little or no regulation.

In mixed economies, so called because of the blend of markets and government, markets play a dominant role, but are regulated to a greater extent by government to correct market failures, such as pollution and traffic congestion; promote social welfare; and for other reasons, such as defense and public safety. Mixed capitalist economies predominate today.

1.5 Features of Capitalism

Following features are identified under capitalism. All these factors jointly contributed to the development of the capitalist mode of production:

- a) Extended Commodity Production system.
- b) Production is for exchange. Maximisation of Profit is the objective of production.
- C) Large-Scale Industrial Production
- d) Increasing specialization and division of labour
- e) Substantial increase in production
- f) Substantial increase in concentration of wealth.
- g) Expansion of market and exchange.
- h) Growth and expansion of trade internally as well as internationally.
- i) Advancement of technique of production.
- j) Separation of ownership of means of production from producers
- k) Labour power is freely available for purchase and sale as commodities.
- l) Wage-earners have no alternative but to sell their labour power regularly to earn their livelihood.
- m) Increase in production.
- n) Increasing competition among the capitalists.
- o) Private ownership of means of production by a handful of capitalists who control production.
- p) Increasing capital accumulation and wealth by capitalists.

q) Surplus value, created by workers is converted to capital. Workers are exploited in the sense that wage is much lower than the productivity of the labour.

r) A system of wage payment, which gives the worker only a means of subsistence and extra products of the workers are appropriated by the capitalists.

s) There always exists a class antagonism between labourers and capitalists.

1.6 Origin of Capitalism:

According to Karl Marx, capitalism is among the five types of social formations. The other four are – primitive communism, slavery, feudalism and socialism. Marx explains these social formations through the dialectical method of inquiry which will form the thesis involving productive forces and production relations, culminating in antithesis and contradictions. In course of time, these contradictions become very intense and they give birth to new social formation which can be regarded as the new synthesis.

Out of the five types of social formations, capitalism emerged in the heart of the feudal system. Basically, the decline of the feudal mode of production gave rise to the appearance of the capital mood of production.

Stop to Consider:

Capitalism is an economic system based on following elements:

- Wage Labour
- Private Ownership
- Production for Exchange and Profit
- According Karl Marx, in a capitalist mode of production,

there are two classes: the working class and the capitalist class. The capitalist class is the class which owns the means of production as private property. The workers are hired by the capitalist class for production in exchange for subsistence wages.

- Capitalism implies a particular social relation. The labour class is free to sell its labour power which itself a marketable commodity.
- The working class is separated from the means of production. This class has no other means to earn their livelihood, but to sell labour

1.7. Forms of Capitalism:

Capitalism took various forms throughout the history.

a) **Merchant Capitalism** (15th -18th Century): The Merchant capitalism was the initial form of capitalism which developed during the period of 15th -18th centuries in several countries of Asia, Africa and Europe. Under this system, trade was the only source for the generation of surplus and capital. Money became an important power, with the expansion of trade. However, the basis of trade was exploitation. Through the expansion of trade and commerce, a new mode of production gradually developed.

Industrial production increased considerably with new inventions and discoveries during the period of industrial revolution (1780 – 1840). However, along with this development, merchant capital continued side by side. Trade led to the sufficient accumulation of capital. In England and many other countries of Europe, the peasants and serfs were available as wage labour, since the time of feudalism. With the new system, peasants were forcibly driven out of their farms. In this way, primitive accumulation took place by exploitation of the peasants

and workers who were deprived of the means of production. It resulted in the formations of proletariat. The merchant capitalist developed a type of production system which was capitalist in nature. The system is known as putting-out-system, in which the merchant capitalist supplied raw materials to the actual producers and craftsmen in villages for production at their homes for the capitalist. The capitalist was the owner of the finished products. In this system, the workers owned the means of production.

b) Industrial Capitalism: It is the next stage of merchant capitalism. During this stage, the workers were deprived of means of production and an entirely new system of production developed where industrial capital gained supremacy over merchant capital. As the industrial capitalism developed, many workers started cooperating in production and the labour process becomes social. It was true of manufacturing production which is an essential concomitant of industrial capitalism. The industrial capitalists in Britain supported parliament which represented their interests. In course of time, there was a transition from manufacturing to factory system. With the growth of capitalism, market expanded and production grew considerably. It also led to technical revolution and mechanical invention, which led to the industrial revolution in Europe. During industrial revolution, new products were produced with new method of production. All this brought a revolution in the mode of production which became more and more capital-intensive and highly productive. However, it increased the gulf between the capitalist class and the working class. The social and economic inequalities between these two classes increased considerably. Production became more and more social but the appropriation of its gain became more and more private. This is the basic contradiction under capitalism.

Monopoly Capitalism: In course of time, concentration and centralization of capital in a few hands and increasing competition

among the capitalists led to the growth of monopoly. This was apparent in all branches of production and in banking finance and capital markets. The growth of monopoly capitalism which was evident in the late 19th century, produced imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism as stated by Lenin. However, in the mid –twentieth century, a new form of imperialism made its appearance particularly in third world countries. This new form of capitalism can be called *Neocolonialism*.

SAQ

Explain the main features of Capitalist Mode of Production as stated by Karl Marx (150 Words)

1.8 Stages of Capitalism:

The development of capitalism falls into a number of stages characterised by diverse levels of maturity. Each of them is recognizable by fairly distinctive traits only when we seek to trace the stages and to select one of them as marking the opening stage of capitalism. If we are discussing Capitalism as a specific mode of production, then it follows that we cannot date the dawn of this system from the first signs of the appearance of large-scale trading and of a merchant class, and we cannot speak of a special period of merchant capitalism. We must look for the opening of the capitalist period only when changes in the mode of production occurs, in the sense of a subordination of the producer to a capitalist.

Before publishing his brilliant work “*Das Capital*,” Marx spent many years of his life on the analysis of capitalism, because he was convinced that a thorough theoretical understanding was needed in order to facilitate the practical critique of capitalism, its overthrow by

the proletariat. His work is mainly the critique of political economy, which stands for the economic theory developed by the classical bourgeois economists like Adam Smith and David Ricardo. Marx studied their theories extensively. Starting their theories and subjecting their categories such as value, commodity, money, capital, etc, to a sharp critical analysis, Marx proceeds to expose the true nature of capitalism. In the process he breaks down the powerful scientific legitimization of capitalist economy and not only provides a new scientific model for the analysis of capital, but lays the foundations for a fundamental critique of the totality of capitalism.

b) Political Economy of Capitalism: There are mainly two ways to study capitalism and to get to know its specific character and both ways we need in order to get a full understanding. The first way is to study its history, how it was born, how it developed, under which circumstances, and with what results. This demands a study not only of the economic process but of the development of the whole bourgeois society. The second way of study capitalism is the systematic analysis of the economic structure of capitalist society. In that Capital is constructed according to this dialectical logic.

C) Various forms of capitalism: Number of economists classifies capitalism into different groups using various criteria. Capitalism, for example, can be simply divided into two types, based on how production is organized. In liberal market economies, the competitive market is prevalent and the big volume of the production process takes place in a decentralized manner akin to the free-market capitalism seen in the United States and the United Kingdom. Coordinated market economies, on the other hand, exchange private information through non-market institutions such as unions and business associations—as in Germany and Japan. Recently, economists have identified four types of capitalism distinguished according to the role of entrepreneurship in driving innovation and the institutional setting in which new ideas are put into place to spur economic growth. In state-

guided capitalism, the government decides which sectors will grow. Initially motivated by a desire to foster growth, this type of capitalism has several drawbacks: excessive investment, picking the wrong winners, susceptibility to corruption, and difficulty withdrawing support when it is no longer appropriate. Oligarchic capitalism is oriented toward protecting and enriching a very narrow fraction of the population. Economic growth is not a central objective, and countries with this variety have a great deal of inequality and corruption. Big-firm capitalism takes advantage of economies of scale. This type is important for mass production of commodities. Entrepreneurial capitalism produces breakthroughs like the automobile, telephone, and computer. These innovations are usually the product of individuals and new firms. However, it takes big firms to mass-produce and market new products, so a mix of big-firm and entrepreneurial capitalism seems to be the best combination.

1.9. Capitalism and Class Conflict

According to Marx, the history of human society is the history of class struggle. Each stage in human history is marked by a division of society into two groups, the ‘haves’ and the ‘have-nots’, those who dominate and those who are oppressed. The very foundations on which capitalism survives, namely, the existence of private property, mass production of commodities under the factory system for profit and the existence of a working class that is forced to sell its labour-power in the market, leads to polarisation of classes.

As capitalism progresses, these class divisions become wider. The interests of the bourgeoisie and proletariat become more and more contradictory. The proletariat becomes united. After all, they share the same problems and begin to seek the same solutions. A ‘class in itself’ becomes a ‘class for itself’. The revolution of the proletariat will, according to Marx, bring in a new stage of history, ‘communism’, where the owners of the means of production will be the workers

themselves. The contradictions of capitalism will be overcome and a new social order will be born.

Revolution is inevitable. Capitalism thus is a system, which according to Marx symbolises the most acute form of exploitation, inequality and polarisation of classes. By this is meant that the social distance between the owners of the means of production i.e., the bourgeoisie and the working class i.e. the proletariat becomes greater and greater. The concept of class conflict is very important in Marx's understanding of capitalism.

Therefore, Karl Marx views capitalism as one of the stages in human history, which emerges out of the contradictions of the previous stage. Capitalism too, is beset with inner contradictions. It is a stage in which class conflict is at its greatest intensity. After all, the means of production are concentrated in a few hands. The labour force is considered only in terms of its labour power, which can be bought and sold for a price namely, wages. The inequalities of the system lead to polarisation of classes. The proletariat comes to realise that they have common interests and common problems and will seek solutions to these problems. The proletariat will not just remain a "class in itself" but become a "class for itself". Their liberation will be through revolution. The revolution of the proletariat will usher in a new stage, communism, where the means of production will be in the hands of the workers themselves.

Check your progress

1. How capitalism is different from other mode of productions?
2. What are the main pillars of capitalism?
3. Why class conflict is inevitable in Capitalism?

1.10. Neo-Liberalism:

1.10.1 Introduction:

The Concept of neo-liberalism is usually considered as a modern alternate of classical economic liberalism. In simple words, it is the revival of liberalism. Neo liberalism is centered in the self- regulating capacity of the market, and correlatively the need to limit the scope of action of the state. These twin principles highlight two features of this ideological tradition: the puzzles of the state and market on the one hand, and of politics and economics as their respective spheres of operation on the other.

During the past twenty years, the concept of neo-liberalism has become widely popular in academic as well political discussions. According to many international scholars, neo-liberalism is an ideology shaping our world today and that people live in an age of neo-liberalism. Neo-liberalism is a revitalization of liberalism. This argument proposes that liberalism, as a political ideology has been absent from political debates and policy-making for a period of time, only to reappear in more recent time is a revived form. It advocates that liberalism has undergone a process of initial growth, intermediary decline, and finally a recent transformation. Alternatively, neo-liberalism could be visualized as a distinct philosophy and in this interpretation, neo-liberalism would share some historical and some of the basic vocabulary with liberalism in general. According to this interpretation, neo-liberalism shares same attributes with American neo-conservatism.

Few definitions of Neo- Liberalism are:

David Graeber, “Neo-liberalism isn’t an economic program – it’s a political program designed to produce hopelessness and kill any future alternatives.”

Henry Giroux, “The ideology of neo-liberalism, with its privitaization, its deregulation, its emphasis on consumption, its elimination of

basically apparatus that can provide alternative points of view, has been so powerful and so normalized.”

1.10.2 Meaning:

Neo-liberalism is a political project that is justified on philosophical grounds and seeks to extend competitive market forces, consolidate a market-friendly constitution, and promote individual freedom. The specific content and overall weight of these three components vary as do the motives of those who promote them.

The term “Neo- Liberalism” was introduced in a positive sense, as Neoliberalismus, by Alexander Rüstow and other members of the Freiburg Circle in the 1930s. It was actually introduced as intellectual-cum-political project in 1938 by German scholar Alexander Rusttow at the Colloque Walter Lippmann ; the conference defined the concept of neo-liberalism as involving “the priority of price mechanism, free enterprise, the system of competition, and strong and impartial state. So neo-liberalism was associated with supporting a modern economy policy with state intervention. Neo-liberal state interventionism brought a clash with the opposite laissez-faire camp of liberals.

It also signified a renewal or reform of classical or laissez-faire liberalism and called in particular for a strong state that would regulate as well as protect and expand free markets. In short, it called for a ‘free market, strong state’. This version inspired the Ordoliberal ‘social market economy’ in post-war Germany and has been influential elsewhere in Continental Europe.

Another variant of “Neo-Liberalism” is promoted by the Chicago School, which argues for the self-regulating capacities of free markets and opposes government activities that do not directly support market

widening and deepening. These notions were pursued by ‘los Chicago Boys’ in 1973 after General Pinochet’s US-backed military coup d’état in Chile. This circumstance and the alleged failures and side-effects of neoliberal recipes are another reason why the term is rare as a self-description even when market fundamentalist neoliberal policies were rolled out in other countries.

Neo-liberalism enjoyed growing acceptance as an economic and political strategy in the 1970s; witnessed panic-stricken meetings in New York and Washington a generation later at the height of the global financial crisis; and, most recently, seems to be undergoing a return to business as usual. There have been many efforts over these long decades to promote or protect ‘neoliberal’ institutions and practices as the best basis for economic, legal, political, social, and moral order in complex social formations. There is an even wider range of commentaries and criticisms concerned with neoliberalism, its core features, social bases of support, and its impact on various sites and scales from the local to the global. This contribution addresses some of these issues. It has five main aims: to offer a baseline definition of neoliberalism; to discuss different social scientific approaches to neoliberalism; to distinguish four main types of neoliberalism from a critical political economy viewpoint and relate them to the world market, geopolitics, and global governance; to review the contradictory aspects of neoliberalism in actually existing capitalism; and to assess its prospects after the first global financial crisis and first great recession of the 21st century.

Neo-liberalism offered a dogma based on the unavoidable truths of modern economies. The basics of modern economics, and of the philosophy of neo-liberalism explained by Adam Smith in his great work, *the Wealth of Nations*. Adam Smith set the foundation of neo-liberalism with his argument that free exchange was a transaction from which both parties necessarily benefitted, since nobody would willingly engage in exchange from which they would emerge worse

off. Any restriction on the freedom of trade will reduce well being by repudiating individuals the opportunity to improve their situation. Adam Smith, further argued that expansion of market permitted increasing specialization and so the development of the division of labour. Exchange was the means by which the advantages gained through the increased division of labour shared between two parties to the exchange. According to Adam Smith, any obstacles to the freedom of exchange limit the development of the division of labour and so the growth of the wealth of the nation and the affluence of each and every one of its inhabitants.

In the area of foreign policy and international relations, a neo liberal approach aims to promote free trade and open markets and Western democratic values and institutions. Inspired by such an ideology most of the Western Liberal democracies have followed the United States in its call for enlargement of the community of democratic and capitalist states. Neo-liberalism draws its ideological strength from the belief that all financial and political institutions created in the aftermath of the Second World War have stood the test of time, which provides the foundation for contemporary political and economic arrangements.

Stop to Consider:

- Neo-liberalism is a revival of liberalism.
- As a political ideology, liberalism has been absent from political discussions and policy-making for a period of time, only to emerge in more recent times in a reincarnated form.
- Alternatively, neo-liberalism might be perceived of a distinct ideology, descending from, but not identical to liberalism proper.
- Neo-liberalism is understood as an ideology that is shaped in a few centres, which thrn diffuses outwards.

- Neo-liberal thinkers desired to limit government, but the consequence of their policies has been a huge development in the power of the state.

1.10.3 Characteristics of Neo- Liberalism:

- a) Neo-Liberalism is understood as an ideology that encompasses various forms of free-market fundamentalism,
- b) Neo-liberalism is diffused and translated across contexts very quickly.
- c) Neo-liberalism is operative at various spatial scales.
- d) Neo-liberalism displaces established models of welfare provision and state regulation through policies of privatization and de-regulation.

e) It brings off various changes in subjectivity by normalizing individualistic self interest, entrepreneurial values and consumerism.

With the change of time, neo –liberalism has introduced a new mode of regulation or form of governmentality. The main features of this renewed neo-liberalism can be understood at one level as a revival of many central features of classical liberalism. The main features of this neo-liberalism are based on following features:

- a) **The self-interested individual:** It sees individuals as economically self-interested entity and best judge of his/her interests and needs.
- b) **Free market economies:** the best way to allocate resources and opportunities is through the market. Markets must be free from the regulations.
- c) **A commitment to laissez- faire:** Neo-liberalism stands for a limited government as the free market is a self-regulating order it regulates itself better than the government or any other external force.

d) **A commitment to free trade:** it aims at the abolition of tariffs or subsidies, or any form of state imposed protection or support. It is against any form of protectionism.

Neo-liberalism is broadly divided into four main areas of thinking: Institutional Liberalism, Sociological Liberalism, Republican Liberalism and Interdependence Liberalism.

1.11 Summing up:

This unit is helpful for you to understand one of the most relevant theory i.e. capitalism. You may be in a position to understand the definition, significance and various features of capitalism. You have also learnt about the various stages of capitalism like industrial capitalism, merchant capitalism, and monopoly capitalism. Each of these concepts contributed towards the development of capitalism as dominant mode of production. In addition, you learnt about Marxist interpretation of capitalism and his theory of class struggle. Marx views capitalism as one of the stages in human history, which emerges out of the contradictions of the previous stage.

This unit also discusses in details about another dominant theory in international relations i.e. neo-liberalism. Neo-liberal thinkers are not revolutionaries, who want to limit state to the provision of law and order and national defence. A neo-liberal state can include a welfare state, but most limited kind. The role of the state should be limited to safeguarding the free market and providing a minimum level of security against poverty.

1.12. References:

Baylis J. and S. Smith, *International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues*, Sage, New Delhi, 2012

Basu, Rumki, *International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues*, Sage, New Delhi, 2012

Brin and Williams, *Global Political Economy*, Red Glove Press, UK, 2018

Butler, Eamonn, *An Introduction to Capitalism*, Institute of Economic Affairs, London, 2018

Ghosh, B.N. *Political Economy – A Marxist Approach*, Macmillan India Limited, Delhi, 1990

Gupta & Johari, *International Relations & World History*, Vishal Publishing Co, Delhi, 2020

Paper-viii

Block- 11

Bretton Woods System

Contents:

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Objectives

1.3 Meaning of Bretton Woods System

1.4 Significance of the Bretton Woods System

1.5 Collapse of the Bretton Woods System

1.6 Summing up

1.7 References and suggested Readings

1.1 INTRODUCTION:

After the World War II, there was a feeling of need for economic regain in trade and Commerce specially monetary relations. Bretton Woods had become instrumental in bringing about the economic recovery of Europe, but in structuring a framework for commercial and financial behavior which continues to be essential till now. Bretton Woods was regarded as victors' conference and the United States had set the agenda and dominated the proceedings. Bretton Woods focused on a range of measures to stabilise the international financial system and facilitated the expansion of trade.

In this unit ,we will discuss on the meanings and significance of the Bretton Woods. We will also lay our focus on privilege of Bretton Woods Currency and it's role in world economy. In the present unit, we will make an attempt to highlight on the collapse of the Bretton Woods System.

1.2 OBJECTIVES:

Bretton Woods System had provided a common solution to economic and monetary crisis in world economy. After thorough reading of this unit, you will be able to

discuss the meaning of the Bretton Woods System

focus on the significance of the Bretton Woods System

describe the role and impact of the Bretton Woods System in world economy

analyze the failure of the Bretton Woods

1.3 MEANING OF THE BRETTON WOODS SYSTEM:

Bretton Woods System was an agreement which held in New Hampshire in 1944. It can be termed as Bretton Woods Summit. In 1944, a summit was held in New Hampshire, USA to reach an agreement, is called as Bretton Woods summit. The Bretton Woods system is a set up of unified rules and policies that provided the framework to create fixed international currency exchange rates. Approximately 730 delegates as representatives of 44 allied nations met in Bretton Woods in July 1944 with the principal goals of creating an efficient foreign exchange system, preventing competitive devaluations of currencies and scaling up the international economic growth. They gathered to sketch out the rules and formal institutions that would govern their trade and monetary relations.

The Bretton Woods System had established the rules and regulations for commercial and financial relations among the United States, Britain, Western European countries, Australia, Canada and Japan. The Bretton Woods System became the first example of a full scale negotiation for fiscal order that was intended to govern monetary relations among independent nations. The prime characteristic of the Bretton Woods system was an obligation for each country to adopt a monetary policy that need to be maintained its external exchange rates within 1 percent by tying its own currency to gold.

Though the Bretton Woods conference took place over just three weeks from 1st July to the 22nd of July, 1944, the preparation for it had been going on for several years. The primary designers of the Bretton Woods system were the famous British economist John Maynard Keynes and American chief International Economist of Treasury Department Harry Dexter White. John Maynard Keynes had emphasised to build a powerful global central bank to be called the clearing Union and issue a new international reserve currency which was called the bancor. White's plan envisioned a more modest lending fund and a greater role for the U.S. dollar rather than the creation of a new Currency. White had proposed a new monetary institution called the Stabilization Fund.

By the provision of the Bretton Woods agreement, the U.S. dollar was to be pegged to the value of gold. Moreover, all other currencies in the system were pegged to the U.S. dollar's value. The exchange rate for the price of gold was set at \$ 35 an ounce. The Bretton Woods agreement and system created a collective international currency exchange regime that lasted from the mid 1940s to the early 1970s.

The main purpose of the Bretton Woods system or agreement was to set up a new system of rules, regulations and procedures to ensure economic stability of the major economically advanced nations. Besides this, the Bretton Woods system was to design a post war monetary system which facilitates greater stability of the exchange rates without using the gold standard and to promote international trade and development

Check your progress

1. What do you mean by Bretton Woods system?
2. What is the basic aim of the Bretton Woods agreement?
3. write true or false
 - a) Jhon Maynard Keynes and Harry Dexter White were the prime designers of the Bretton Woods System?
 - b) Under the Bretton Woods System, gold was the basis for the U.S. dollar and other currencies were pegged to the U.S. dollar's value.

1.4 Significance of the Bretton Woods System:

Bretton Woods system and agreement are of great importance to provide a number of significant financial aspects in the financial world. Due to the efforts and initiative in the Bretton Woods Summit, the creation of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB) is possible. Both the institutions were introduced in December 1945 and have withstood the test of time, globally serving as important pillars for international capital financing and trade activities. The purpose of the IMF was to monitor exchange rates and identify nations that needed global monetary support. The World Bank, initially was called the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which was established to manage funds available for providing assistance to countries that had been physically and financially devastated by world War II. The IMF is an international organization which at present consists of 190 member nations. It facilitates world trade expansion and thereby contributes to the promotion and maintenance of high levels of employment and real income. It also ensures exchange rates stability to avoid competitive exchange depreciation. Furthermore, IMF eliminates foreign exchange restrictions and supports in creating systems of payment for multilateral trade. Another formal institution was formed in the name of the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which has now been replaced by the World Trade Organization. GATT was set up to break down discriminatory trade practices. All the world's currencies were set to be valued in terms of US dollars and gold was used to determine the value of the dollar. Under the agreement, US made promise to convert dollars into gold on demand. In the twenty-first century, the IMF still continues to support global monetary and financial

cooperation. Likewise, the World Bank provides necessary help to promote these efforts through its loans and grants to governments.

In 1958, the Bretton Woods system was seen to be fully functional as currencies became convertible. Countries had settled international balances in dollars. The United States had taken the responsibility of keeping the price of gold fixed and to adjust the supply of dollars to maintain confidence in future gold convertibility. The Bretton Woods system was in place till persistent US balance of payments deficits led to foreign held dollars exceeding the US gold stock. That is implying that the United States could not fulfill its obligation to redeem dollars for gold at the official price.

Another notable significant of Bretton Woods system was currency pegging. The Bretton Woods system included 44 countries and these countries were brought together to help regulate and promote international trade across borders. As with the benefits of all currency pegging regimes, currency prgs are expected to provide currency stabilization for trade ,goods and services as well as financing. All of the countries in the Bretton Woods system agreed to a fixed peg against the US dollar with diversions of only 1% allowed. Countries were required to monitor and maintain their currency pegs which they achieved primarily by using their currency to buy or sell US dollars as needed. The Bretton Woods system therefore minimized international currency exchange rate volatility which helped international trade relations.

Moreover, the Bretton Woods system has a significant expansion of international trade and investment as well as remarkable macroeconomic performance. By the creation of the Bretton Woods system, there was to avoid the rigidity of previous international monetary systems and to address the lack of cooperation among the countries on those system. The classic gold standard was abandoned after world War I. In the interwar period, governments took competitive devaluations and set up restrictive trade policies that worsened the great depression. Bretton Woods System envisioned an international monetary system that would ensure exchange rate stability, preventive competitive devaluations and promote economic growth. Although all participants agreed on the goals of the new system, plans to implement them differed. Every 44 nations who have joined the discussion needed to contribute a membership fee to fund the institution. The amount of its contribution was based on a country's economic ability. Member states agreed to fix rates by trying their currencies to the US dollar. Under the Bretton Woods agreement allied nations promised that their Central banks would maintain fixed exchange rates between their currencies and the dollar. Bretton Woods System provided a stable exchange rate and environment that helped in reconstruction of the world economy and the growth of international finance and trade. The Bretton Woods System was the first system where each country had to have a monetary policy that kept the exchange rates of its currency within a fixed value plus or minus one percent in terms of gold.

Stop to consider:

The New International Economic order can be defined as the set of proposals, prescribed rules, norms and procedure. It is advocated by developing countries to end economic colonialism and dependency through a new independent economy. Key themes of the NIEO included both sovereign equality and the right of self determination. In 1974, the United Nations General Assembly had adopted the Declaration for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. In 2018, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the resolution "Towards a New International Economic Order, which reaffirmed " the need to contribute working towards a new international economic order based on the principles of equality, sovereign equality, interdependence, common interest, cooperation and solidarity among all states.

SAQ

Discuss the significance of Bretton Woods System. (80 Words)

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

Explain the provisions of the Bretton Woods System in the economic activity. (100 words)

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

1.5 Collapse of the Bretton Woods System:

Despite the stable and rapid growth, all were not functioning well after the post world war II. From the early 1960s, the US dollar's fixed value against gold was seen to be overvalued. The rising costs of its overseas involvements had weakened the US's finances and competitive strength. The US dollar no longer made a commandable confidence as the world's principal currency. It failed to maintain its value in relation to gold. This crisis of US's dollar led to the collapse of the system of fixed exchange rates and the introduction of a system of floating exchange rates.

In the 1960s, the world had experienced a substantial economic expansion. From the mid-1970s the international financial system also brought changes in significant ways. Earlier developing nations could turn to international institutions for loans and development support. But now a days they were compelled to borrow from western commercial banks and private lending institutions. This led to periodic debt crisis in the developing world and due to lower income, there is an alarming rate of increase in poverty especially in Latin America and Africa. The industrial world was also affected by the unemployment that started rising from the mid 1970s and remaining high till the early 1990s.

The Bretton Woods system was dissolved between 1968 and 1973. In August 1971, U.S. president Richard Nixon announced the temporary suspension of the dollar's convertibility into gold. Nixon devalued the US dollar relative to gold. US dollars had struggled through out most of the 1960s within the parity established at Bretton Woods. One substantial problem was that one national currency, the US dollar had to be an international reserve currency at the same time. This provided the national monetary and fiscal policy of the United States free from external economic pressures. To make ensure international liquidity, the U.S was forced to run deficits in their balance of payments. In 1960s they ran a very inflationary policy and limited the convertibility of the US dollar due to the reserves were insufficient to meet the demand for their currency. On the other hand the other member countries were not willing to accept the high inflation rates that the par value system would have impacted and the dollar ended up being weak and unwanted. As predicted by the Gresham's law that bad money drives out good money. This crisis had been marked as the breakdown of the system. By 1973, the Bretton Woods system had collapsed. Aftermath, countries were free to choose any exchange arrangement for their currency, except pegging its value to the price of gold. They were able to link its value to another country's currency. An attempt was made to revive the fixed exchange rates but failed. It allowed the market forces to determine its value relative to other countries' currencies. By March 1973, the major currency started to float freely against each other.

Another notable problem was the in the late adjustment of the parties to changes in the economic environment of the countries. Among the nations lack of trust and destabilising speculation have been emerged. Some nations try to buy and selling their own currency to influence the process. Since the collapse of the Bretton Woods system, members of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have been free to choose any form of exchange arrangements that they have their desire. Lots of changes had been experienced in the field of currency, economy and trade such as allowing the currency to float

freely, pegging it to another currency or a basket of currencies, adoption the currency of another country, participating in a currency block or forming part of a monetary union.

Here, we can highlight the structural factors, Structuralists' views and Operationalists' view on the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system. Structural factors play a vital role in the down fall of the Bretton Woods system. The structuralists stressed that it was the deficit in the Bretton Woods system itself that caused the breakdown. The incompatible role of U. S's dollar set an unsteady foundation of the Bretton Woods system. Conflicting sovereign goals and self interests of the big powers of the conference, UK and the USA have caused decolonization which was regarded as one of the main dilemmas faced by the system during the 1960's. Besides, some another operational factors were responsible for the collapse of the Bretton Woods system such as uncooperative gold accumulation behavior of other countries. Moreover, the structuralists viewed that the Bretton Woods system failed due to the conflicting sovereign goals, divergent objectives of the two powers(America and Britain). The operationalists expressed that the problem lies in the mismanagement of the Bretton Woods system. The uncooperative behavior of the European countries deviated from the original design of the system. Another mismanagement was that other countries failed to comply with the adjustment of exchange rate assigned in the article of agreement. In the agreement, there was a term called fundamental disequilibrium which signifies that countries had rights go adjust their exchange rate at the range of 1% when outward and inward payments did not balance. Though, there are many causes of the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system yet, this system remains as a significant event in the world financial history.

Stop to consider :

President M. Nixon in 1971 had made an announcement about his New Economic Policy that was to create a new prosperity without war. It was known as the "Nixon shock" and marked as the beginning of the end for the Bretton Woods system of fixed exchange.

The ideology of globalization would seem to run the global economic order and the industrialised nations have begun to worry about the implications of the growing size and the speculative nature of financial movements in times of globalization. Every industrialised country put emphasis on a "new system of Bretton Woods". In 1996, the Managing Director of the IMF Michel Camdessus had stated that even though the monetary system had changed since 1944 the aims of the Bretton Woods system were as valid today as they had been in the past. He claimed that international cooperation would be required to create a new Bretton Woods system where countries must have the understanding level of economic policies of other countries.

SAQ

Write down the reasons of the breakdown of Bretton Woods system. (40 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.6 Summing up :

This unit has helped you to understand that after world War II, introduction of the Bretton Woods system had changed the economy and currency pattern of the countries. As a result of the Bretton Woods, the three significant international formal institutions were created such as WB, IMF and WTO. Although Bretton Woods system was remarkably successful in reviving an international economy destroyed by war, it was seriously flawed as a long term economic strategy. By 1970s, gold stock of US had dropped to US dollar 10 billion. Bretton Woods system failed to provide enough new gold to compensate for the growth in world trade. The Bretton Woods formally became to an end in 1971 when Richard Nixon had announced that the US would no longer exchange dollars for gold. The system of the Bretton Woods with its fixed exchange rates does not exist today.

Despite the formal demise of the Bretton Woods system, the benefits of the Bretton Woods system were a significant expansion of international trade and investment as well as remarkable macroeconomic performance. Due to the pressure of the Bretton Woods system, the United States was not willing to supply the amount of gold yo the rest of the world demanded, because the gold reserve was declined and eroded the reliable in dollar. It can be concluded that significant monetary reforms such as the system of the Bretton Woods can only function if they are integrated into wider economic and political convergence. Undoubtedly the Bretton Woods conference which was held in New Hampshire in 1944 has been a huge impact on the economic situation of the world since 1945.

1.7 References and Suggested Readings:

Bordo, Michael and Eichengreen, Barry: A Retrospective on the Bretton Woods system, The University of Chicago press, 1933

Griffths, Martin and O' Callaghan Terry: International Relations: The key Concepts, London and NewYork, 2002

Moggride, Donald: Shaping the post war world, Bretton Woods and reparations, London, Macmillan

Links:

www.eirna.com/html/reports/bwoods.htm

www.imt.org

www.ncrb.unac.org/unreform/archive/globalization.html

www.worldbank.org

Unit 5: Global governance

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Objectives

5.3 Global Governance: The Concept

5.4 Summing Up

5.5 References and Suggested readings

5.1 Introduction

We have already learnt that, Political economy is a social science that studies production, trade, and their relationship with the law and the government. It is the study of how economic theories affect different socio-economic systems such as socialism and communism, along with the creation and implementation of public policy. Different groups in an economy have different beliefs as to how their economy should be developed; hence, political economy is a complex field that covers a broad range of political interests. In simple terms, political economy refers to the advice given by economists to the government on either general economic policies or on certain specific proposals created by politicians. In this unit we are going to study the concept of Global Governance. As we know, Global political economy is a field of study that deals with the interaction between political and economic forces. At its centre have always been questions of human welfare and how these might be related to state behaviour and corporate interests in different parts of the world. Despite this, major approaches in the field have often focused more on the international system perspective. In this context study of global governance occupies a predominant position to the study of political science.

5.2 Objectives

After going through this unit you will be able to

- ***explain*** the meaning of global governance in the contemporary international system
- ***assess*** the UN's contribution to global governance

5.3 Global Governance: The Concept

The Concept

Global governance is a broad, dynamic, and complex process of interactive decision-making that is constantly evolving and responding to changing global circumstances. The incidence of poverty on cross-border peace, development and the environment is obvious today. Also the consequences of poverty in terms of living conditions call for a unified action to tackle it. Recent research states that poverty is not simply a short fall of money, but also involves the constant day-to-day hard choices associated with poverty and in effect taxes an individual's physical and mental resources. This cognitive tax, in turn, can lead to economic decisions that perpetuate poverty. To face the challenge, the United Nations MDGs suggests that the fight against poverty belongs to the pivotal political challenge of the 21st century involving a network of structures between governmental and nongovernmental actors at various levels in the field of poverty reduction. This perspective is making positive contributions with some regions in the world heading toward the achievement of the target. Even those countries in sub-saharan Africa where most of the global poor live and who are lagging behind, are making frantic efforts to do so, with the assistance of global bodies. The survey research design was used for the study. Data generated were statistically analyzed and it was found that global governance has strong positive relationship with poverty reduction.

Meaning

Global governance is a process of international cooperation among transnational actors, aimed at negotiating responses to problems that affect more than one state or region. Government Institutions of global governance—the United Nations, the International Criminal Court, the World Bank, etc.—tend to have limited or demarcated power to enforce compliance. Global governance involves multiple states, as well as international organizations, with one state having more of a lead role than the rest. Private Institutions under global governance includes the international non profit organisations operating at a global scale. The modern question of international governance exists in the context of globalization and globalizing regimes of power: politically, economically and culturally. In response to the acceleration of worldwide interdependence, both between human societies and between humankind and the biosphere, the term "global governance"

may name the process of designating laws, rules or regulations intended for a global scale.

The term world governance is broadly used to designate all regulations intended for organization and centralization of human societies on a global scale. The Forum for a new World Governance defines world governance simply as "collective management of the planet".

Traditionally, government has been associated with "governing," or with political authority, institutions, and, ultimately, control. Governance denotes a process through which institutions coordinate and control independent social relations, and that have the ability to enforce their decisions. However, authors like James Rosenau have also used "governance" to denote the regulation of interdependent relations in the absence of an overarching political authority, such as in the international system. Some now speak of the development of "global public policy".

Adil Najam, a scholar on the subject at the Pardee School of Global Studies, Boston University has defined global governance simply as "the management of global processes in the absence of global government." According to Thomas G. Weiss, director of the Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies at the Graduate Center (CUNY) and editor (2000–05) of the journal *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, "Global governance"—which can be good, bad, or indifferent—refers to concrete cooperative problem-solving arrangements, many of which increasingly involve not only the United Nations of states but also 'other UNs,' namely international secretariats and other non-state actors." [6] In other words, global governance refers to the way in which global affairs are managed.

States are more likely to formally include civil society organizations (CSOs) in order to avoid a potential legitimacy advantage of their counterparts and to enhance domestic legitimacy if the following two conditions apply: first if they are more central to the global governance network; and second, if other states formally include CSOs as well. Thus, while government choices concerning whether to involve formally CSOs in global climate policy are obviously driven to a considerable degree by domestic factors, the authors concentrate on international network effects.

Thus it can be said that,

Global governance is the process by which sovereign states coordinate and cooperate in pursuit of solutions to transnational issues, often through the good offices of international organisations. Contemporary

international society does not constitute a world government in the sense that states are functionally sovereign and are therefore free to determine their own domestic and international policies.

Needs of Global Governance

The techniques, institutions, rules, norms, and legal arrangements used to manage relations between states and to facilitate cooperative action across various issue-areas. In the current international context, governance is carried out in the name of the global polity by both governmental and non-governmental organisations. This concept should not be confused with the term ‘good governance’ that is often used in some international organisations (particularly the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank) to promote a particular reform agenda for specific countries. Democracy, transparency, and market-friendly reforms are usually high on the list of that agenda.

Institutions and regimes help actors to manage transnational issues by creating norms, rules and practices that shape actors’ behaviour and build trust between them. This process – known as global governance – often leads to the creation of formal international organisations (IOs) where disputes can be judged and treaties can be interpreted. This chapter will consider the global governance potential of several such organisations. Criticised by some for being too powerful and by others for not being powerful enough, IOs range from specialised agencies – such as the Universal Postal Union and the World Meteorological Organization – to sprawling organisations that deal with issue areas as varied as security, the world economy and regional integration.

The recent surge of interest in global governance has received its impetus from three sources. The first is the end of the cold war. This increased the expectation that international institutions (particularly the United Nations) would play a more central role in the management of the international system. The second is the rise of globalisation and a new sense of ‘globality’ that pervades much contemporary thinking. For some observers, globalisation is itself a manifestation of global governance in so far as it compels states to conform to the competitive demands of a global market. The third source of renewed interest in the concept is the heightened awareness that our planet is bedevilled by problems that require a concerted and coordinated global approach. Contemporary debates about global governance revolve around the most appropriate location of authority and power within the context of a world experiencing both integration and fragmentation.

Global Organisation and Global Governance

Global governance brings together diverse actors to coordinate collective action at the level of the planet. The goal of global governance, roughly defined, is to provide global public goods, particularly peace and security, justice and mediation systems for conflict, functioning markets and unified standards for trade and industry. One crucial global public good is catastrophic risk management – putting appropriate mechanisms in place to maximally reduce the likelihood and impact of any event that could cause the death of 1 billion people across the planet, or damage of equivalent magnitude. See here for a list of global catastrophic risks.

The leading institution in charge of global governance today is the United Nations. It was founded in 1945, in the wake of the Second World War, as a way to prevent future conflicts on that scale. The United Nations does not directly bring together the people of the world, but sovereign nation states, and currently counts 193 members who make recommendations through the UN General Assembly. The UN's main mandate is to preserve global security, which it does particularly through the Security Council. In addition the UN can settle international legal issues through the International Court of Justice, and implements its key decisions through the Secretariat, led by the Secretary General.

The United Nations has added a range of areas to its core mandate since 1945. It works through a range of agencies and associated institutions particularly to ensure greater shared prosperity, as a desirable goal in itself, and as an indirect way to increase global stability. As a key initiative in that regard, in 2015, the UN articulated the Sustainable Development Goals, creating common goals for the collective future of the planet.

Beyond the UN, other institutions with a global mandate play an important role in global governance. Of primary importance are the so-called Bretton Woods institutions: the World Bank and the IMF, whose function is to regulate the global economy and credit markets. Those institutions are not without their critics for this very reason, being often blamed for maintaining economic inequality.

Global governance is more generally effected through a range of organisations acting as intermediary bodies. Those include bodies in charge of regional coordination, such as the EU or ASEAN, which coordinate the policies of their members in a certain geographical

zone. Those also include strategic or economic initiatives under the leadership of one country – NATO for the US or China’s Belt and Road Initiative for instance – or more generally coordinating defense or economic integration, such as APEC or ANZUS. Finally, global governance relies on looser norm-setting forums, such as the G20, the G7, the World Economic Forum: those do not set up treaties, but offer spaces for gathering, discussing ideas, aligning policy and setting norms. This last category could be extended to multi-stakeholder institutions that aim to align global standards, for instance the Internet Engineering Taskforce (IETF) and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C).

In summary, global governance is essential but fragmented, complex and little understood. In this context, the key questions raised by the Global Challenges Foundation are, how to reform institutions, how to develop alternative institutions, and how to use the new possibilities of technology to improve governance.

Stop to Consider

Mechanism for global governance

- International Governmental Organizations (IGOs): World Trade Organization and the UN system are examples of existing state-centered governance mechanisms. They utilize partnerships with non-state actors that have expertise and resources.
- Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs): UN Global Compact is an example of an international PPP. UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) utilize the PPP strategy across all aspects of implementation of the SDGs.
- Private governance: They set sector-specific standards. Eg: Moody’s Investors Service and Standard and Poor’s Rating Groups sets international accounting standards.
- Tripartite governance mechanisms: It includes involvement of state, private and civil society actors. For example Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, publish What You Pay and the African Peer Review Mechanism, thus helping in categorizing PPPs.

Challenges:

- Gridlock: Current international institutions fail to provide a coordinated response to current agendas. Eg: Recent crisis in Syria showed lack of cooperation among international institutions.
- Principle of sovereignty: Issue of sovereignty comes while dealing with international problems.
- Limited capacity: For eg political divisions and partisan interests within the Security Council blocked any international response to the mass atrocities committed in Syria, thus strengthening impunity and encouraging the expansion of war crimes and crimes against humanity.
- Rise of increased nationalist movements: Eg: The issue of refugees in EU effects global cooperation
- Many alternative institutions: Rising powers as BRICS while advocating for better representation in institutions as UNSC, IMF, WB have developed alternative mechanisms as ADB.

UN and Global Governance

The United Nations is the most global and all encompassing organisation in the world. This organisation alone through its organs and agencies has contributed not less than 50,000 laws to International Law. Founded by 50 members at the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations, the organisation took its cue from the League of Nations earlier established to prevent conflicts of interests among states but failed to prevent the outbreak of the Second World War. It was assumed, the lessons learnt in the issues that led to the failure of the League of Nations will be corrected in the new organisation now formed with the involvement of powerful countries like the United States whose decline for membership of the league contributed to its failure. It will however, be important to add that students should make conscious effort to having access to the charter and articles of the United Nations as this will benefit students reading and understanding of the United Nations and its formation. The charter consists of 36 articles stating the expected behaviours among states when relating with one another.

Ordinarily, the United Nations is seen as the highest body comprising states of the world. Its establishment has been referred to as compromises among the powerful countries after the Second World War. While it has since then existed and modulated states interaction with one another, it has also acquired so much power that enables it to touch on state on almost every aspect. The United Nations was established by 51 countries in 1945. Today this number has grown to 194. With its secretariat in New York, the UN has six organs and countless numbers of affiliated agencies that help it to carry out its duties.

As an organisation having universal membership, the UN mandate encompasses security, economic and social development, the protection of human rights, and the protection of the environment. All of these duties, the UN tries to protect through the principles in its charter, its resolutions that regulate states interactions. Organs of the UN also help to enforce these regulations so the international system even though anarchical enjoys some forms of order.

Self Asking Questions

Identify the similarities and differences between the League of Nations and the United Nations pointing out while the former failed and the latter has largely succeeded.

The role of the UN and its entities in global governance for sustainable development

Global governance for sustainable development is mainly based on formal arrangements and treaty-based institutions with defined memberships, mandates and institutional machinery. Three issues which commonly arise in governance discussions are:

- **Effectiveness:** current arrangements have been unable to satisfactorily address development challenges, such as to free humanity from poverty and hunger, to reduce global economic imbalances and inequalities, to foster inclusive economic growth for human and social progress, to advance international cooperation for development, to reverse environmental degradation or to operationalize an effective framework for climate change mitigation and adaptation. Progress has been uneven and the reasons many and varied.
- **Representativeness:** developing countries remain under-represented in several key decision-making bodies. Current arrangements fall short in representing evolving world realities and accommodating changing power relations. Related to this, ways to enhance transparency, accountability and the meaningful participation of all stakeholders, including business and civil society, need greater attention.
- **Coherence:** existing governance arrangements have been largely unable to bridge the gap between globally agreed goals and aspirations, and policies at the national level. The lack of coherence and some degree of duplication is widely evident in the diverse global approaches to sustainable development.

The formal system of international governance in the economic, social, environmental and related fields has been based on two basic principles: specialization of and coordination among specialized international organizations. Most of these institutions were created in a different context in response to specific challenges. In an era of interrelated sustainable development challenges the current structures present a challenge for integrated responses.

Specialized agencies are autonomous entities with their own governance structures. They have specific mandates in their area of expertise and take decisions according to their own decision-making processes and rules. These institutions are accountable to their membership, which could differ from one to another.

In some cases, the respective weight of their members in their related area put the representativeness of International Organizations (IOs) into question. As an example, the Bretton Woods Institutions, which play a crucial role for maintaining global macroeconomic stability, and providing resources, guidance and assistance to their membership, face this limitation. In these institutions, calls have been made to improve the voting systems to adequately reflect shifts in economic power, and ongoing reforms aim to strengthen the voice and representation of emerging economies and developing countries through quota shares reallocation.

In other cases and various areas, International Organisations (IOs), whose decision making processes are based on the consensus rule or the “one-state-one-vote” principle, demonstrate broad inclusiveness. However, building consensus among member states can sometime prove complex and difficult, thereby affecting the effectiveness of these institutions to take action. Implementing decisions can also prove challenging. International arrangements face compliance gaps at the national level and difficulties in ratification of signed conventions. Coordination, the second basic principle, has been the responsibility of the United Nations. The overall coordination of UN system activities in economic, social and related areas was explicitly delegated to the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), as one of the six principal Organs.

Stop to Consider

United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

The United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC; French: Conseil économique et social des Nations unies, CESNU) is one of the six principal organs of the United Nations, responsible for coordinating the economic and social fields of the organization, specifically in regards to the fifteen specialised agencies, the eight functional commissions and the five regional commissions under its jurisdiction. ECOSOC serves as the central forum for discussing international economic and social issues and formulating policy recommendations addressed to member states and the United Nations system.[1] In addition to a rotating membership of 54 UN member states, over 1,600 nongovernmental organizations have consultative status with the Council to participate in the work of the United Nations. ECOSOC holds one four-week session each year in July, and since 1998 has also held an annual meeting in April with finance ministers heading key committees of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Additionally, the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF), which reviews implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, is convened under the auspices of the Council every July. It has 54 members.

However, the decentralized structure of the system, with the specialized agencies, funds, programmes and subsidiary bodies of ECOSOC has made internal coordination and cooperation difficult.

ECOSOC has been recently reformed through GA resolution 68/1 and clearly assigned the function of promoting coordination, cooperation and coherence among the various parts of the system, and to promote a balanced integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development in the context of the follow-up to United Nations conferences and summits. The Council is also mandated to continue to strengthen and further promote dialogue on and implementation of the financing for development agenda, inter alia, by strengthening existing arrangements, including the special high-level meeting with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Along the same lines, the Rio+20 Outcome Document recommends strengthening the institutional framework that “should find common solutions related to global challenges to sustainable development” (Para 75) , and “enhance coherence, reduce fragmentation and overlap and increase effectiveness, efficiency and transparency, while reinforcing coordination and cooperation” (Para 76). To this end, the universality of the UN is critical (Para 77) and the key role of the ECOSOC to ensure the UN system-wide coherence, enhance the overall coordination and achieve a balanced integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development, is paramount (Para 82). The strengthening of international environmental governance through the upgrading of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as the leading global environmental authority (Para 88) is part of the new institutional framework for sustainable development.

Furthermore, the setting up of the new universal, intergovernmental, High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) (Para 84) can help improve cooperation and coordination under the auspices of the GA and ECOSOC. The UN-GA recently decided that HLPF “consistent with its universal character, shall provide political leadership, guidance and recommendations for sustainable development, follow up and review progress in the implementation of sustainable development commitments, enhance the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development in a holistic and cross-sectoral manner at all levels”.

Check Your Progress

1. What do you mean by global governance?
2. Write a note on the role of UN in the process of Global Governance.
3. What do you mean by sustainable development?

Security and Global Governance

The most important visible manifestation of global power in this realm is the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). Yet, in the face of increasing discontent on the part of emerging powers, there is a contestation about its legitimacy. It is reflected in increased demand for participation and representation, specifically where representation is not equal as in the case of the United Nations General Assembly. Today's security multilateralism at its highest level is reflected in UNSC structures that reflect the immediate post-war balance of power that is now nearly 70 years old. As Brzezinski (2012:76) argues, the "heretofore untouchable" UNSC, with its five permanent members with exclusive veto rights, "may become widely viewed as illegitimate" unless it is reformed. Brazil, India, Turkey are the most vocal proponents of a change in the UNSC while Russia and China – with their permanent memberships and veto power – are relatively silent.

A key feature of global governance has been the security cooperation engendered by transatlantic relations since the end of World War II. Despite divergences over perceptions of security interests, it has survived as a key cornerstone of transatlantic partnership. The establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 was a product of shared security concerns on both sides of the Atlantic in response to perceived Soviet expansionism during the Cold War (Müftüler-Baç and Cihangir 2012). Yet, it was not only the convergence of material security interests that bound the transatlantic allies together, but also their common values. The US and Europe emerged as the main global advocates of democracy, human rights and the rule of law in the 21st century after the Soviet threat had receded (Manners 2010)

Transatlantic security relations have never been straightforward and have survived multiple crises in the postwar period (Cowles and Egan 2012). Now, in addition to a wide range of global issues that pose security threats (especially to Europe), such as illegal migration, trans-border organized crime and international terrorism, there is the existential threat associated with nuclear proliferation, which ultimately requires a military response and a nuclear deterrence capability that increases the importance of the transatlantic alliance and NATO's role in international security. In this context, recent tensions in US-European security relations recede in significance because "NATO would provide an essential link with strategic nuclear forces. Thus Washington chose to perfect the alliance's military set up (implement the long-time-sought flexible response and the equitable sharing of defence burdens) rather

than abandon the alliance. Many Europeans for their part still deemed the US commitment to Europe's security important" (Athanassopoulou 2006:116).

Ultimately, NATO remains the most powerful and integrated military institution in the world, despite a growing military imbalance amongst its allies. In military terms, the power of Europe is in decline. Largely for that reason, the outgoing US Secretary of Defence, Robert Gates, cast doubt on the future of the transatlantic security alliance in 2011 while lambasting European states "that are apparently unwilling to devote the necessary resources or make the necessary changes to be serious and capable partners in their own defense" (Gates 2011). But as the (increasingly) senior partner in the Atlantic Alliance, the US remains the dominant global leader in hard security resources and material. And despite being politically bruised and logistically stretched in Afghanistan and Libya, NATO held firm and showed its unmatched operational capability in both theatres.

Stop to Consider

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization also called the North Atlantic Alliance, is an intergovernmental military alliance between 28 European countries and 2 North American countries. The organization implements the North Atlantic Treaty that was signed on 4 April 1949. NATO constitutes a system of collective security, whereby its independent member states agree to mutual defense in response to an attack by any external party. The NATO headquarters are located in Haren, Brussels, Belgium, while the headquarters of Allied Command Operations is near Mons, Belgium. Security in our daily lives is key to our well-being. NATO's purpose is to guarantee the freedom and security of its members through political and military means.

POLITICAL - NATO promotes democratic values and enables members to consult and cooperate on defence and security-related issues to solve problems, build trust and, in the long run, prevent conflict.

MILITARY - NATO is committed to the peaceful resolution of disputes. If diplomatic efforts fail, it has the military power to undertake crisis-management operations. These are carried out under the collective defence clause of NATO's founding treaty - Article 5 of the Washington Treaty or under a United Nations mandate, alone or in cooperation with other countries and international organisations.

THE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE OF FINANCE

All countries can be affected by international financial crises, with their vulnerability increased or decreased by global arrangements that create rules, pool resources and coordinate actions. These amplify or constrain strategies available to individual governments. In 1997, when a speculative attack on the Thai baht rapidly engulfed East Asia in a major financial meltdown, Thailand tried several strategies. It used up its own foreign exchange reserves attempting to support its currency. It then floated the currency, yet was

still overwhelmed. The prime minister sought bilateral assistance from China and Japan, but neither was willing to provide emergency loans. Finally, the Government was forced into the arms of the IMF. Its programme failed to stem the crisis, and soon Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and the Republic of Korea were forced to take emergency measures.

Cooperation in global finance since World War II has mostly been coordinated through regional and international institutions, primarily the IMF and the World Bank Group. The 2002 Human Development Report described the system as dominated by the United States and the European Union, but challenged by the rise of powerful, transnational NGOs. Determined to hold the IMF and the World Bank to account, these groups successfully put debt relief, poverty alleviation, environmental and human rights concerns, and transparency on the agenda of international institutions. That said, they were predominantly northern NGOs, challenging a northern paradigm. Since 2002, as emerging economies have become more powerful players in global financial governance, they have taken new places at the tables of discussion and rule-making. They have become financiers in their own right. And they have developed their own regional monetary and support arrangements. This rapid transformation poses new challenges and strategic choices for developing countries. Three issues are analysed here: the rise of emerging economies in global discussions of finance, the new politics of aid and the increase in regional monetary arrangements.

Self Asking Question

Briefly discuss the security aspects of Global Governance.

Challenges to Global Governance

Today, global governance has a new challenge. The rise of the global South and a shift in global power towards emerging economies—China, in particular—has become more obvious. China and other emerging economies have forged deeper and stronger economic relations with neighbours and across the developing world. They have rapidly expanded their global markets and production. As they rely more on global market access, they will increasingly require global rules to protect that access.

Global rules can be made in formal, multilateral institutions, or (as became very popular in the 1990s and 2000s) in informal, standard-setting networks of private and non-governmental actors.

Emerging economies are likely to favour the former. Brazil, China, India and the Russian Federation are state-centred in their own governance, and guard their sovereignty in international relations. Multilateral institutions can formalize representation and decision-making, and respect the power and processes of national governments. Traditional multilateral institutions are not fit for this purpose, however. For decades, powerful governments have.

A growing number of emerging global governance actors aim to contribute to the solution of interdependent issues supplementing, and sometimes clashing, with already established regimes designed to address certain international problems separately from other issues. Hale et al. (2013) define the situation when current international institutions fail to provide a coordinated response to current agendas challenges as “gridlock”. Through the examples of sovereignty, and by discussing the questions of power and equality we will show how new developments in international relations affect and reshape collaborative responses to the most pressing issues.

Various global governance actors coalesce around the ideas and norms of human rights and human security; however, the principle of sovereignty continues to challenge the practical application of those ideas internationally. Huge and severe violations of peoples’ rights and freedoms during inter- or intra-state wars or conflicts continue to erode human security in different parts of the world. However, governance actors working for the maintenance of peace, security, justice and the protection of human rights have limited capacity to improve situations because of complicated approval procedures of humanitarian intervention or authorization of peacekeeping operations. For example, political divisions and partisan interests within the Security Council (particularly the use of veto power by some of its permanent members) blocked any international response to the mass atrocities committed in Syria, thus strengthening impunity and encouraging the expansion of war crimes and crimes against humanity (Adams, 2015). A rise of nationalist sentiments and movements in Russia and some European countries also continues to erode international cooperation in response to challenges such as the huge influx of refugees, and the ongoing conflict in Ukraine. All of these threaten the international security, and order in general, that was created during the post-Cold War period. Yet, even as the principle of the responsibility to protect has gained political support and international legitimacy since it was introduced about a decade ago, its contribution to preventing mass atrocities and protection population remains low. As Luck (2015) points out, policy practitioners and scholars need to think in a more nuanced way about

sovereignty. Both decision-making sovereignty, when governments choose to independently determine whether a particular course of action for the cause of human rights protection is in their national interest and erosion of sovereignty open the door to more atrocities within and across states' boundaries. This scholar, for instance, argues that the ineffective exercise of sovereignty by a number of states over their own territory becomes a significant barrier to exercising protection responsibilities in other places (Luck, 2015: 504).

Power in the current system of global governance has become more diffused. The power shift accompanying the rise of Brazil, Russia, India, China (the BRICs) and other so-called "rising powers" pose questions about the possible reordering or shifts in the current state of global governance. While advocating for better representation in institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the UN Security Council, the governments of China, India, Brazil and other emerging economies have started to develop and maintain alternative institutions for economic and political collaboration. The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and the New Development Bank are products of these efforts. While rising powers' behaviours are shaped by the structural features of global capitalism, "the differing contours of BRICs' state-society relations provide the foundations for conflicts with Western powers over the most liberal aspects of global governance" (Stephen, 2014). The Western ideas of privatization, autonomous markets and open capital accounts are challenged by state-controlled approaches to development in the countries of so-called Global South. The proliferation of Sovereign Wealth Funds (SWFs), and national development banks in BRICs challenge an autonomous status of private capital in current global economic affairs. Those developments have led to the conclusion, by some scholars, that the most liberal features of global governance order are being contested by rising powers (Stephen, 2014). In addition, a small group of big and influential countries such as India and China gain more negotiating power (Barkin, 2013), as their non-participation in international treaties and policies (for example, climate change) might substantially diminish the effects of other countries' efforts to solve these global issues. The shifting global power configuration challenges each type of multilateral setting whether it concerns international institutions that have a selective Western-based membership (for example, OECD, NATO, G7/G8); international institutions that shape the state of international policies but do not provide rising powers with equal membership and power in their governing bodies (the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the UN Security Council); or multilateral settings in which rising and established

powers interact more or less on an equal footing (the World Trade Organization, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change) (Lesage and Van De Graaf, 2015).

Economic and political inequality have long-lasting implications for governance both within and between states. Inequality in either form contributes to a rise in extremism and social unrest, and it also raises the questions of what responsibility the international community should bear for human development beyond just satisfying basic needs, that is, security, food and shelter. While the SDGs agenda of 2015 prioritizes the goal to “(e)nd poverty in all its forms everywhere” (United Nations, 2015), questions still remain about exactly who will fund this eradication of poverty and which actions are best suited to this fight. Global governance actors, for example, focus more on intervention measures in poor countries, as they are primarily guided by a “narrow” understanding of security rather than thinking of more long-term development issues, or the “everyday” insecurities experienced by individuals in different parts of the world. A huge diversification of financial sources of development aid complicates the task of applying a common framework, based on individuals’ needs and development interests approach. In addition, the supply of development resources including official development assistance is also moving away from the old North towards the BRICs and other new official donors such as South Korea and Turkey, plus private foundations like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, faith-based organizations, remittances from diasporas, heterogeneous SWFs and a plethora of Exchange-Traded Funds as well as novel sources of finance such as taxes on carbon, emissions, financial transactions and so forth (Shaw, 2015).

Thus, the observed changes in socio-economic and political aspects of the current world pose new questions and create new challenges for previously active participants of global policy processes, as well as for new actors of global governance. Global governance actors will need to critically reflect on the relevance of earlier policy tools to rapidly changing conditions in the current world.

The future of global governance

Global governance is arguably inevitable for the survival of the human race in present and future generations. Although global governance sometimes appears fragile and ineffective in response to current challenges, the trend of globalization and the demand for global governance approaches have already passed the point of no return. The

future of global governance will be mainly shaped by the following five factors: individual empowerment, increasing awareness of human security, institutional complexity, international power shift and liberal world political paradigm. We draw this conclusion by applying the findings and observations from different field of studies including security studies, international political economy, global governance field and communications studies.

First, because of information technology and mass/social media, individual citizens—especially in developed countries—have acquired much more information power than a half century ago. Individuals can attain higher awareness of situations related to national and international affairs. Compared with humans in the twentieth century, a majority of those in the twenty-first century can more easily access international security information, thanks to the Internet and media exposure. Therefore, individual citizens of the world are more likely to understand the importance and the impact of international security on their personal lives. Digital media played a major role in the Arab Spring of 2011 in Egypt and Tunisia: social networks allowed communities to unite around shared grievances and nurture transportable strategies for mobilizing against dictators (Howard and Hussain, 2011). Globalization of the new media illustrates how communities throughout the world can be mobilized for collaborative response as well signals a new trend in the intersection of new media and conventional media such as television, radio and mobile phone (Khondker, 2011). The US National Intelligence Council also identified individual issues and the decreasing influence of the state as one of the main global trends for the twenty-first century, arguing that the potential political power of individuals has significantly increased since the end of the Cold War because of the proliferation of information and transportation technologies (National Intelligence Council, 2012). This trend will strengthen the convergence between domestic and international politics, constraining state behavior (Putnam, 1988) and continue to produce many transnational actors. Considering the dramatic increase of individuals' capabilities in information gathering, analysis and political projection, the trend of individual empowerment is logically supposed to pave a wider road towards cooperative global governance, because peace is generally preferred over war by individual humans.

Second, as the trend towards “individual empowerment” continues, global society through global governance architecture will need to pay high attention to human security, which protects individual humans from fatal threats to physical safety, and human dignity, whether

human-made or of natural origin. Human security is an innovative concept for security in response to horizontal (such as military, economic and political) and vertical (such as individual, state and global) threats, which traditional security concepts cannot effectively control (Grayson, 2008). The focal point of state security is too narrow to encompass the myriad threats that challenge societies today. The threat of sovereign states engaging in large-scale war is less probable today than at any time in modern history. War has not been eliminated, rather its form has shifted from sovereign versus sovereign to substate wars between differing identity groups or insurgencies against the state. Beyond war, the concept of human security is concerned with varieties of security: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security (UNDP 1994). Human security provides an excellent compatible conceptual paradigm to global governance regimes in the future, which must respond to transnational, multi-dimensional threats that a single country cannot manage. For example, a number of national security analysts have already begun to recognize environmental degradation and natural disasters such as epidemics, floods, earthquakes, poverty and droughts as national security threats similar to military disasters (King and Murray, 2001–2002).

Third, we must additionally consider “institutional complexity” (Held and Hale, 2011) as another direction for future global governance development. As the trend of individual empowerment gains more momentum, the influence of civil society is expected to grow in terms of authority and resources. Various non-state actors will not only affect their national governments’ behavior more significantly, but will also engage in networks of transnational relations more actively. International institutions in global governance will likely keep expanding to “regime complex”, a concept defined as “an array of partially overlapping and nonhierarchical institutions governing a particular issue area” (Raustiala and Victor, 2004).

Fourth, global governance in the future will be also be shaped by power shifts in international relations. Almost all the traditional institutions of global governance were initiated by Western countries, and their pluralistic political culture and influential civil societies have shaped the political context of global governance. States of the Global South, especially China, have improved their relative power in relation to the Global North. As a result, the voice of actors originating from the Global South is expected to become more prominent in global governance regimes and institutions traditionally dominated by a small

number of the Global North states. Therefore, an increase in multilateralism will further complicate the face of global governance.

Fifth, the future of global governance is also rooted in liberal paradigms of world politics. States and non-state or transnational actors tend to be more cooperative with global governance when a liberal world order is maintained. Global governance regimes to date have evolved with liberal paradigms such as democracy, bottom-up orientations and human rights promotion. While the advancement of democratic practices in the states without strong traditions of following liberal values remain a challenge, democracy has near-universal appeal among people of every ethnic group, every religion, and every region of the world and democracy is embraced as an international norm by more states, transnational organizations and international networks (McFaul, 2004). Liberal approaches challenge the traditional concept of the state as a unified unitary actor that lacks adverse interpretation of national interest. Accordingly, even in traditional security areas, there are more spaces for international cooperation. Global security governance through intergovernmental institutions such as the UN, International Atomic Energy Agency and International Criminal Court has made considerable progresses and gained more influence. If the realist paradigm dominates national security, however, the world would have to overcome deep uncertainty and doubt about the effectiveness of global governance. As a result, global governance today and in the future will be in the face of such serious threats as US–China hegemony rivalry, US–Russia military confrontation and Middle East conflicts. Nevertheless, as long as global society retains liberal paradigms powerful enough to offset the negative effects of mutually suspicious realist paradigms, global governance will continue to generate into effective hybrid regimes that hold the potential of creating a future world that is more cooperative, sustainable and secure.

5.4 Summing Up

Thus from the above discussions we come to conclude that, Globalization, the end of the Cold War and increased involvement of non-state actors in global affairs represent fundamentally shifting relations of power, speeding up national economies' integration and contributing to the convergence of policies in different issue domains. This review considers the state of global governance by presenting a variety of global governance arrangements, key challenges facing governance in an increasingly globalized context and possibilities for

the future governance. Current global governance arrangements favour flexibility over rigidity, prefer voluntary measures to binding rules and privilege partnerships over individual actions. This synopsis of the state of global governance examines the evolving role that sovereignty and the enduring human struggles for power and equity are playing in shaping international relations and governance. This contribution argues that individual empowerment, increasing awareness of human security, institutional complexity, international power shifts and the liberal world political paradigm will define the future of global governance. This article is published as part of a thematic collection dedicated to global governance.

5.5 References and Suggested readings

- Rashchupkina Y (2016) *Global governance: present and future*. Palgrave Communications. 2:15045 doi: 10.1057/palcomms.2015.45.
- Barkin S (2013) *International Organization: Theories and Institutions*. Palgrave Macmillan: New York.
- Bhagwati J (2004) *In Defense of Globalization*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Biermann F and Pattberg P (2008) *Global environmental governance: Taking stock, moving forward*. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*;
- Grayson K (2008) *Human security as power/knowledge: The biopolitics of a definitional debate*. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*;
- Lesage D and Van de Graaf T (2015) *Rising Powers and Multilateral Institutions*. Palgrave Macmillan: London.
- Stephen P (2014) *Rising powers, global capitalism and liberal global governance: A historical materialist account of the BRICs challenge*, *European Journal of International Relations*;

PAPER VIII- IR-II**BLOCKIII-****UNIT I-PEACE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Peace-concept and discourse
- 1.4 Challenges to peace
- 1.5 Creating peace
- 1.6 Peacemaking and Peacebuilding
- 1.7 Summing up
- 1.8 References and Suggested Readings
- 1.9 Model Questions
- 1.10 Answer to Check Your Progress

1.1 Introduction

The quest for peace has dominated humankind for centuries, it has proved to be truly elusive. Though all of humanity has denounced war and violence of all kind, yet the chances of having peace have not materialized. All religions condemn violence and give importance to peace, love and cooperation; world leaders have called upon the need for peace and global institutions have been created for establishing peace. But peace when achieved has proved to be temporary in character and violence again comes to the forefront. Peace is a rather psychological concept, always relative and juxtaposed to violence. The concept of peace is multifaceted and mainstream theories of international relations have always sought to address the ‘cause of war’ and the concept of peace was

seldom given its due recognition. Peace is the pre-condition for long term stability and happiness of individual, communities and states.

1.2 Objectives

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

- analyse concept of peace in international relations,
- understand the mechanisms that create peace
- realize the importance of peacemaking and peacebuilding institutions in world politics.

1.3 Peace-concept and discourse

If we begin with the need to survive, we immediately see that peace is a primary requirement of the human condition itself.

Johan Galtung (1995)

For centuries, humanity has grappled with the idea of ‘peace’, yet defining such a term has been a difficult task. Often, in politics, statecraft and international relations, it is its ‘absence’ that has taken centre-stage. Global institutions, multilateral treaties, international NGOs have talked about the importance of peace, but achieving the same has proved to be difficult.

According to the United Nations-

The nature of conflict and violence has transformed substantially since the UN was founded 75 years ago. Conflicts now tend to be less deadly and often waged between domestic groups rather than states. Homicides are becoming more frequent in some parts of the world, while gender-based attacks are increasing globally. The long-term impact on development of inter-personal violence, including violence against children, is also more widely recognized.¹

According to another report by the World Bank- ‘By 2030, up to 2/3 of the world's extreme poor could live in fragility, conflict and violence (FCV) settings. Conflicts also drive 80% of all humanitarian needs’.² According to the Global Peace Index 2021 ‘there are now signs that militarisation is increasing’ and ‘the number of forcibly displaced people increased from just over 40 million in 2007, to over 84 million in 2020’.³ Hence violence does not seem to relent and peace has proven to be as obscure as ever before.

From spiritual to religious leaders as well as state leaders, all have stressed the importance of peace-‘inner’ as well as ‘external’. For states it is the ‘absence of hostilities’, for most it is a ‘regulative principle’ which should govern the lives of individuals and states. While humanity has progressed materially, seldom it has brought about the required benefits. International relations has sought to find answers to ‘how to prevent war’, rarely has it found the rights answers, with each war giving way another war. Violence certainly too has taken new dimensions- from interstate violence to intra-state violence; involvement of state and non-state actors in perpetuating violence has hurt one and all. Like other terms such as ‘justice’, peace is difficult to define for it is related with a set of conditions. Johan Galtung has made an important distinction between ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ peace. Negative peace essentially denoted ‘absence’ of fear, war and conflict. In contrast ‘positive peace’ is related with ‘tranquility’ and harmony with oneself and others. Peace is a ‘dialectical’ concept, wherein the state of peace is often determined ‘negatively’ or by the ‘absence’ of anger, fear and confrontation. Peace is seen as enabling condition for individuals and states to achieve results that are harmonious to one and all. Effectively, attainment of absolute peace is hard for it depends on conditions beyond one’s control.

Peace in international relations has been debated from various perspectives. For the idealists – positive view of human nature, the goals of disarmament and the possibility of cooperation are important facets of peace. Kant’s central idea of ‘perpetual peace’ created an intellectual

foundation for importance of peace in world politics. Over the years- humanitarian laws, the formation of ICRC (1863), the Geneva Convention of 1864 reveals that the global community was interested in pursuing 'peace'. During the interwar period, the formation of the League of Nations was a definite highpoint of idealism.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Geneva Conventions: These are a set of treaties and protocols which form the core of international humanitarian law.

- First Geneva Convention:Convention (I) for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field. Geneva, 12 August 1949.
- Second Geneva Convention:Convention (II) for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea. Geneva, 12 August 1949.
- Third Geneva Convention:Convention (III) relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. Geneva, 12 August 1949.
- Fourth Geneva Convention:Convention (IV) relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Geneva, 12 August 1949.
- Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions:Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I), 8 June 1977.
- Protocol II additional to the Geneva Conventions:Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II), 8 June 1977.
- Protocol III additional to the Geneva Conventions:Protocol additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Adoption of an Additional Distinctive Emblem (Protocol III), 8 December 2005

For the realists, 'anarchy' is the hallmark of international relations. According to the realists, human nature is essentially 'negative', state interest is guided by national interest where 'power' plays an important role; uneasy 'peace' is achieved through balance of power. For neo realists like Kenneth Waltz, state behavior is guided by 'structure'. War is inevitable and peace is bounded. While regimes and norms do play a role in world politics, in many parts of the globe, insecurity in the form of intra-state clashes, humanitarian intervention, global terrorism, forced displacement of people has reaffirmed the view that peace is 'elusive'. From the Marxist perspective, the international order should be based on principles of economic and social justice. The Marxists focus their attention on emancipation of individuals and are opposed to capitalism and imperialism. For Lenin, imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism, made peace impossible; and for A.G.Frank, who was extremely critical of the development model provided by the West, argued that this has caused 'underdevelopment of development' of the third world countries. Marxism as an ideology proposed 'change', but as events unfolded from the aftermath of the Russian revolution, it was anything but peaceful. Again, in many countries in Eastern Europe and Latin America, where communist governments were established, the domestic conduct of those governments left a lot to be desired.

The behavior of states in general is very much determined by a variety of factors- domestic forces, national interests and structural forces. Peace, if any and its many manifestations have emerged as an afterthought of interstate relations. In the new millennium, events in the Middle East, Afghanistan and North Africa reveal that violence and intra-state conflict has become endemic.

1.4 Challenges to peace: Direct violence and Structural violence

Violence operates through various means at different levels. It operates through 'threats' and physical harm. Individuals are subjected to hate crimes because of their political orientation, colour, sexual orientation or

the community to which they belong to. Since the end of the Cold War, security of nations state has come under increasing threat from non-state forces. Likewise, interstate wars and intrastate conflict are a major source of threat to peace and stability. Violation of human rights by state agencies and non-state agencies has increased; especially women and children have been targeted by different armed groups in civil wars in Afghanistan, Syria etc.

War	Year	Casualties (approx.)
The Second Congo War	1998-2003	5.4 million people
Napoleonic Wars	1803-1815	3.5-6 million people
The Thirty Years' War	1618 to 1648	8 million people
The Chinese Civil War	1927-1950	8 million people
The Russian Civil War	1917-1922	9 million people
World War I	1914-1918	7 million people
The Second Sino-Japanese War	1937-1945	25 million
World War II	1939 to 1945	70 million people
Major wars		
Source: brojenproject.org		

In direct violence, 'peace' is general is threatened in a variety of ways. The scale and magnitude of violence varies according to circumstances-it may range from two person 'intimate violence' to genocide. Usually violence occurs when two or more groups see each other as a threat to their identities and goals. Domestic violence, fratricidal clashes and state

sponsored violence and war are some of the key threats to the individual, community and the state. Such direct violence is often meant to physically hurt the opposing party. Often intermittent, the enemy is directly identified before perpetuating violence.

In contrast, ‘structural violence’ is ‘impersonal’. It is continuous and not observable; however, the victims of such violence do feel it in the form of deprivation, poverty and neglect.

Direct Violence	Structural Violence
Kills people directly	Kills people indirectly
Kills quickly	Kills slowly
Somatic harm	Somatic deprivation
Dramatic	Commonplace
Personal	Impersonal
Acute insult to well-being	Chronic insult to well-being
Intermittent	Continuous
Subject-action-object observable	Subject-action-object unobservable
Intentional and immoral	Unintentional and amoral
Episodes may be prevented	Inertia may be mitigated
Differences between direct violence and structural violence Source: Introduction To Peace Psychology by Daniel J. Christie, Richard V. Wagner, and Deborah Du Nann Winter	

Structural violence is often related with conditions related to societal and economic structures of the society. Over a period of time, such structures stabilize and it often favours the dominant class-resulting in deprivation, exploitation and exclusion of a sizeable section of the society. Growing income inequalities, unemployment, poverty has also led to undermining of 'choices' of the marginalized communities. According to Gandhi, 'poverty is the worst form of violence'.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Human Security: It is a 'concern with human life and dignity'. As an approach, it adopts a people centered approach to security that seeks to achieve a world free from 'fear, want and dignity'. Human security encompasses-

- Economic security
- Food security
- Health security
- Environmental security
- Personal security
- Community security
- Political security.

For more, <http://hdr.undp.org>

1.5 Creating peace

Conflict in the post-Cold War era has assumed new dimension- 'postmodern wars' in the form of ethnic conflict and humanitarian intervention. Religion, culture and identity based conflict has come to the forefront in most of the developing world. Unlike traditional wars, these postmodern wars often are long, intermittent, fragmented leadership and assume non-traditional warfare. Often women and children are targeted and 'laws of war' are seldom followed. Again, reconciliation has proved

to be difficult in conflicts like those in Palestine/ Israel , Afghanistan and Rwanda.

Resolution of conflict in inter-state level has proved to be an arduous one, especially when goals and visions of the several warring parties are completely on opposite ends. The importance of Track II initiatives need to highlighted here. Often discussion between Heads of States do not materialize or bring about peace, it is here that Track II diplomacy become important. These are activities that go beyond the official realm. It involves NGOS, academicians *etc.* who offer more creative ways for achieving peace. Workshops, capacity building programmes, humanitarian workers do provide the necessary impetus to bring together different groups to solve matters in a more closed environment. Peace can only be meaningful if it emerges from within rather than being imposed by outsiders.

Johan Galtung's TRANSCEND approach is important for it seeks to address and transform structural and cultural violence. It is also in 'favour of integration, consensus, cooperation, mutual learning and creative collaboration, the aim is for equity and symmetric power structures.'⁴ This approach argues, regardless of cultural backgrounds, in no hierarchical order, that all human beings have certain basic needs which are universal in character- *i.e.* survival, wellbeing, identity and freedom. At the heart, is the idea of 'nonviolence' which is essential for the transformation of the society. Among other forms of violence, cultural violence is the hardest to transform for it more deep rooted in psyche of the people, which in turn legitimizes structural and direct violence. Every conflict encompasses –attitudes, behavior and contradictions (ABC), and arriving to peaceful solution should be multipronged rather than linear in approach.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Nonviolence:For Mahatma Gandhi it is more than 'pacifism'; rather 'non-violence is a weapon of the strong'. It is a more than a tool for

achieving political ends, rather it is a way of life. ‘Satyagraha’ was advocated by Mahatma Gandhi to achieve social progress and independence for India. Martin Luther King, a black civil rights leader led the March on Washington(1963). He successfully led the civil rights movement in the United States, which ultimately resulted in ending the legal segregation of African Americans in the country. He was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1964,

For peace to prevail, respect for human rights is a generally regarded as an essential condition. The conventional approach to human rights is rather inadequate to understand the complex nature of the same in the twenty first century. Human rights abuse has assumed new dimensions, perpetuated by state and anti-state forces-from rape, to summary executions to denial of civil liberties. Many states have adopted harsh anti-terror legislations; in the name of national security human rights of vulnerable sections of the society are abused.

While the issue of human rights remains ‘constructed’ from above, meaning that it is formulated by state authorities and international agencies, over the years, the idea of ‘human rights from below’ has gained momentum; this idea is linked with rights and responsibilities of local communities. The concept of human rights for the local communities arise from shared experiences, traditions and cultures which the state must give due importance.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Human rights: These are certain universal rights, regardless of sex, religion, ethnic origin etc. that make our life meaningful and help us live with dignity. These rights range from right to education, food, health, liberty etc. Most of these rights are recognized by states and international community. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) laid the foundation of international human rights law. Together with the

International Covenant for Civil and Political Rights (1966), and the International Covenant for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights(1966) – constitute the International Bill of Rights.

The idea of reconciliation is important for peace. All religions mention about the importance of forgiveness and reconciliations. In South Africa (1996-2003) the Truth and Reconciliation Commission played an important role in putting forward to the public the atrocities that were committed during apartheid years. Such a commission was established in Australia too, the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (2001) which identified the ‘historical wrongs’ committed on the aboriginal community. Peace is identified with tranquility of the individual, harmony between communities and cooperation between states. As such it is dependent upon a variety of factors. Any attempt to have long term ‘peace’ at different levels is a misnomer.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Questions:

1. What is peace?
2. What is the Geneva Conventions?
3. What are human rights?
4. What is TRANSCEND?
5. What is Track II diplomacy?

1.6 Peacemaking and Peace-building

Conflicts often lead to direct violence, and resolution of the same depends on a large number of factors. ‘Peacemaking’ as a concept is related with measures taken by different actors to reduce the intensity and frequency of direct conflicts. Conflict and its resolution largely depend on how an individual or a state sees it to be, *i.e* through ‘lenses’.

Globally, the United Nations and its agencies have played an important role in conflict management and its resolution. The United Nations has been involved in a number of peacekeeping operations since its formation. It was in 1948 when the Security Council authorized the deployment of UN military observers to the Middle East- United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO); since then the UN has conducted more than 70 such operations across the globe.⁵ The early years were confined to-

*Peacekeeping was primarily limited to maintaining ceasefires and stabilizing situations on the ground, providing crucial support for political efforts to resolve conflict by peaceful means. Those missions consisted of unarmed military observers and lightly armed troops with primarily monitoring, reporting and confidence-building roles.*⁶

In the post-cold war era, owing to the change of nature of conflict, the mandate of UNPKOs completely changed. They are now engaged in a variety of activities which range from- ‘helping to build sustainable institutions of governance, to human rights monitoring, to security sector reform, to the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants’.⁷

STOP TO CONSIDER

Principles of UN Peacekeeping Operations: UNPKOs are based on three mutually reinforcing and inter-related principles. These are-

- Consent of the parties
- Impartiality
- Non-use of force except in self-defence and defence of the mandate

For more details-<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/principles-of-peacekeeping>

Likewise the NATO, formed in 1949, is a ‘crisis management organisation that has the capacity to undertake a wide range of military operations and missions’.⁸Resolving a conflict and ensuring long term peace can be achieved through an interest based approach’, which is a compromise based solution between the opposing camps. Again, the underlying principle of conflict resolution is a commitment of all parties concerned to peace and ‘non-violence’.

Peace-building, on the other hand is a long term commitment, a process which encourages reconciliation of warring groups and reformation of political institutions. It involves transformation of relations between peoples, communities and nations-through negotiation and dialogue.According to the ‘Agenda for Peace’⁹a report published by then UN Secretary General, BoutrosBoutrosGhali, peacemaking and peacekeeping operations must be complemented by post-conflict peace-building efforts which includes implementation of projects that bring the warring camps together. Amongst others, it includes ‘freer travel, cultural exchanges and mutually beneficial youth and educational projects’. In post conflict zones, peace-building must address the issue of ‘landmines’, capacity building programmes for officials and measures to strengthen public participation and democratic institutions.

1.7 Summing up

Violence and conflict have proved to be an endemic feature of global politics; peace though is a universal goal for all actors, has proved to be elusive. State behavior is often influenced by structural conditions, and power as well as national interest have often been key determinants in a states’ foreign policy. The absence of direct violence may or may not indicate the prevalence of peace. Structural violence often creates challenges for the vast majority of humanity which makes peace unattainable.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Questions:

7. What is UN Peacekeeping Operations?
8. What are Human Rights?
9. What is the Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa?
10. What is human security
11. What is peacebuilding?
12. In which year was the IPCC awarded the Nobel Prize?

1.8 References and Suggested Readings

Chadwick F. Alger, *Peace Research and Peacebuilding*, Springer (USA), 2014.

Charles Webel and Johan Galtung (ed) *Handbook of peace and conflict studies*, Routledge (NY), 2007.

Dunne, T., Milja Kurki and Steve Smith (eds.) (2013), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 3rd edn., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ho-Won Jeong, *Peace and Conflict Studies: An Introduction*, Ashgate Publishing (UK), 2000.

Oliver P. Richmond, *Peace in International Relations*, Routledge (NY), 2008

Thomas Matyók Jessica Senehi Sean Byrne (eds) *Critical Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies*, Owmann & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (UK) 2001.

Weber, Cynthia (2010), *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction* (3rd edn.) London: Sage

1.9 Model Questions

A) Short Questions

Q 1: In which year was Martin Luther King awarded the Nobel Prize for peace ?

Q 2: What is the full form of UNMOGIP?

Q 3: What is the full form of UDHR?

Q 4: In which year was the International Covenant for Civil and Political Rights adopted by the UN?

Q 5: When was the NATO formed?

B) Long Questions

Q 1: Discuss the concept of negative and positive peace.

Q 2: Discuss the role of UNPKO in bringing about peace in world politics.

Q 3: Evaluate the concept of nonviolence and its relationship with peace.

Q 4: Evaluate the challenges to 'creating' peace.

Q 5: Discuss Johan Galtung's contribution to peace research..

1.10 Answers to Check Your Progress

Answer to Q No. 1: 1964

Answer to Q No. 2: United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan

Answer to Q No. 3: Universal Declaration of Human rights

Answer to Q No. 4: 1966

Answer to Q No. 5: 1949

*****XXXXXXXX*****

¹A New Era of Conflict and Violence, available at <https://www.un.org/en/un75/new-era-conflict-and-violence>, accessed on 24 August 2021

² Fragility, Conflict and Violence, available at <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/overview>, accessed on 24 August 2021

³ Global Peace Index 2021, available at <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GPI-2021-web.pdf>, accessed on 24 August 2021

⁴ Counselling and training for conflict transformation and peace-building: the TRANSCEND approach Wilfried Graf, Gudrun Kramer and Augustin Nicolescou in Charles Webel and Johan Galtung (ed) Handbook of peace and conflict studies, NY: Routledge, 2007 ,pp.129.

⁵ For complete list of UN Peacekeeping Operations ,available at <https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/peacekeeping/en/operationslist.pdf>

⁶ Our History, United Nations Peacekeeping, available at <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/our-history>

⁷ Our History, United Nations Peacekeeping, available at <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/our-history>

⁸ Operations and missions: past and present, available at https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_52060.htm

⁹ Boutros Boutros-Ghali, An agenda for Peace , available at <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/145749?ln=en>

UNIT 2 PEACE MOVEMENTS

CONTENTS

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Objectives
- 2.3 Peace movements-concept
- 2.4. Origins of peace movements
- 2.5 Peace movements in the post-Cold War era
- 2.6 Peace movement-an evaluation
- 2.7 Summing up
- 2.8 References and Suggested Readings
- 2.9 Model Questions
- 2.10 Answer to Check Your Progress

2.1 Introduction

While the importance of peace has always been advocated by all the political actors, seldom has it been achieved. The growing incidence of violence and wars globally reveal that the steps by various states to address insecurity and violent conflict have proved to be inadequate. Some form of structural violence pervades across nearly all sections of the society. Peace movements have been instrumental in shaping international law as well as in influencing state behavior. Over the years, the nature of peace movements has changed to include anti-war movements, anti-nuclear movements, civil rights movement etc. World politics in the new millennium has changed and so too has the threats. Increased militarization, global terrorism, refugees and involuntary displacement of people are some of key problems faced by greater humanity. Peace movements have sprung up across the globe, they do face daunting challenges.

2.2 Objectives

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

- know the concept of peace movement,
- know about the origin of peace movements,
- understand the challenges to peace movements in contemporary times.

2.3 Peace movement- concept

Peace movements are a kind of social movement which have come to play an important role in pressurizing states and non-state agencies in renouncing wars, greater adherence to international humanitarian laws and respect for human rights. Such movements seek to reduce violence and achieve peace between different warring camps. They adopt various means to achieve these goals which include- lobbying for anti-war legislation and supporting political parties which have a strong anti-war manifestoes. Through political demonstrations, peace marches, promote people to people activities and greater use of social media, such movements try to influence public opinion and shape national legislation. Often such movements are supported by environmentalists, feminists and civil rights groups. Very often peace movements are event driven, and peace activists and groups lead such movements from different parts of the world.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Social movements: it is a form of sustained collective action to promote or preserve a change. Rather than an individual actor, it consists of a dense network of relations who are working towards a common goal. They are developed by a group of individuals, who are supported through different networks, who share strong 'collective identity'. Many a times, social movement question state policies on development or its attitude towards civil liberties. Social movements have led to alteration of state policies on environments, race relations and militarism.

A peace movement starts with the belief that human beings should engage in war or violent conflict including ethnic cleansing etc. They oppose militarization of state and society as well as the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The character of peace movements has changed – as they now target issues of social justice and protection of human rights.

2.4 Origins of peace movements:

The beginnings : The earliest forms of peace movements were more 'religious' in nature as it was led by the Church often seeking to restrain violence by the nobility, the Peace and Truce of God in the Middle Ages (5th -15th centuries), it led laid down the foundation of modern peace movements in Europe. By the 16th century, new Christian sects like with Quakers, Amish and the Mennonites started to make their presence felt by advocating 'pacifism'. In the 18th century, works by Immanuel Kant -*Thoughts on Perpetual Peace* and efforts by Jeremy Bentham for the formation of a peace movement was well recognized. It was during Napoleonic Wars (1803-1815), that universalist ideals emerged; anti-war petitions and anti-war demonstrations took place in Britain. The first peace movement in the United States was launched by David Low Dodge- New York Peace Society in 1815. Subsequently the London Peace Society was launched in 1816 and the First International Peace Congress was convened in London (1843).The American Civil war (1861-65), the Crimean War (1853-56) did highlight the horrors of war to the general public.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Peace: As a concept, it is a process as well as a goal. While it refers to 'tranquility' on one hand, it is also seen as 'absence of violence' on the other side of the spectrum. Johan Galtung distinguishes between 'negative' and 'positive' peace; the former is related 'absence of war' and the latter is related 'transformation' of individual and state behavior. Peace is often strained through 'direct violence' and 'structural violence'. 'Peace' as a tool to further political change has been advocated by Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr.

During the war, several groups emerged protested against the war- Fellowship of Reconciliation (1914) Woman's Peace Party (1915), the American Union Against Militarism (1915). The use of chemical weapons against combatant and non-combatants renewed the debate on the need for humanitarian laws and restraint on the use of particular

weapons. The formation of the League of Nations (1920) presented a slender hope for peace in world politics.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Gandhi and nonviolence: Considered to India's 'father of the nation', Mahatma Gandhi through his ideas of nonviolence (ahimsa) greatly shaped the course of India's independence and world politics. Influenced by the pacific ideas of Leo Tolstoy, he employed the methods of nonviolent resistance to British rule. Mahatma Gandhi steered nationwide campaigns against untouchability, respect for rights of the women, and attainment of 'swaraj'. His notable work includes –The Story of my Experiment with Truth.

World War II (1941-45) and its aftermath: While several anti-war groups continued to operate, growing nationalism ensured that its activism and sentiment towards it declined. Pacifists in general were targeted by the Third Reich in Germany. Eminent personalities like Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein adopted two varying strands towards the war. For the former, adopting a position of 'relative pacifism', argued that war was necessary to defeat the Nazis; Einstein in his book *Ideas and Opinions* (1954) argued about the continuing need to loathe violence, but realized that "these hateful weapons provided the only effective protection." It is estimated that World War II led to deaths of more than 75 million.

The atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki left a deep impact on Japanese society; subsequently peace movements became prominent in Japan. The Anti-nuclear movement was led by the *Japanese Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs* and in the UK the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (1958) was held. Research by scientists and increasing public pressure led to a moratorium on over-ground nuclear tests and the signing of Partial Test Ban treaty (1963) by the governments of US, USSR and the UK. Anti-nuclear protest marches took place across the United States including the International Day of Nuclear Disarmament (June 20, 1983) and the Great Peace March for Global Nuclear Disarmament (1986).

STOP TO CONSIDER

Vietnam War: Also known as the Second Indochina War (1955-75) was fought between North Vietnam (supported by the Soviet Union and China) and South Vietnam (supported by the USA, South Korea etc). During 1967-69, as death tolls began to rise, anti-war marches took place in several cities across the US. In 1967, Martin Luther King Jr., a civil rights activist, bolstered the anti-war movement by his opposition to the Vietnam War. This war also drove the 'underground papers' which were published independently in the United States and advent of Woodstock music festival.

Three Generations of peace approach¹: According to Johan Galtung (2008) that there are three generations of peace approach. The *first generation* to peace was a 'reaction against war'. Lasting efforts till World War II, this generation of peace movements advocated the

abolition of war as a social institution. Stressing the need for global governance, it advocated mechanisms of ‘democracy, human rights and regimes’. The motto for this generation was ‘Peace is too important to leave to the generals.’

STOP TO CONSIDER

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC): The ICRC is an agency which is ‘independent, neutral organization’ that ensure ‘humanitarian protection and assistance for victims of armed’.

It takes action in response to emergencies and at the same time promotes respect for international humanitarian law and its implementation in national law. The work of the ICRC is based on the Geneva Conventions of 1949, their Additional Protocols, its Statutes – and those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement – and the resolutions of the International Conferences of the Red Cross and Red Crescent.

The Red Cross has been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize four times- 1917, 1944, and 1963 as well as award to Henri Dunant (1901), who was the ‘father’ of the Red cross. More details are available at www.icrc.org

The second generation to peace, between the World War II and the end of the Cold War, was a ‘reaction against governments’. People were questioning state policies towards wars and violent conflict. This generation gave importance to peace education and nonviolence. It advocated conflict transformation in a more creative manner. Icons such Martin Luther King Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi came to the forefront. NGOs were increasing becoming active in resolving violent conflict. The motto for this generation-‘Peace is too important to leave to the states’.

The third generation to peace approach started at the end of the Cold War. By the motto ‘Peace is too important for shallow approaches’, it advocated the importance of ‘peace cultures’ and creation of ‘peace structures’ that address increasing gulf between different classes and gender. According to this generation, the states must address the ‘basic needs’.

Peace Marches			
Peace Marches/walks	Goal	Place	Year
Aldermaston Marches	Anti –nuclear demonstration	England	1950-60
European Peace Marches	Protest arms race and against military spending	UK , Germany	1978-1992
The Great Peace March for Global Nuclear Disarmament,	Elimination of nuclear weapons	USA	1986
Black coat protests or lawyers’ movement	Independence of judiciary	Pakistan	2007
Olof Palme peace march	Opposition to nuclear arms race	East Germany	1987
The World is Bordo	Anti-terrorism rally	Tunisia	2015
The Women's Peace Crusade	Spread the idea of	Great	1916-18

	'people's peace'	Britain	
--	------------------	---------	--

2.5 Peace movements in the post-Cold War era

The end of the cold war reflected new realities- a unipolar world, the stress on 'democracy' by the international community, the prevalence of a liberal order. But it only reflected only one part the world, while most countries in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia continued to grapple with conditions of poverty, corrupt authoritarian regimes, and rampant abuse of human right of vulnerable sections of the society. While the goal of peace activism shifted from disarmament and nuclear arms, at an international level, there was renewed focus on opposition to humanitarian intervention. Opposition to "operation Desert Storm" did cause a little discomfort to US government, peace movements in Europe were fairly intense in opposing NATO's intervention in the conflicts in Yugoslavia more particularly, Kosovo.

The impact of peace movements on global politics and state policies is a matter of debate. The anti-war protests led to withdrawal of the US from Vietnam, it did not affect its long term policies as it continued to indulge in 'humanitarian intervention' in different parts of the world. Again, anti-nuclear protests did yield in in some form of moratorium on the testing and use of nuclear weapons; however, it is conventional weapons that are causing more fatalities in the twenty-first century. The growth of non-conventional security threats to humankind has meant that the nature of peace activism and movements too has changed. In the late 1990s, issues of peace and peace-building became integrated to a broader agenda of 'global justice movement'. Such movements are part of the new social movements which are different from the traditional social movements which were more related with labour and workers. On February 15, 2003, under the banner 'the world says non to war', 12-14 million people came out to protest against war in Iraq across 800 cities around the globe, crying out slogans such as 'Not in my name ' and 'No blood for oil'. It must be recalled that mass movements' proceeds in cycle wherein 'periods of mobilization and demobilization alternate.'² The demography of participants had changed too as it included activists with high levels of education, a relatively large proportion of whom were women, belonged to the younger age cohorts, and predominantly worked in the human service sector.³ Today, peace movements do not operate in isolation, but rather are part of factors which contribute to transformation of society and state policies by stressing on the need for peaceful change.

2.6 Peace movements: evaluation

Seldom have the trajectory of wars been decided by peace movements; most end with heavy casualties for all parties concerned. The growing voice of nationalism often prevents the goal of achieving international solidarity that is in favour of 'peace'. The importance of peace movements should be judged by their ability to influence state behaviour and its policies.

Protests that led to social and political changes		
Incident/event	Place	Year
The Salt March	India	1930
Suffrage Parade	USA	1913
Delano Grape Boycott	USA	1960s

Montgomery Bus Boycott	USA	1955-56
Singing Revolution	Estonia	1988

The impacts of peace movements have been felt mostly in Europe where they successfully helped transform public opinion towards wars and violent conflict. The voices of peace movements continue to remain intermittent at best. The threat of use of nuclear weapons and conventional wars has greatly reduced. The unconventional wars- global terrorism, ethnic conflict, genocide however continue in different parts of the world. Unlike the western world, peace movements are yet to gather momentum in the developing countries and those countries that are being directly affected by violent conflict. For peace movements to be successful, they need to mobilise sufficient support towards the greater goal, *i.e.* sustainable peace. Often, a tattered coalition of different NGOs seldom works in achieving this goal. Non-violent protests and marches do help bring about more state accountability, but most movements rarely go the distance. Often resolution of conflicts are interrelated with a host of ‘support factors’- human rights violation, refugees, displacement, achieving human security. Therefore peace movements often go beyond the issue of peace and look to address the ‘support factors’ that bring peace.

Peace movements are not monolithic in character- they differ in organization, scope and methods in achieving their goals. In the long run, the success or failure of peace movements should be judged by their ability to transform lives of combatants and non-combatants as well as alter state policies.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Humanitarian law: These are a set of laws which are related with armed conflict; it seeks to ‘humanise’ arm conflict. It seeks to protect human rights of combatant and noncombatants. Also referred to as ‘laws of armed conflict’, it seeks to regulate ‘jus in bello’ or ‘conduct of war’. Over the year, conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan reveal that warring parties have seldom respected international humanitarian law (IHL) and have engaged in ‘war crimes’. The Geneva Conventions (1949) form the bedrock of IHL.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Questions:

1. What is peace?
2. What is a social movement?
3. What is nonviolence?
4. What is the ICRC?
5. What are peace movements?
6. What are International Humanitarian Laws?

2.7 Summing up

People's grievances against the state and its policies have been on an upward trajectory. The Arab Spring and other movements like the 'Occupy Wall Street, 'Black Lives Matter' and the 'Me Too' reflect the diversity of global justice movement where the stress has been on 'dignity' of the individual or their community. Globalisation and neoliberalism has affected lives of millions of peoples worldwide, and increasingly women, workers, minorities, LGBTQ are part of this global coalition which is seeking justice from states and questioning social structures. The Middle East, Tunisia, Syria, Lebanon have all witnessed clashes between state authorities and students; protest movements have become common in the West too. Racism and discrimination continues challenge greater humanity. Authoritarian regimes and their use of indiscriminate anti-terror laws on minorities reflect that 'peace' is still far away for most of the general population. In contemporary times, peace movements continue to 'event specific' and are rather disjointed in their efforts to achieve their goals. But a world where 'insecurity' has been the more dominant factor that has guided the behavior of communities and nation-states, peace movements will continue to remain in shadows. Operating through a large coalition, peace movements still have a long way road ahead. With the advent of social media, peace activism has become more mainstream and the role of the state is evermore scrutinized. There is an urgent need to have global institutions that are more broad-based in character where human rights and dignity of all is well respected.

2.8 References and Suggested Readings

Baylis, J., Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (2008), *The Globalisation of World Politics*, (New York: Oxford University Press).

Brown, Chris and Kirsten Ainley (2005), *Understanding International Relations* (3rd edn.), New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Porta, Donatella della and Mario Diani. (2006) *Social movements : an introduction* , Blackwell Publishing (UK).

Hermann T. (1992) . 'Contemporary Peace Movements: Between the Hammer of Political Realism and the Anvil of Pacifism'. *Western Political Quarterly*. 45(4):869-893.

Johnson, Richard L. (1996) 'Failures and Successes of Peace Movements', *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 2:2, 173-175, DOI: 10.1207/s15327949pac0202_6.

A. Snow, David and Sarah A. Soule, Hanspeter Kriesi, (2004) *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd (UK).

Chiba ,S. and Thomas J. Schoenbaum (2008), *Peace Movements and Pacifism after September 11*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc. (USA).

Cortright, D. (2008) *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas*, Cambridge University Press (UK).

Berger, S. and Holger Nehring (2017) *The History of Social Movements in Global Perspective - A Survey*, Palgrave Macmillan (UK).

2.9 Model Questions

A) Short Questions

Q 1: In which year did the ‘Suffrage Parade’ take place?

Q 2: Who is Olof Palme?

Q 3: In which year was Henry Dunant awarded the Nobel Peace prize?

Q 4: What Were Aldermaston Marches?

Q 5: Who was Martin Luther King Jr.?

Q 6: In which year did the ‘Great Peace March for Global Nuclear Disarmament’ take place?

B) Long Questions

Q 1: Discuss the concept of peace movement.

Q 2: Write a brief note on the three generations of peace approach.

Q 3: Discuss the importance of peace movements in the post-Cold War era.

Q 4: What are the reasons for the limited success of peace movements?

Q 5: Discuss the origins and changing nature of peace movements.

2.10 Answers to Check Your Progress

Answer to Q No. 1: 1913

Answer to Q No. 2: Prime Minister of Sweden from 1969-76 and 1982-86

Answer to Q No. 3: 1901

Answer to Q No. 4: It was a series of marches that took place in the UK to protest against nuclear weapons.

Answer to Q No. 5: He was a civil rights activist in USA.

Answer to Q No. 6: 1986

*****XXXXXXXX*****

¹Galtung, Johan (2008). ‘Searching for peace in a world of terrorism and state terrorism’ in Shin Chiba, Thomas J. Schoenbaum (eds) *Peace movements and pacifism after September 11*, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, (UK) 2008, pp42-43.

²Klandermans, B. (2010). Legacies from the Past: Eight Cycles of Peace Protest. In Tarrow S. (Author) & Walgrave S. & Rucht D. (Eds.), *The World Says No to War: Demonstrations against the War on Iraq* (pp. 61-77). University of Minnesota Press. Retrieved August 29, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctts43x.8>

³Giugni, Marco. (2015). Peace Movements. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.96021-5.

UNIT 3

CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND DIPLOMACY

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Conflict: Sources and Types
- 1.4 Meaning and evolution of conflict resolution
- 1.5 Methods of Conflict Resolution
- 1.6 Diplomacy: Meaning and Definition
 - 1.6.1 Function
 - 1.6.2 Types
- 1.7 Future of diplomacy
- 1.8 Summing up
- 1.9 References and suggested readings

1.1 Introduction

To quote Joseph Frankel, ‘An important dimension of international relations is found in the dominant modes in which states conduct their international behavior and engage in interaction.’ Whenever there are human beings living together they enter into certain relationships with one another. Such interaction between individuals and groups in social life takes various forms such as cooperation, competition and conflict. When individuals or groups combine to gain a goal, it is called cooperation. Competition is a form of opposition or struggle in which two or more parties struggle for some mutually desired goal. It occurs whenever and wherever the goals available are limited in supply. It implies that there are rules of the game in which competitors must conform. When competition breaks through the rules it transforms itself into conflict. In conflict one party seek to obtain their goals by thwarting, injuring or even destroying the opponent in order to secure a goal. International relations are basically the study of interstate relations in these three aspects: cooperation, competition and conflict. In this chapter, we will have a detailed study on how nations enter into conflict with each other for various reasons and the various methods

used for conflict resolution. Similarly we will also understand the concept of diplomacy and its importance in international relations. Diplomacy is a part and parcel of international relations. Foreign policy comes into action only through diplomacy. The Oxford English Dictionary defines diplomacy as “The management of international relations by negotiation; the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys; the business or art of the diplomatist.” Thus, diplomacy is one of the major instruments or techniques of executing foreign policy. The following chapter will help us to understand the types, functions, importance and future of diplomacy in international relations.

1.2 Objectives:

The main objectives of this chapter are to understand the following in details:

1. *Meaning* of conflict
2. *Types and Sources* of conflict
3. *Methods* of conflict resolution
4. *Meaning, Types, Functions* of diplomacy
5. *Future* of diplomacy in international relations

1.3 Conflict: Sources and Types

The term conflict is used to mean a variety of things such as disagreement, fight, argue, debate, contest, clash, war etc. Lewis Coser, an American sociologist defines conflict as “Clash of values and interests, the tension between what is and what some groups feel ought to be.” International society is composed of a number of sovereign states which are governed by self-interest. These states do not recognize any superior authority standing over them. As a result all state relationships contain elements of conflict. The desires and beliefs of states can never be identical resulting in inevitability of conflicts between them. Competition takes place between states for scarce resources, trade, territory, status, security, influence or goodwill. Each of these is insufficient to satisfy the demands of all, conflicts occurs over how they should be divided and over what principles should determine that division. States compete with each other for some mutually desired goals. But competition often breaks between them which transform itself into conflict.

International conflict arises between states. Conflict that occurs between states takes the form of revolutions, civil disorders, terrorism etc. International conflict arises from the aims and activities of independent states. Countries of greater capability will have wider and more varied interests and conflict between them will have regional or global significance. For example, during the cold war period, the conflict between USA and USSR created a hostile environment dividing the world into two poles. Both the superpowers had the potentiality to interfere in the conflicts of the lesser powers.

A careful study of the histories of major conflicts in the present century reveals the following sources of conflict. These are:

1. **Limited territorial conflicts:** This type of conflict arise where there are incompatible positions with reference to possession of a specific portion of territory (Sino-Indian conflict over the MacMohan Line) or to rights enjoyed by one state in or near the territory of another (Soviet right in Sakhalin islands).
2. **Conflicts over the composition of a government:** This type of conflict developed over the composition of a government more particularly during the cold war period. For example, the American and Soviet involvements in the Vietnam War revolved around the question what would constitute a legitimate government in that country and the two superpowers held incompatible positions.
3. **Imperialism:** This is another source of conflict in which one nation seeks to subjugate other peoples by force for commercial and security purposes. For example, Nazi Germany's occupation of Austrian and Soviet occupation of a part of Poland in 1931 and in 1939 respectively.
4. **Strategic Imperialism:** This type of conflict arises when one attempts to secure territorial rights or privileges from another state in order to protect its security interests. Israel's incorporation of some areas of Arab states is an example which is the result of strategic imperialism.
5. **Liberation:** Conflicts may arise due to the liberation conflicts or revolutionary wars wages by one state to liberate the people of another state usually for security or ideological reasons. In this context, we may take the example of India's war against Pakistan to liberate the people of Bangladesh.
6. **Ethnonational confrontation:** Control over ethnic minorities is a major source of international conflict such as the present Iran-Iraq conflict and the Lebanese conflict.
7. **Unifying a divided country:** Conflicts may arise from a government's objective of unifying a divided territory for example: The Korean war of 1950.

Types of Conflict: International conflicts may be classified as the following:

1. **Great power conflict** as typically represented by Soviet-U.S cold war politics resulting in bipolar politics.
2. **Violent conflicts** as in the case of Korean War resulting from a) differing capacities, b) differing ideological and political systems, c) differing attitudes towards the settlements of problems of unification of the two Koreas, d) the ethno-national conflicts between Israel and the Arab countries.
3. **Hegemonic conflicts** which may arise for establishing hegemonic power in the world for example: U.S attempt to impose its will in Korea, Vietnam, as well as soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan.
4. **Muted conflicts** such as the conflicts between Somalia and its neighbors which started with diplomatic exchanges and escalated to guerilla warfare and occasional clashes between regular armies. It finally ended in the conclusion of a series of agreements leading to the normalization of relation between Somalia and its neighbors.

Apart from this, another distinction has been made between **objective** and **subjective conflict**.

Objective conflict: Conflict over power relations, distribution of land and resources, and symbols such as prestige, influence and security is objective conflict. The traditional view is that all conflict, of which there a fixed amount to be shared in any is given situation, is of this nature. The result will either be victory by one side or the other (as in the case of zero sum game) or a compromise made by some form of third party intervention.

Subjective conflict: Conflict is said to be subjective when it is value based though the parties may see it as a conflict of interest. In a number of conflicting situations the outcome could be equally satisfying to both sides. Thus there is the possibility that a conflict that appears to have arisen from objective differences of interest might be transformed into one when both sides could gain from collaboration. This happens when the parties in conflict originally could not assess the costs or outcomes of the conflict.

This was all about conflict. Now we have to understand the meaning of conflict resolution. In general term, conflict resolution means the process of resolving a problem or a dispute. Following discussions will give us a detailed analysis of the meaning of conflict resolution.

1.4 Meaning and evolution of conflict resolution:

Conflict resolution involves the process of settling disputes or disagreements between parties to establish peace. It can be defined as “The development and implementation of peaceful strategies for settling conflicts—using alternatives to violent forms of language—are known as conflict resolution” (Goldstein, 2003). We may also say that conflict resolution is an umbrella term for a whole range of methods and approaches for dealing with conflict: from negotiation to diplomacy, from mediation to arbitration, from facilitation to adjudication, from conflict management to conflict transformation and from restorative justice to peacekeeping. Thus it refers to a range of process aimed at alleviating or eliminating sources of conflict.

The process of conflict resolution mainly started in 1950s and 1960s at the peak of the cold war period mainly when the development of nuclear weapons and the conflict between the two superpowers (USA and USSR) seemed to threaten human survival. A group of pioneers from different disciplines saw the value of studying conflict whether it occurs in international relations, communities, families or individuals. A group of people in North America and Europe began to establish research groups to new ideas. Thus the new ideas developed and the field of conflict resolution began to spread through scholarly journals by the 1980s. For example, in the war torn regions of Africa and South East Asia, humanitarian agencies were seeing the need to take account of conflict and conflict resolution as an integral part of their activities. At the same time, International Organizations set up conflict resolution mechanisms and conflict prevention centers. Former US President Jimmy Carter became one of the most active leaders of conflict resolution and Non –Governmental Organisations (NGOs).

The first institution of peace and conflict research appeared in the twenty year period between (1945-1965). The peace research Laboratory was founded by T. F. Lentz at St-Louis, Missouri after the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki 1945. Kenneth Boulding an economist at the University of Michigan initiated the journal of conflict resolution (JCR) in 1957 and also set up the centre for research on conflict resolution in 1959. Influence by Gandhian ideas, John Galtung found a unit for research in peace and conflict in the University of Oslo. He was also the founding editor of Journal of Peace research launched in 1964. Apart from this Adam Curle and Elise were other great scholars who later on developed practice of mediation and new voices of conflict resolution.

STEPS TO CONSIDER

Growth of conflict resolution as a field of study since (1975-2010)

1976: (Latin American Council for peace Investigation), Latin American regional affiliate of IPRA Guatemala.

1979: University of Ulster, Centre for the study of conflict (Northern Ireland).

1980: University for Peace, UN University, Costa Rica.

1982: Carter Centre: International Negotiation Net Work.

1984: Nairobi Peace Group (from 1990, National Peace Initiative).

1984: United States Institute of Peace Washington.

1985: International Alert, United Kingdom.

1986: Conflict Resolution Network, Australia.

1986: Harvard Law School, Program on Negotiation.

1986: Jean B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame, U.S.A.

1988: Institute for Conflict Resolution and Analysis, George Mason University, USA.

1988: Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution/ European Peace University.

1990: Centre for Conflict Resolution, University of Bradford.

1991: First European on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution, Istanbul.

1991: Gastonz. Ortigas Peace Institute, Philippines.

1992: Centre for Conflict Resolution, University of Cape Town South Africa.

1992: Institute for Multi -Track Diplomacy Washington.

1992: Academic Associates Peace Works, Nigeria.

1992: Instituto Peruano de Resolución de Conflictos, Negociación, Medicación, Peru.

1993: Berghof Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management, Berlin.

1993: Organization of African Unity, Mechanism for Conflict, Mechanism for Conflict, Prevention, Management and Resolution.

1993 : University of Ulster/United Nations University : Initiative of Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity (INCORE).

1994: The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

1994: (Ibero-American Conferences on Peace and the Treatment of Conflicts), Chile.

1994: International Resource Group Somalia, Kenya, Horn of Africa.

1995: UNESCO'S Culture of Peace Programme.

1996: European Centre for Conflict, Prevention, Holland.

1996: Forum on Early Warning and Early Response-London.

2000: The Nelson Mandela Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution-Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi.

2010: PG Diploma in Conflict Resolution- Department of West Asian Studies, Aligarh Muslim University.

In today's global world conflict resolution has immense importance and relevance. It can be said that it is only through the mechanism of conflict resolution, conflicts rivalries and disputes can be minimized and thus peace can be established. Conflict resolution has become a mechanism of peace building and peace making process. Conflict resolution lays emphasis upon peaceful and non-violent methods such as diplomacy, negotiation, communication, arbitration, mediation and through cooperative and confidence building majors. It is well known that "Violence Begets Violence" and humanity can be preserved and protected from the onslaught of war and holocaust only when the conflicted parties are prepared to adopt conflict resolution mechanism for solution of their disputes. Conflict resolution is an integral part of social justice and social transformation which aims to tackle the human crisis through the peaceful means and avoid conflicts among the nation states. It can be argued that conflict resolution mechanism is the protector guardian and custodian of peace, harmony, social justice, and equity across the globe.

SAP

Do you think elimination of conflict is possible from international politics? Justify your answer.

1.5 Methods of Conflict Resolution:

From the above discussion we have come to know about the meaning and evolution of conflict resolution. It is to be mentioned here that conflicts start among people due to clash of interests and gains. Same is the case of the nation-states. Conflicts in human society can be resolved when we will give equal and due share to the marginalized and downtrodden sections of the society. In different societies there are different types of conflicts where different methods and techniques of conflict resolution have to be used. It is to be mentioned here that war is the last resort in political phenomenon. The aim of conflict resolution is not the elimination of war which is actually impossible and unrealistic. Rather the primary aim and objective of conflict resolution is to transform actual and potential violent situation into which is to establish

1. Negotiations:

Negotiation means a discussion of two or more people with the goal of reaching on agreement. It is an integral part of every human activity. The term negotiation means all the interactions, strategies, and face to face efforts to argue with and modify the position of an adversary. Negotiations between nations can be either bilateral or multilateral. Negotiations can be conducted either between Heads of States or Ambassadors or the representatives of the conflicting states involved.

2. Mediation:

Mediation is a voluntary and confidential method for handling conflict. It has become a popular term in the discussion of conflict resolution. Mediation implies that there is collaboration between conflicting parties with an unbiased third party acting as a mediator. The third party mediator who derives authority from the parties themselves would help the parties to assess the conflict situation realistically and stimulate the parties to reach an agreement among them which does not appear to be a compromise to either group. The mediator regulates a process of discussion and negotiation between conflicting parties to achieve the main goal of mediation, which is to establish an agreement that will resolve the conflict. However successful mediation depends on the skills and experience of mediators. For example, the former Soviet Union mediated a settlement between India and Pakistan at Tashkent in 1965.

3. Adjudication and arbitration:

The final method of resolving international conflict is adjudication and arbitration. Under this method the parties by mutual agreement submit the issues under contention to an independent legal tribunal, the International Court of Justice. The court is supposed to decide the case on the basis of international law and its jurisdiction usually extends to legal issues. This procedure is seldom used except to handle disputes and minor issues normally friendly states.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Why does conflict arise in international relations? Discuss its main sources.
2. What are the different types of conflict?
3. Distinguish between subjective and objective conflict.
4. What do you mean by conflict resolution? Discuss its importance in present international politics.
5. Discuss the various methods of conflict resolution with examples.

1.6 Diplomacy: Meaning and definition

Diplomacy is an art of maintaining relations between the states. It is an ancient instrument of foreign policy. The ancient Greek city states had diplomatic relations with one another. For example, according to the famous Greek political philosopher Thucydides, the ancient Greek city states developed a very well-structured diplomatic link in around 500 BC. This ancient art is still alive in the 21st century, despite many challenges and transformations. Today diplomacy is one of the major instruments or techniques of executing foreign policy though the terms foreign policy and diplomacy are used interchangeably and are interdependent yet these are technically different. Foreign policy is the business of governments (top leaders as policy makers such as head of government, cabinet ministers, and top foreign ministry bureaucrats and advisors), whereas diplomacy is the job of trained officials (diplomats such as envoys, ambassadors, high commissioners, consuls general etc). The former is the substance, the latter is the method. However both the terms are interdependent and complementary in this complex contemporary world. Foreign policy comes into action only through diplomacy. It has become part and parcel of international relations. It is the method of communication among governments for the maintenance of international relations. The Oxford English Dictionary defines diplomacy as “the management of international relations by negotiation; the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys; the business or art of the diplomatist.” Nicholson, a great Frankel defines diplomacy as “the business of communicating between governments.” Harold Nicolson, a great scholar and practitioner of diplomacy in the twentieth century explains five different meanings of the word diplomacy. These are:

- a) As a synonym for foreign policy
 - b) as negotiation
 - c) the machinery by which such negotiation is carried out
 - d) as a branch of the foreign service and
 - d) as an abstract quality or gift, which, in its best sense, implies skill in the conduct of international negotiation; and its worst sense, implies the more guileful aspects of fact. Thus from the above definition, we can conclude that
- i) Diplomacy is a technique of implementing foreign policy.
 - ii) It is a channel of communication between governments.
 - iii) It is a method of adjusting and managing inter-state relations.
 - iv) It is a quality or skill of international negotiations.
 - v) It is a bargaining game aiming at achieving maximum and giving minimum.
 - vi) It is the art of forwarding nation’s interests.

- vii) It is workable and useful both in peace and war.
- viii) For successful and effective working of diplomacy requires trained and professional diplomats.

Thus diplomacy may be defined both in a broad and narrow sense. In a broad sense, diplomacy means the conduct of relations between states and other political entities (such as the UNO, SAARC and so on) through bilateral negotiations, multilateral conferences and international organizations. In its narrower sense, diplomacy refers to the process of representation and negotiation by which states commonly deal with one another.

STEPS TO CONSIDER

CLASSIFICATION OF DIPLOMATS

In a technical and professional sense diplomacy includes two types of personnel. These are:

1. Diplomatic personnel: the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961) divided the heads of diplomatic missions into three categories. The first category comprises ambassadors and high commissioners, the second categories comprise Envoys extra-ordinary and Ministers Plenipotentiary and the third category is made of charges d'affaires. The diplomats of first two categories are accredited to the head of the host state where as charges d'affaires are accredited to the foreign minister or secretary of the state of the host country.

2. Consular Personnel: related to the diplomatic function is the consular function and services. Consular functions (codified in the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, 1963) include processing and issuing entry and exit visas, facilitating commercial and other activities related to investment and providing information about the home state to all invested parties. Moreover consuls are divided into five classes: a) Consul general b) Consuls c) Consuls of career d) Vice consuls not of careers and e) Consular agents. Consular personnel enjoy less diplomatic privileges and immunities than diplomatic personnel in the host country.

SAP

Establish the relation between diplomacy and foreign policy.

1.6.1 Functions of diplomacy:

In the contemporary times, diplomacy has assumed new role and significance in many ways. The main functions of diplomacy are as follows:

1. Representation:

The diplomat represents his country abroad. In this sense, the diplomats are the chief representatives of their countries in a foreign land. This representation is of three types- symbolic, legal and political. As symbolic representative, the diplomat attends a number of ceremonies and functions such as Independence Day, Republic Day etc. As legal representative, he casts his vote at international conferences on behalf of his government. As political representative, the diplomat is to sell the foreign policy of his country and project a favorable image of his country. A diplomat connects two countries, their states and the states where they are working. Their main duties are thereby to implement the foreign policies of their governments and to protect the national interests of their countries in the alien land. The function of representation is thus very important for the diplomats as well as their country.

2. Negotiation:

The second important function of diplomat is negotiation. A successful diplomat must be an able negotiator. He may have to participate in bilateral, trilateral and multilateral negotiations in international relations; it is possible to resolve tensions through negotiations. As a negotiator, diplomat is to bargain and strike a balance between 'giving what is asked and getting what is wanted.' However the success of negotiation depends upon several factors such as preparation of agenda, maintenance of due secrecy, the strength of economic and military power backing it etc. the success of foreign policy and the prestige of a nation often depend upon successful negotiation.

3. Obtaining information:

Another important task of diplomat is collect data and information from his or her bargaining activities. Only a resident diplomat can have the real feel of the political, economic, social and other conditions prevailing in the host country.

4. Reporting:

After gathering information, the next step is reporting the same to the home country. This indeed helps the home country to take an effective decision. For example, political officers usually report on the structures, processes and personalities of political movements and political parties, the friendliness or hostility of the host country towards the home country. Similarly the military attaché's send

information regarding the host country's military force, the quality of its military leadership, military equipment, weapon system etc.

5. Protection of Nationals and National Interest:

The diplomat has to protect the nationals of his country resident in the land in which he is stationed. He has to safeguard the interests of his nationals and prevent any sort of discrimination against them in foreign land. At the same time, the diplomats have to look after national interests as interpreted by policy makers and according to treaties and principles of international law. For example, the Indian Ambassador in Afghanistan shall protect the interests of the citizens of India in Afghanistan. Indian citizen can contact the Indian Embassy in Afghanistan during any crisis or emergency.

6. Policy making:

Today diplomats also provide advice to the makers of foreign policy. They provide a large portion of information upon which policy is based. A principal contribution of diplomats in the policy-making process thus comes from their skill of interpretation and judgment about conditions in the country to which they are accredited.

7. Substantive functions:

Apart from the above, the diplomats also perform some substantive functions such as a) conflict management b) problem solving c) cross-cultural interaction d) negotiation and bargaining e) programmed management.

Thus from the above discussion, it becomes clear that a diplomat performs a number of tasks which helps the home country in taking effective decision in relation to the host country. Apart from this, Hans J Morgenthau in his book 'Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace' identified four major tasks of diplomacy. These are:

- i) Determine the objectives of the state and the power actually available to fulfill these objectives.
- ii) Assess the objectives of other states and the power actually available to fulfill these objectives.
- iii) Diplomacy must assess to what extent these objectives are compatible with each other.
- iv) Diplomacy must employ the means suited to the pursuit of these objectives.

Thus according to Morgenthau the failure of any of these tasks may jeopardize the success of foreign policy. Every nation must set its objectives in accordance with its national power. Diplomats must also assess the objectives of other states and whether they have available power to fulfill their objectives. Though this assessment is not an easy task for a diplomat, yet it is a vital function. Morgenthau also viewed that a diplomat must continuously compare the objectives and powers

of his nations with that of other nations. For example, Indian diplomacy must assess the objectives and powers of India with those of China or Pakistan or USA. Lastly, according to Morgenthau, diplomacy must ensure all possible means to fulfill its interest. It may engage in negotiation, persuasion, appeal or threat of use of force. However, it is to be mentioned here a state with weak military power cannot threaten cannot use force to fulfill its objectives. Morgenthau thus analyzed diplomacy in the context of power. As an exponent of realist theory, Morgenthau believes that international politics is a game of power. However an analysis of diplomacy in the context of power is not free from criticisms. For example, it is easy for a diplomat to assess the power of his state but it is not possible to assess accurately the power of another state. But inspite of it, we can say that the 'four main tasks of diplomacy' highlighted by Morgenthau has the fact that a diplomat will always apply his reason and wisdom to assess his objectives and also that of other nations. Diplomacy as an instrument of foreign policy is actually put into practice by the diplomats.

1.6.2 Types of diplomacy

Diplomacy may be classified into various types on the basis of time, techniques, practices etc. some of the major types of diplomacy prevalent in the present times can be discussed as below:

1. Old Diplomacy:

This type of diplomacy developed towards the close of the 16th century and continued up to 1918-1919. This type of diplomacy was mainly confined to Europe. The non- European countries were outside its purview. It was mainly a big power affair of European countries. Even the smaller countries of Europe had no role in old diplomacy. The diplomatic officers were selected and appointed by the monarch who were solely responsible to the king. Thus they were not recruited on merit through competitive exams. Strict secrecy was maintained while conducting negotiations. For serving national interest Diplomats often resorted to means and practices such as bribing and murder.

2. New Diplomacy:

The era of new diplomacy emerged in the 20th century and especially after the First World War. It is beyond euro centrism and thereby includes a number of new states. New diplomacy is subjected to democratic control. The process of negotiation are democratically determined and subjected to democratic scrutiny and control. Important political issues are directly discussed by summit level

political leaders of concern countries. The main differences between old and new diplomacy are:

- i) The old diplomacy was mainly confined to Europe whereas the new diplomacy is truly international in nature.
- ii) Unlike old diplomacy, new diplomacy is not dominated by big powers of Europe.
- iii) The old diplomacy was aristocratic whereas the new diplomacy is democratic. The diplomats in the past were mainly selected from the aristocratic class whereas in a new diplomacy the diplomats are recruited from public on the basis of merit.
- iv) In the old diplomacy the negotiations were more secret however there is no place for secret agreements and treaties in new diplomacy.
- v) Old diplomacy was run by generalists whereas the new diplomacy is dominated by specialists from commerce, economics, science and military.

STEPS TO CONSIDER

Factors responsible for the rise of new diplomacy:

1. With the emergence of several new sovereign independent states in Asia, Africa and Latin America. International politics is no longer confined to Europe thus new diplomacy assumes worldwide character and was no longer confined to Europe.
2. Acceptance of the equal status of all states, the extension of principles of democracy to the international field, expansion of mass media, etc replaced old democracy with new democracy.
3. Military alliance system after the Second World War and more particularly after the cold war politics have given birth to co-alliance, economic diplomacy (new diplomacy).
4. New techniques of communication such as telephone, radio, television, internet, satellite communication, computer together with fast supersonic air transportation have drastically altered the tempo and temper of diplomacy. The foreign minister of government and direct virtually all diplomatic representatives.
5. The growing importance of public opinion has made all states very sensitive. One of the main functions of diplomats today is reporting on the attitudes of people in the host countries which is another factor responsible for the decline of old diplomacy and rise of new diplomacy.

3. Secret Diplomacy:

Secret Diplomacy was an important sub category of old diplomacy. Old diplomacy was marked by secrecy and secret agreements. The congress of Berlin of 1878 was a fine example of Secret Diplomacy in the 19th century. History is full of such secret treaties for example during first world war a good number of promises were made by the allies to Italy and other states to keep them neutral or to ensure their participation in the struggle. Similarly there were secret treaties signed between Britain and France signed in 1984. However this process of secret diplomacy generated fear and suspicion at the international level. Policy making should never be secret nor their secret agreements.

4. Open Diplomacy:

Open diplomacy developed with the growth and advent of democracy especially in the 20th century. It was US President Woodrow Wilson who developed open diplomacy after the WW1. Later on, the principle of open diplomacy was adopted by the League Covenant and the UN Charter. But open diplomacy is difficult to achieve in reality. The chief profounder of open diplomacy that is Woodrow Wilson himself concluded secretly a series of negotiations with British Prime Minister Lloyd George and French Prime Minister Clemenceau at Paris after the WW1. Thus it can be said that secret diplomacy is mainly for open agreements and treaties and not for totally open negotiations.

5. Personal Diplomacy:

When foreign ministers, prime ministers and even heads of states directly and personally participate in diplomatic parleys, it is called personal diplomacy. When vital national interests and major political considerations are involved in any issue, the negotiations are usually conducted by top level political leaders, for example, the Shimla Summit attended by Indira Gandhi and Bhutto in 1972, Lahore Summit by Vajpayee and Sharif in 1999 Washington Summit between Yeltsin and Bush in 1992 etc. are example of personal diplomacy.

6. Conference Diplomacy :

A large part of international dealings is conducted through the medium of international conferences and the periodic meetings regional and international organizations. This is known as conference diplomacy. It is a multilateral method of diplomatic negotiation in which leaders or representatives of more than two countries participate. Some of the examples of conference diplomacy include The Hague Conference of 1899 and 1907, The Bretton Woods Conference of 1944, The Yalta Conference of 1945, The NPT review Conference of 1995 etc. The nations usually resort to this type of diplomacy to discuss and solve

common problems to achieve special objectives and to make international treaties.

7. Institutional Diplomacy:

A new type of diplomacy has developed that is Institutional diplomacy with the rise of international and Regional institution like the U.N, IMF, NATO, European Union etc. In this type of diplomacy negotiation are usually conducted by international institution with a view to solving international conflicts and problems. In this context we may refer to the role of the United Nations in solving various international conflicts and crisis such as The Korean conflict in 1953, The Congo crisis of 1950, The Middle East war of 1967, etc.

8. Bilateral Diplomacy:

Sometimes modern states don't want to solve its external relation through the United States or the regional organizations. Bilateral Issues and matters between two countries are continued to be tackle through Bilateral Diplomacy. It normally requires negotiations by two concern nations for example India and Pakistan, India and China, India and USA, etc meet a number of times to solve out their differences bilaterally.

9. Economic Diplomacy:

Economic Diplomacy has also made a significant place for itself in the contemporary international relations. The role of "Oil diplomacy and Dollar diplomacy" in the present times illustrates the importance of Economic Diplomacy. This type of diplomacy has developed with the idea of liberalisation and globalization on the one hand and the growth of regional blocks such as NAFTA, SAFTA, APEC, European Union, etc on the other. It is also to be mentioned here that economic method are used both in times of peace and war. International trade economic aid and assistance are used as convenient tool of diplomacy in peace time. During war it is used as a means of coercing the adversaries.

All the above mentioned types of diplomacy have their own merits and demerits. However each type of diplomacy is used in present times except the old diplomacy.

1.7 Future of Diplomacy:

In the age of information technology there has been a significant change in the role and importance of diplomacy. Infact information technology (IT) has revolutionized every aspect of life in the 21st century. Tele conferencing, Email, Internet, Satellite T.V, etc are the new buzzword of the present century. This has vastly improved the security and speed of communications between nations. As a result

governments can quickly react to world events and maintain a closure and constant dialogue with their representative abroad and thus with other governments. For example two heads of government can directly communicate between themselves over telephone, fax, email or video conferencing and discuss necessary political and other related issues. This trend has raised doubts over the future of diplomacy. For a long period of time professional diplomats were the undisputed channels of diplomacy. But since the Second World War with the development of science and technology traditional notion of diplomacy faced a crisis. Now the question arises about the role of diplomacy in present context. It must be pointed out here that neither diplomacy nor the importances of diplomacy have decreased over the years. When two heads of governments are talking directly they are also engaged in diplomacy which is known as direct diplomacy. It is to be noted here that the politicians are not very well acquainted with very details of foreign policy. So when the heads of government meet directly, they are accompanied by senior diplomats and bureaucrats. Moreover every nation carries out diplomatic mission in other countries in order to maintain a healthy relation with others as well as to protect its national interest and implement its foreign policies in other nations. The role of diplomacy is very crucial in this context.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Diplomacy is an important tool of foreign policy. (Write true of false).
2. Who is the author of the book 'Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace'?
3. Distinguish between Old and new Diplomacy?
4. What are the 'main task of diplomacy' highlighted by Morgenthau?
5. Discuss the various types of diplomacy with examples.
6. Discuss about the future of diplomacy.

1.8 Summing up:

From the above discussion we can sum up that conflict, conflict resolution and diplomacy are essential part of international relations. When nations try to fulfill its respective national interest they enter into conflict with other nations. In order to solve those conflicts the idea of conflict resolution has emerged. Conflict resolution involves the various methods like negotiation, mediation, adjudication and arbitration to resolve international conflicts. Similarly, diplomacy is an

important tool of foreign policy. Infact there is a close relationship between diplomacy and foreign policy. Diplomacy is a crucial and continuous activity in international relations. Though with changing times and ever changing requirements of nations, diplomacy has changed its forms and style yet its importance has remained intact as ever.

SAP

Do you think diplomacy has lost its significance in this era of Information and Technology? Justify.

1.8 References and suggested readings:

1. Basu, R. (2012). 'International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues' New Delhi: Sage Publications.
2. Bhattacharya, D.C. (2010). 'International Relations Since The Twentieth Century' Kolkata: Vijaya Publishing House.
3. Chatterjee, A. (2010). 'International Relations Today: Concepts and Applications' New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.
4. Malhotra, V.K. (2012). 'International Relations' New Delhi: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Unit 4

UN and Peace Keeping Operations

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 History of Peacekeeping
- 1.4 Women and Peacekeeping
- 1.5 Difference between Peacekeeping and Collective Security
- 1.6 Impact of Peacekeeping operations
- 1.7 Challenges of Peacekeeping
- 1.8 India's role in UN peacekeeping operations.
- 1.9 Summing up
- 1.10 References and suggested readings

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Whether it was League of Nations or the United Nations, the development of international organizations were designed to maintain international peace and to protect their members from the threat of war. From its establishment, the UN has been trying to protect and promote peace and security in the world. The UN Charter clearly stipulates that membership is open to all 'peace loving' countries. It serves as a framework which co-operatively find solution to the problems of the states like inter-state conflicts and also maintain post war peace and security. In order to perform its significant and foremost role of maintaining peace and security there are three methods employed by the UN. These are pacific settlement, collective security and preventive diplomacy or peacekeeping. The first two are provided in the UN Charter whereas the third one was invented by its most active Secretary General. Thus the then UN Secretary General

Dag Hammarskjold vigorously pursued the peacekeeping operation as a means to establish peace. Peacekeeping is a way to maintain international peace and security. The Principal organs responsible for the UN Peacekeeping are the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Secretariat and the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations which are involved in planning, mounting and supporting the UN sponsored peacekeeping missions. The UN has often taken measures to prevent disputes from escalating onto war, to persuade the opposing parties to go for negotiation rather than use of arms and thus help to restore peace. Peacekeeping is thus one of the major mechanisms to ensure peaceful resolutions of conflicts in post conflict situations. The peacekeeping forces were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in September 1988 by the Norwegian Nobel Committee. In this chapter, we will have a detailed study on the idea of peacekeeping, its evolution and the problems associated with it.

1.2 OBJECTIVES

The UN peacekeeping helps the countries torn by conflict create conditions for lasting peace. The main objectives of this unit include:

1. *History* of the peacekeeping operation
2. *Women* and the peacekeeping operation.
3. *Difference* between peacekeeping and collective security.
4. *Impact* of the peacekeeping operation
5. *Challenges* of the peacekeeping operation
6. *India* and the peacekeeping operations
7. *Summing up* of the Unit.

1.3 History of the peacekeeping operation

Now let us understand the history of the UN peacekeeping operation. The UN was established in 1945 mainly for the promotion and protection of peace and security in the world. The concept of 'peacekeeping' has been an offshoot of the 'preventive diplomacy' ideas of the UN's second Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold. He considered it as the first task of the UN Secretariat to stabilize areas of conflict so as to bring together the parties in conflict to resolve or try to resolve their differences by peaceful means. In fact, peacekeeping emerged in response to the failure of the collective security due to the East West confrontation.

STEPS TO CONSIDER

Preventive diplomacy is a step taken 'to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts'. In simple terms, it can be defined as a way of preventing conflict, both internal and external within states and between states, as well. Preventive diplomacy encompasses all aspects of peacekeeping. It is based on the assumption that it is better to forestall conflict than to allow it to spread. The idea of preventive diplomacy is the result of the following factors:

1. Cold war rivalry between USA and USSR.
2. The threat that the entire world was facing due to race for armaments.
3. The increase in the number of non-aligned countries developing countries whose interests and objectives are not necessarily the same as those of superpowers.
4. Lastly, not the least, UN Secretary general Hammarskjold's frustration with the UN's legal structure, particularly the inability of the Security Council to adequately perform its function of maintaining peace.

Thus the role of the executive organ of the UN was expanded by mediating between contending parties and by enlisting the UN's administrative support for peacekeeping operations.

Peacekeeping is one of the major ways which helps UN to maintain peace and security. It may be mentioned here that the word 'peacekeeping' was not anticipated in the UN Charter. However there are many provisions with regards to peaceful settlement of disputes, the use of force to end conflict and how to maintain international peace and security. Accordingly, peacekeeping has been defined as 'an operation involving military personnel, but without enforcement powers, established by the United Nations to help maintain or restore international peace and security in areas of conflict.' The first UN peacekeeping operation was started in 1948 and 1949 in relation to the issues of Middle-East and Indo-Pak border issues respectively. Over the years, peacekeeping has evolved from a primarily military model of observing ceasefires and separation of forces after wars to help lay the foundations for sustainable peace. The UN peacekeepers provide security and peace building support to countries to restore peace. Peacekeeping does not proceed with the moral or legal idea of crimes in which there are 'aggressor' and 'victims' rather, it relies on the realist concept of conflicts in which all are 'victims'. Peacekeeping forces are instructed to maintain complete impartiality between the conflicting parties. Of course, they have the right to self-defence and are supposed to use minimum force when necessary. They have the responsibility to create the safe environment for the passage of humanitarian aid and evacuation of innocent civilians to safer areas.

The UN has also declared 29th May as International Day for peacekeepers to honour the memory of UN Peacekeepers who have lost their lives in the cause of peace. The UN peacekeeping has political, military and humanitarian dimensions by way of intervention, mediation, supervision and observations and assistance. The UN peacekeeping forces include troops and military observers, civilian police monitors and civilian support staff. Although UN is a legally authorized body to intervene in a conflict or war situation particularly through peacekeeping operations, it is necessary to affirm its three basic principles that is consent, impartiality and use of force for self-defence. These three principles are inter-related and mutually reinforcing.

STEPS TO CONSIDER

Principles of Peacekeeping

UN peacekeeping is guided by three basic principles:

1. Consent of the parties:

UN peacekeepers are deployed with the consent of the main parties to the conflict. This requires a commitment by the parties to a political process. Their acceptance of a peacekeeping operation provided the UN with the necessary freedom of action, both political and physical to carry out its mandated tasks. In the absence of such consent, peacekeeping operation becomes risky which may lead to conflict keeping away the peacekeeping operation from its mandate of establishing peace.

2. Impartiality:

The UN peacekeepers should be impartial in their dealings with the parties to the conflict, but not neutral in the execution of their mandate. A peacekeeping operation must avoid activities that might compromise its image of impartiality.

3. Non use of force except for self defence:

UN peacekeeping are not enforcement tool. However, they may use force only with the authorization of the Security Council and that too for self defence. In certain cases, the Security Council has given peacekeeping operations 'robust' mandates authorizing them "to use all necessary means" to protect civilians under imminent threat of physical attacks and assist the national authorities in maintain law and order. Robust peacekeeping involves the use of force at tactical level with the authorization of the Security Council and consent of the host nation and or main parties to the conflict.

The UN peacekeeping operations are varied in nature. It involves activities such as facilitating ceasefire agreements, mediating conflicting situation to find lasting solution, monitoring elections, restoring representative democracy, promotion of human rights, establishing rule of law for political reconstruction as such. During the

period of cold war, peacekeeping mainly evolved the deployment of unarmed or lightly armed military personnel between conflicting parties. But in the post cold war era, there has been a shift in the UN peacekeeping towards multi-dimensional operations. There has been an expansion in the non-military components of the peacekeeping operations such as deploying civilian workers in key areas such as protecting and promoting rule of law, good governance, protecting the rights of children and women, providing relief and recovery of victims of conflicts and wars etc.

The UN peacekeeping operations include multi-dimensional activities connected with political, military, economic and humanitarian aspects. The political activities of the peacekeeping includes restoring democracy, rule of law and good governance such as support to conducting free and fair election, judicial reforms, empowerment of civil society as such. Supporting to disarmament, reintegration, local security and law and order are some of the major military activities of peacekeeping. Humanitarian activities of peacekeeping include relief distribution, providing shelter, sanitation facilities, water supply and other basic human needs. The economic activities are associated with the presence of a peacekeeping mission in a certain location include catering services to foreigners, including those provided by hotels, restaurants, bars and in the transportation sectors etc. the UN has no standing army or police force of its own. The member countries contribute military and police personnel required for each operation. The peacekeepers wear their countries uniform and are identified as UN peacekeepers by a UN blue helmet and a badge. The UN peacekeepers come from all walks of life. Though they have diverse backgrounds, they share a common purpose that is to protect the most vulnerable and provide support to countries to establish peace. It may be mentioned here that over 3,500 peacekeepers have lost their lives for the cause of peace. They included military, police, international civil servants, UN volunteers etc. Although peacekeeping has conflict reducing effect, all are not equally effective.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. The primary function of UN is to maintain world peace and security. (write true/false)
2. Name the Secretary General associated with the idea of preventive diplomacy.
3. Which day is celebrated as International peacekeepers day?
4. Discuss the role of UN peacekeeping in the post cold war period.

1.4 Women and Peacekeeping:

Women have also played an important role in peacekeeping. Women are deployed as police and military personnel, civilian and have made a positive impact on peacekeeping environments. They inspire other women and girls to fight for their rights in a male dominated society and push for participation in peace processes. They have proved that they can perform the same roles to the same standards and under the same difficult conditions as their male counterparts. Infact the UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres is committed to building the number of women peacekeepers. Thus, a top priority of UN peacekeeping is to increase the number of female military personnel in peacekeeping operations, including women staff officers and military observers to 15% by the end of 2018. Currently, only 6.6% of all uniformed military, police and justice and corrections personnel in field missions are women. While the UN encourages and advocates for the deployment of women in peacekeeping, yet the responsibility of deployment of women in the police and military lies with the members states. By 2028, the target for women serving in police units is 20% and 30% for individual police officers. If more women are engaged in peacekeeping then it will result in more effective peacekeeping. Women peacekeeper have greater access to communities, help in promoting human rights and the protection of civilians and also encourage women to become a meaningful part of peace and political processes. Following are some of the reasons that help us to find out the importance of women in peacekeeping.

1. Better access: Women peacekeepers can have better access to the population including women and children by supporting the survivors of gender based violence and violence against children. Thereby, they will help to generate critical information that would otherwise be difficult to reach.
2. Building trust and confidence: Women peacekeepers are essential enablers to built trust and confidence with local communities and help improving access and support local women. For example, they can interact with women in societies where they are prohibited from speaking to men.
3. Inspiring and creating role models: Women peacekeepers serve as powerful mentors and role for women in post conflict situation in the host community, setting examples for them to advocate for their own rights and pursue non-traditional careers.
4. Role in Covid-19: UN peacekeepers are facing one of their greatest challenges in the covid-19 pandemic. Peacekeepers are assisting governments and local communities to face the pandemic

including protecting the vulnerable communities. Women peacekeepers are on the front lines in this fight and are an integral part of the Covid-19 response, implementing their mandates within current constraints while taking all precautionary measures.

Thus qualified women are given priority for individual staff military positions at UN Head Quarter and field missions. Thus the Member States are now requested to nominate a minimum of 20% women for individual police officer positions and 30% for justice and corrections government provided personnel. Thus attempts have been made to increase women in the peacekeeping family and thus make the operations more effective.

SAQ

Discuss the role of women as peacekeepers. Why do you think it is necessary to include more women in the field of peacekeeping operations?

1.5 Difference between Peacekeeping and Collective Security:

The principle of collective security mainly stands for ‘one for all and all for one’. It is a process of joint action in order to prevent or counter any attack against an established order. It is a security technique used by inter-governmental organizations to restrain the use of force among the members. The principles of peacekeeping are quite different from the principles of collective security. It may be compared with collective security only in the respect that each may involve the deployment of military forces. However in other aspects, both the processes are different which may be mentioned as below:

1. The collective security lays emphasis to check aggression through collective enforcement. On the other hand, the peacekeeping emphasis on non-coercive activities which mainly aims at re-establishing and maintaining peaceful international order.
2. Unlike collective security, in peacekeeping operations, the purpose is not to fight or defeat an aggressor but to prevent fighting and thus keep order and maintain a ceasefire.
3. The peacekeeping forces maintain an attitude of neutrality and impartiality regarding the adversaries which is not possible under collective security measures.
4. Unlike collective security’s enforcement measures and military action, the mission of peacekeeping is to keep peace using measures short of armed force, a role that is more of police rather than military.

5. The collective security measures cannot be undertaken without the support of one or more superpowers. Whereas, the peacekeeping was mainly designed to stop the intrusion of superpower rivalry into a potentially explosive situation.

6. Some of the examples of the peacekeeping missions are the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) in Egypt from 1956-1967 in the wake of the Suez Crisis, the United Nations Congo Operation (UNCO) to avoid clashes between Congo and Belgium (1960-64), the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) in 1978, etc. Since 1945, the Collective Security has been put into practice a number of times. The idea of collective security was extensively discussed during the WWI which took shape in the 1919 League Covenant and again in the Charter of the UN after the WWII. The Collective security system of UN was put into practice for the first time in 1950 when North Korea invaded South Korea. Since then it has been used in a number of occasions.

Thus we can say that though peacekeeping and collective security has some differences yet the aim of both is to maintain peace and security in the world. We can therefore say that peacekeeping is an extension of the collective security system.

STEPS TO CONSIDER

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Collective security is as valuable device for crisis management in international relations. It is mainly designed to protect international peace and security against war and aggression in any part of the world. It is also regarded as a deterrent against aggression in so far as it lays down that the collective power of all nations will be used to repel aggression or war against any state. It is based on the principle 'Aggression against any one member of the international community is an aggression against international peace and security. Thus it has to be met by the collective efforts of all the nations.' Thus the underlying principle of collective security has been 'One for all and all for one'. Aggression or war against any one nation is a war against all the nations. Therefore, all the nations are to act collectively against every war/aggression.

1.6 Impact of Peacekeeping Operations

The UN is an authorized institution to respond to a conflicting situation through different means. Peacekeeping is one such means through which UN has been trying to establish peace and maintain

world order. Peacekeepers have been playing an indispensable role in internal and institutional peacebuilding. According to the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (UNDPKO), since 1948, there were 71 peacekeeping operations initiated by the UN and 14 of them are underway at present. Over 124 countries contribute to the UN peacekeeping operations with nearly 100,000 troops, police and civilian personnel. Among them 95 percent are missionaries with a mandate to protection of civilians. Over 600 human rights are involving in supporting the promotion and protection of human rights.

It was during the cold war period that the peacekeeping operations of the UN emerged. In the late 1940s, the Security General and the General Assembly had authorized the UN Secretary General to send ceasefire observation groups to Greece, Palestine, Kashmir and Indonesia. UN peacekeeping did not develop fully until the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF1) was created to step in between Egypt and Israel to allow the withdrawal of British and French troops that had joined Israel in taking armed action against Egypt in the Suez crisis on November 1957. Since then similar operations had been undertaken in Congo (ONUC) in 1960, Cyprus(UNFICYP) in 1964, Lebanon(UNIFIL) in 1978, Namibia(UNTAG) in 1989, Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR) in 1992,Cambodia(UNTAC) in 1992. The UN peacekeeping involves two types of functions: observation and peacekeeping. Observers are unarmed military personnel sent to a troubled area to watch the situation and report back to the UN. Observation is not an easy job. Observers are required to monitor the prevalence of human rights and democratic principles in troubled areas. In other words, they help in the process of transition from war to democracy. This function of observation proved immensely beneficial for Nicaragua and El Salvador after the cold war. For the purpose of peacekeeping, lightly armed military are sent to the troubled zone to dissuade warring parties and negotiate with their military leaders. Their role is very sensitive. They must be impartial in their approach as peacekeeping efforts would have little chance of success of considered biased by any side.

STEPS TO CONSIDER

Types of Peacekeeping:

In reality peacekeeping operations have been of two types: armed forces type operations and observer operations. Following are some of the operations involving multinational armed forces:

1. The United Nations Emergency Force(UNEF-I) in Egypt from 1956-1967 in the wake of the Suez crisis.
2. The United Nations Congo Operation (ONUC) in 1960-64 to avoid clashes between Congo and Belgium.

3. The United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) in 1964.
4. The UNEF –II dispatched to the Middle East in 1973 and terminated in 1979.
5. The United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) Created in 1978.
6. A United Nations Security Force (UNSF) composed primarily of Pakistan troops also served as the military arm of the UN Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA) in West Irian in 1962-62.

Some of the observer type missions were:

1. The United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans(UNSCOM) established in 1947 to investigate the Greek border situation
2. The United Nations Truce Supervision Organisation (UNTSO) operating since 1949 to report on ceasefire and armistice violations by Israel and its neighbours.
3. The United Nations Commission for Indonesia (UNCI) observing ceasefire and with aiding negotiations for Indonesian independence in 1949
4. The United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) responsible since 1949 for patrolling the ceasefire line in Kashmir.
5. The United Nations India-Pakistan Observation Mission (UNIPOM), established to patrol the border between India and Pakistan during and immediately after the 1965 war between these two countries.
6. The United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM) established in 1991 to monitor the demilitarized zone along the Iraq Kuwait border.
7. The United Nations Yemen Observation Mission (UNYOM) established in 1963 to observe and certify the implementation of the disengagement agreement between Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic.

During the cold war, most of the peacekeeping operations were mainly confined to the Middle East, part of Africa and other regional conflicts which were mainly associated with decolonization. These peacekeeping operations were largely military in nature. In the early 1990s, the peacekeeping operations largely expanded which included activities like resettlement of refugees, police training, protection of humanitarian relief efforts, electoral assistance, disarmament etc. it may be mentioned here that during this period, particularly in 1988, Noble Peace Prize was awarded to the UN peacekeepers for their contribution towards establishing peace in many conflicting situations. It is to be mentioned here that, there are also many shortcomings in the UN peacekeeping. However, in the last two decades, they worked

effectively in establishing peace and resolving conflicts in many parts of the world. It was able to transform some major conflict into minor conflicts. The UN peacekeeping operations have helped to serve thousands of human lost and displacement. They have helped to prevent conflict from breaking out or recurring. They have been successful in reducing the intensity of the conflicts in many instances. They have also helped to reduce duration of conflict. Similarly, the UN peacekeeping have also helped to increase the duration of post conflict peace. By reducing conflict, peacekeeping can prevent displacement of civilians, thus further reducing the humanitarian sufferings that extend beyond the countries.

It can also be argued that peacekeeping operations have also positive economic effects in different ways. They help to increase agricultural production by reducing the conflicts. Peacekeeping helps to recover the local economy and institutional building by ensuring lasting peace. The UN peacekeeping have also impact on human rights since human rights protection and promotion is a core focus of UN peacekeeping operations. Most of the UN peacekeeping operations include human rights office and officers implementing human rights functions. They commit to contribute to the protection and promotion of human rights, empower the population to assert and claim their human rights and enable states to implement their human rights obligations and uphold the rule of law. Thus the peacekeeping is one of the most important conflict management mechanisms of the UN to respond to global security threats. Therefore, the UN peacekeeping missions deployed in violent civil wars are increasingly expected to prevent human rights violations. At the same time, the peacekeeping operations have become more complex in nature because of the complexity of the inter-state and intra-state conflicts. The success of the operations were always questioned and criticized because of the challenges related to the aspects of the peacekeeping. The following section examines the major issues that imposes challenges to the successful operations and implementation of UN peacekeeping.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. In which year was the UN peacekeeping awarded with the Nobel Peace Prize.
2. What are the two types of peacekeeping operations? Give examples.
3. Discuss the main differences between collective security and peacekeeping.

1.7 Challenges of the peacekeeping operations:

So far we have discussed the impact of the peacekeeping operations. But as mentioned earlier, the peacekeeping faces some challenges in its successful operations. Although we have seen that the UN peacekeeping through its various mechanisms, resolutions and resources have been successful to some extent to control violence and other casualties, still there are some issues challenging the successful operations of the peacekeeping. For an operation to be successful, collaboration and support of the conflicting parties are very essential. However, in recent operations, it has been seen that the UN has to act without the clear consent of the parties in conflict which in turn imposes a number of issues and challenges. There are different kinds of issues challenging the successful operations of the peacekeeping. However in this unit, we have mainly focused on the political, military and humanitarian issues that are challenging the operations to a great extent.

1. Political Issues:

Political issues are influential in making the UN peacekeeping operations so difficult. Consent of the host country, political stability of the post conflict situation and political will of the host country are some of the political factors that greatly influence the smooth functioning of the peacekeeping.

The UN has adopted the fundamental principle that the peacekeeping missions will be deployed only with the consent of the host state and the other parties to the conflict. Otherwise, this may prevent the peacekeepers from implementing their mandates and also lead to risk in peacekeeper's safety and security. The absence of genuine host state consent represents one of the greatest threats to the success of UN peacekeeping operations. The success of the peacekeeping operations also depends on the political stability of the state. The crisis in the UN peacekeeping in Somalia was due to the political and social instability resulting in breakdown of the infrastructure, communications, transport and system for the distribution of goods and services leading to increasing tensions among the population. It was evident in the UN peacekeeping operations of the former Republic of Yugoslavia, Cambodia and Haiti too. Lack of international support from all UN member countries is another political issue which makes peacekeeping difficult. The UN peacekeeping missions face financial problems due to the late payment or withholding of assessed contribution resulting in immense difficulties in fulfilling their missions. Moreover, without the political support of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, more particularly of the logistical, financial and political

support of the USA, no operation has ever been completed successfully. This was the main reason for the failure of the operations in Somalia and Haiti in relation to disarmament and demobilization after civil war.

2. Military Issues:

Like the political issues, UN peacekeeping operations are also made difficult by some military issues. Military personnel and their conduct in peacekeeping operations will influence the destiny of the operations. Peacekeeping are not combat forces. They merely monitor the previously declared ceasefires and truces. For example, in Rwanda almost 800,000 people were killed in a period of one month by the armed groups even when the peacekeeping forces were there. This clearly indicates the limitation of UN peacekeeping mandates to control violence or human rights violations during operations. There are also instances of misconduct, human rights violations and abuse of military forces that also challenges the peacekeeping operations. There are many violation and abuse cases of peacekeepers in Iraq and Afghanistan peacekeeping operations. Similarly, in Cambodia some military contingents were guilty of misbehavior such as abusing the local population, black marketing and running prostitution business. Inefficiency and credibility also effect the UN peacekeeping operations. Peacekeeping without the ground peace also poses a serious challenge to the peacekeeping operations. For example, in Somalia, the UN peacekeeping troops were unable to disarm the combatants or impose peace due to the absence of ground peace.

3. Humanitarian Issues:

Providing humanitarian assistance in post-conflict situation is one of the functions of the UN peacekeeping. Assisting to return the refugees and displaced people, distributing relief and providing essential amenities are some of the major duties of the UN peacekeeping humanitarian workers. They perform this tasks either themselves or with the support of some International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs). However it has been seen that lack of political and social instability sometimes makes it difficult to effectively perform this task. Peacekeeping also perform a number of task at the local or community level such as medical support, relief distribution, repairing basic infrastructure and so on. However, lack of co-ordination, commitment of civilians and political support make restraints this function of the peacekeeping too. Success of peacekeeping also depends on the effective co-ordination between military peacekeeping forces, NGOs and other civilian staff. In the absence of effective co-operation, UN peacekeeping cannot secure its

desired goals. For example, the UN Refugee Agency, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Kosovo was frustrated by the inability of the United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) police to provide security for returning refugees. Moreover, capturing humanitarian and development aids, kidnapping, holding hostage and killing of humanitarian workers by the rebel or arm groups are some of the major issues that the peacekeeping forces face.

It is thus worth mentioning that, peacekeeping is a risky activity. Since 1948 to 2017, more than 3,500 personnel have lost their lives in serving the peacekeeping missions. This is mainly because of the fact that the UN and member states are failing to adopt and take necessary measures needed to operate securely in dangerous environment. Thus the UN and the troop or police of contributing countries should take appropriate measures so that the peacekeeping can successfully complete its tasks without any harm.

SAP

What do you think the international community can do to make the peacekeeping operations successful? Give your view points.

1.8 India and the Peacekeeping:

As an 'original' founder member of the United Nations, India has never hesitated to the calls of the UN to contribute troops for maintaining international peace and security. In 1950, soon after India's independence, the 60 Parachute Field Ambulance of the Indian Army was sent to provide medical cover to forces engaged in the Korean war. Infact, the unit served in Korea for a total of three and a half years (1950-May1954). It is the longest single tenure by any military unit under the UN flag. Indian peacekeepers have served in UN peacekeeping around the world. More than 200,000 Indians have served in 49 out of the 71 UN peacekeeping missions established around the world since 1948. Around 3802 troops from UN member-states have given their lives defending the UN charter between 1948-2018. Out of this, around 175 are from India who have laid down their lives while serving the UN peacekeeping operations. Some of the peacekeeping missions in which India has contributed troops are Korea(1950-54), Middle East (956-67), Congo (1960-64), Cambodia (1992-93), Mozambique (1992-94), Somalia (1993-94), Rwanda

(1994-96), Angola (1989-99), Sierra Leone (1999-2001), Ethiopia-Eritrea (2006-08). At present, Indian troops are undertaking the following UN peacekeeping operations (out of total 16 missions underway):

1. Lebanon (UNIFIL) since December, 1998,
2. Congo (MONUC/MONUSCO) since January, 2005,
3. Sudan (UNMIS/UNMISS) since April, 2005,
4. Golan Heights (UNDOF) since February, 2006.
5. Ivory Coast (UNOCI) since February, 2017.
6. Haiti (MINUSTAH) since December, 1997.
7. Liberia (UNMIL) since April, 2007.

They protect civilians and support peace processes, and also carry out special tasks. For example, in Eritrea Indian engineers helped to rehabilitate roads as part of the UN Mission in Eritrea and Ethiopia (UNMEE). Indian doctors provide medical care to the local population in missions around the world. Veterinary doctors are also sometimes deployed as part of the peace building process. Indian peacekeepers have served in some of the most physically demanding and harsh environments including South Sudan. They have also brought the ancient Indian practice of Yoga to UN missions. Moreover, India has a long tradition of sending women on UN peacekeeping missions. In fact, in 2007, India became the first country to deploy an all women contingent to a UN peacekeeping mission. For example, The Formed Police Unit in Liberia provided 24 hour guard duty and conducted night patrols in the capital Monrovia and helped to build the capacity of the Liberian police. India is one of the major troop contributing countries to the UN peacekeeping forces. At present, there are more than 6700 Indian troops are deployed in the UN peacekeeping missions. Thus India today stands as the largest contributor of troops to UN peacekeeping Operations.

1.9 Summing Up:

Thus from the above discussion it becomes clear that the UN peacekeeping remains one of the most effective tools to respond to the challenges of world peace and security. The UN peacekeeping continued to be a dynamic and demanding activity responding to conflicts between states. Everyday, the UN peacekeepers are protecting millions of civilians at conflicting situations, and help in finding sustainable peace. At the same time, it is also true that the UN peacekeeping at times becomes difficult due to issue discussed above (political, military and humanitarian). Therefore, there is a need of reforms in structures and processes of the UN peacekeeping operations

to overcome the various problems associated with it and for the smooth functioning of the operations. There should be active coordination of UN and other related organizations for peacekeeping. At the same time, enthusiastic support and commitment of the global community, specially a friendly political and military support of superpowers are very much needed in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of UN peacekeeping operations. Moreover, all components of the UN peacekeeping operations should respect international laws and customs of the indigenous people of the country in implementing peacekeeping mandates. One of the major challenges in UN peacekeeping operations is the absence of permanent peacekeeping force. Therefore, a distinct, full-fledge UN peacekeeping force should be formed trained adequately including other resources. The mandate for peacekeeping operations also must have clear and achievable mission that should integrate strategies to achieve sustainable peace. If all these problems are solved then definitely it will strengthen coherence between political, military, humanitarian and development related activities of UN peacekeeping operations in future.

Check your progress

1. What is the full form of UNDPKO?
2. Discuss the role of UN peacekeeping in the post cold war period.
3. What are the various issues that effect the smooth functioning of the peacekeeping operations? How can this problem be overcome?
4. Mention some ongoing peacekeeping operations around the world.
5. Write the role of India in UN's peacekeeping operations.

1.10 References and suggested readings:

1. Bhattacharya, D.C. (2010). 'International Relations since the twentieth century' Kolkata; Vijoya Publishing House.
2. Chatterjee, A. (2010). 'International Relations Today; Concepts and Applications' New Delhi; Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt Ltd.
3. Ghosh, P. (2020). 'International Relations' Delhi; PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.

4. Khanna, V.N. (2013). 'International Relations' Delhi; Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

4. Malhotra, V.K. (2012). 'International Relations' New Delhi; Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.

UNIT 5

Humanitarian Intervention in World Politics

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Meaning and definition
- 1.4 Evolution of the concept of humanitarian intervention
- 1.5 Differences between humanitarian intervention and humanitarian aid
- 1.6 Humanitarian intervention and the ‘war on terror’
- 1.7 Conditions for humanitarian intervention
- 1.8 Is humanitarian intervention justified?
- 1.9 Summing up
- 1.10 References and Suggested readings

1.1 Introduction

The discussion on the promotion of human rights at the international level has proliferated in the post cold war period. There is a growing tendency to see a linkage between human rights violations and international security. The changes in international relations since the end of the cold war more particularly have increased the probability of intervention with or without the consent of the UN Security Council. ‘Intervention’ refers to various forms of interference in the affairs of others. Humanitarian intervention is a military intervention that is carried out in pursuit of humanitarian rather than strategic objectives. The 1990s can be seen as the ‘golden age of humanitarian intervention’. Thus humanitarian intervention involves the use of

military force by states to end violations of human rights without the consent of the target government and with or without the UN authorisation.

In this chapter, we will have a detailed understanding about the concept of humanitarian intervention in global politics. We will also learn about the evolution of the concept during the cold war and its application in the post cold war period. It will also seek to highlight the changes and continuity of the concept of humanitarian intervention from human rights protection to establishment of peace and security in the world.

1.2 Objectives

As we have already known that humanitarian intervention is a means to prevent human rights violations in a state where such state is either incapable or unwilling to protect its own people or is actively persecuting them. After reading this unit you will be able to

- *meaning and definition* of the concept of humanitarian intervention
- *evolution* of the concept of humanitarian intervention
- *differences* between humanitarian intervention and humanitarian aid
- *relationship between* humanitarian intervention and war on terror
- *conditions* for humanitarian intervention
- *justification* of humanitarian intervention

1.3 Meaning and definition

The state system has traditionally been based on a rejection of intervention. The international law has been constructed on the ground of respect for state sovereignty. However, it has long been recognized that intervention may be justifiable on humanitarian grounds.

Humanitarian interventions are military actions taken with the aim of reducing human suffering and preventing atrocities. For example, in 1827 in the battle of Navarion, the British and French destroyed the Turkish and Egyptian fleets off south-west Greece to support the independence of Greece. However, the modern idea of humanitarian intervention was a creation of post cold war period which was closely linked to the establishment of a 'new world order'. The issue of humanitarian intervention is related to international law, morality and international relations. Humanitarian intervention has been defined differently by various scholars. According to Bhikhu Parekh, "Humanitarian intervention is an act of intervention in the internal affairs of another country with a view to ending the physical suffering caused by the disintegrations or gross misuse of authority of the state, and helping create conditions in which a viable structure of civil authority can emerge." Humanitarian intervention has been defined by Adam Roberts as "a military intervention in a state, without the approval of its authorities, and with the purpose of preventing widespread suffering or death among the inhabitants." Tonny Brems Knudesen defines humanitarian intervention as "dictatorial or coercive interference in the sphere of jurisdiction of a sovereign state motivated or legitimated by humanitarian concerns." Thus humanitarian intervention includes:

- Use of military force
- Absence of the targeted state's consent which makes it different from the peacekeeping missions
- Its aim is to help non-nationals.

Check your progress

1. Which period is known as the 'golden age of intervention'?
2. "Humanitarian intervention is an act of intervention in the internal affairs of another country with a view to ending the physical suffering caused by the disintegrations or gross misuse of authority of the state, and helping create conditions in which a

viable structure of civil authority can emerge.” Who said this?

3. The aim of humanitarian intervention is to help national/non-nationals. (Tick the correct answer.

4. The main aim of humanitarian intervention is to protect human form gross human rights violations. (Write true or false)

1.4 Evolution of the concept of humanitarian intervention

The early discussion of the humanitarian intervention be traced back to the 16th and 17th century classical writers on international law, particularly in their discussions on just wars. Vitoria, Gentili, Vattel and Grotius are some well known names in this tradition. Grotius, in his *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* of 1625, stated that states are entitled to exercise the right ‘vested in human society on behalf of the oppressed individuals’. It allows the use of force to end human sufferings. This idea of Grotius has been represented today by writers like Vincent, Lillich and Lauterpacht. Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, philosophers of political liberalism, such as Mill, related the concept of humanitarian intervention to the concept of human rights.

The modern concept of humanitarian intervention started with the states justifying their acts of intervention for humanitarian reasons. Some of the well known examples in this context are intervention against the Ottoman empire for the protection of Christians, the Greek war of Independence, Lebanon-Syria, the Bulgaria agitation and Armenia. The strategic motives behind all these interventions throw light on the humanitarian character of the intervention. The lack of prohibition on the use of force in international relations was an important reason to explain the existence of this practice. Therefore international lawyers discussed this in the framework of just wars.

The UN Charter introduced a new solution to the use of force in international relations. Firstly, it extended the doctrine of non-

intervention to all states as a universal norm and secondly it allowed the use of force only in case of self defence or collective security measures under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Thus it justified the intervention in the domestic affairs of a state only for the sake of international peace and security. Moreover, all acts of intervention were made subject to UN authorization as it is the representative of the international community. Along with the emergence of non intervention as a universal norm, the UN initiated a parallel development that is the development of human rights as a global issue. Infact Article 1 of the UN Charter emphasis on promoting respect for human rights and justice as one of the fundamental missions of the organization. Humanitarian intervention, as the most assertive form of protecting human rights was clearly incompatible with the norms of non-intervention and state sovereignty. As a result, the UN Security Council, since 1945 had the right to authorize the use of force to end human rights violations. On the contrary, throughout the cold war period, the UN Security Council was hardly able to implement the UN Charter's provisions due to the ideological war between the two super powers, the emergence of China as a global power, North South division and so on. This resulted in some unilateral interventions by some countries to defend human rights in other countries. Mentioned may be made of the Indian intervention in East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), the Tanzanian intervention in Uganda etc. These interventions may be labelled as humanitarian as they were responses to humanitarian crisis. They rather justified their act on the ground of self defence. UN's response was limited to condemning such interventions.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Some potential examples of humanitarian intervention are as follows:

1. Bombardment of Algiers in 1816: It was an attempt by Britain and Netherland in August 1818 to end the slavery practices of Omar Agha, the Dey (ruler) of Algiers. The attempt was partially successful as around 3000 Europeans were set free following the bombardment and signed a treaty against the slavery of Europeans.
2. The Battle of Navarino, 1827: It was fought in the Navarino Bay (modern Pylos) in 1827 by Britain, France and Russia against the Ottoman and the Egyptian forces mainly to help the Greece in its war of independence.
3. Northern Iraq, 1991: In the aftermath of the Gulf War, the USA launched Operation Provide Comfort to establish 'safe havens' for the Kurdish people in Northern Iraq by establishing a no fly zone policed by US, UK and French aircraft.
4. Somalia, 1992: On the brink of humanitarian catastrophe, a UN authorized and US led intervention that is Operation Restore Hope sought to create a protected environment for conducting humanitarian operations in Southern Somalia.
5. Haiti, 1994: Following a military coup and the growing lawlessness and emigration to USA 15000 US troops were deployed at Haiti to restore order and help in the establishment of civil authority.
6. Rwanda, 1994: Following the Rwandan genocide, Operation Turquoise was launched by French to establish a safe zone for the Hutu refugees.
7. Kosovo, 1999: In the context of ethnic cleansing of the Albanina population, the US led NATO forces campaigned air

strikes and forced the Serbs to agree their forces from Kosovo.

8. East Timor, 1999: In 1999, a multinational UN Force under the aegis of Australia

(International Force for East Timor or INTERFET) was sent to East Timor to bring peace and support East Timorese efforts to achieve independence and self-determination from Indonesia.

9. Sierra Leone, 2000: After a prolonged civil war in Sierra Leone, the UK government sent a small force initially to protect UK citizens, but ultimately to support the elected government against the rebel forces that were being accused of carrying out atrocities.

10. Libya, 2011: In 2011, a multi-state NATO led coalition began a military intervention in Libya to implement the UN Security Council resolution 1973 to have an immediate ceasefire in Libya to end the attacks on civilians and imposed a no fly zone.

The end of the cold war has brought substantial changes in the respect of humanitarian intervention. The changes in the nature of international system mainly due to the end of the super power rivalry have to some extent removed the systematic constraints on intervention in domestic affairs. With the end of the cold war, the norms pertaining to the protection of individual rights resulted in a suitable political atmosphere for initiating interventions. The majority of armed conflicts in the post cold war era are internal or civil war. This has resulted in the increase in the number of interventions which can be seen in the growing number of UN Security Council resolutions under Chapter VII. Moreover in some cases, the Security Council defined gross violations of human rights as a threat to international peace and security and thus imposed economic sanctions or authorized the use of force. Since 1989, it has imposed economic sanctions on almost 14 occasions (compared with twice between 1945 and 1989) and used force almost 11 times other than self defence (as opposed to three times between 1945-1988). Thus the definition of humanitarian

crisis is no longer confined to protecting fundamental rights but it is extended to the question of upholding humanitarian laws of war and providing humanitarian assistance. During the cold war period, intervention was somehow limited as it was considered illegal due to the violation of the principle of sovereignty and self determination. But in the post cold war period, interventions were in some way related to regional or global interventions and legitimized by the UN Security Council resolutions. At the same time, there are also instances of interventions without the authorization of UN in the post cold war period such as the Economic Organisation of West African States' intervention in Liberia, the US,UK and French led intervention in Iraq since 1991, NATO's intervention in Kosovo etc. the cases of Iraq and Kosovo are still complicated in the sense that there were prior Security Council resolutions defining the situation as a threat to international peace and security, but did not receive authorization to use military force. Thus the debate among the scholars has not been settled yet.

1.5 Differences between humanitarian intervention and humanitarian aid

Humanitarian aid is the process of helping people in need who are affected by conflicts, disasters and conflicts. Its main aim is to assist and protect people by giving them resources to rebuild their lives. On the other hand, humanitarian interventions are military actions taken against a government or armed group with the aim of ending violence and stopping atrocities against civilians. Both concepts arose in the 19th century, but from different routes. Humanitarian aid is generally considered to come from the ideas of Henry Dunant and the foundation of the Red Cross. The British, French and Russian involvement in the Greek war of Independence in 1827 is generally viewed as the first instance of humanitarian intervention.

There are some basic differences between humanitarian aid and humanitarian intervention which may be discussed as below:

- Humanitarian aid is non-military whereas humanitarian intervention is use of military force. In humanitarian interventions, military is used to prevent a crisis. Humanitarian aid is used to help people affected by crisis. This is a crucial difference between the two.
- Humanitarian aid is often enacted with co-operation of a state. An important aspect of humanitarian aid is that it is delivered with approval and co-operation of a state government. Whereas humanitarian intervention violates a state's sovereignty by use of military force with the aim of protecting civilians and ending atrocities.
- In humanitarian aid, no legal bases are needed. In order to deliver humanitarian aid to the people in need no international legal authorization is required. But humanitarian intervention should seek legal justification. This is mainly because humanitarian interventions require the violation of a state's sovereignty by military action.
- Humanitarian aid is led by international organizations and NGOs but humanitarian intervention is mostly led by states or multiple states.
- The aim of humanitarian aid is to help people affected by crisis. It provides material assistance and protection to disaster affected people. Whereas humanitarian intervention aims to protect civilians from war crimes. It is a military action that tries to prevent atrocities against civilians.

These are some basic differences between the humanitarian aid and humanitarian intervention. The former provides assistance to people affected by crisis and disaster and the latter use military force to protect people from human rights violations. They both aim to assist people, but the methods used vary greatly. Some of the best known examples of humanitarian aid are 2010 Haiti earthquake, 2004 Asian tsunami, 2015 Nepal earthquake, 2013 Pakistan flood etc. US led operation Provide Comfort in Northern Iraq in 1991, US and UN led

intervention in Somalia in 1992-1993, NATO intervention in the Kosovo War in 1999, UN authorized and Australia led intervention in East Timor in 1999 etc are some well known examples of humanitarian intervention.

Check your progress

1. Mention one writer associated with the concept of humanitarian intervention.
2. Write the factors responsible for the growth of humanitarian intervention in the post cold war era.
3. Discuss the main differences between humanitarian aid and humanitarian intervention?
4. Give two examples of humanitarian intervention during the cold war period.

1.6 Humanitarian intervention and the ‘War on terror’

The war on terror has cast the issue of humanitarian intervention into a very different light. Whereas, before 2001, there was a growing belief that there had been too few humanitarian interventions, in the post 2001 there has been the perception that there have been too many humanitarian interventions. This is mainly because of the controversial wars in Iraq and Afghanistan which were, in part, both justified on humanitarian grounds. But strictly speaking, neither the Afghan war nor the Iraq were examples of humanitarian interventions. Rather in both cases self-defence was the primary justification for military action. Their purpose was to prevent future 9/11 incident. However, supporters of the wars to a greater extent, portrayed them as humanitarian ventures. In case of Afghanistan, the Taliban regime was seen to have established a brutal and repressive regime, that provided a safe haven to terrorist group like Al-Qaeda, violated the rights of women, excluding them from education, careers and public life. In

case of Iraq, the Saddam Hussain regime was seen as ongoing threats to the Kurds in the north and the majority Shia population, both of them had been subject to political exclusion and physical attack. Moreover there was the suspicion that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, the overthrow of Taliban and Saddam Hussain leading to the 'Regime change' promised to bring about respect for human rights, greater toleration and the establishment of democratic government. Therefore, the supporters of the 'war on terror' further extended the doctrine of humanitarian intervention for wiping out the problem of terrorism from the world.

During the 1990s, humanitarian intervention was seen to have limited objectives. Military action was taken mostly in emergency situations mainly to restore peace and order. It was not linked to restructuring of society. However, in case of Afghanistan and Iraq war, the idea of humanitarian intervention was mostly linked to liberal interventionism. Liberal interventionism also known as Liberal internationalism advocates that liberal states should intervene in other sovereign states mostly to pursue liberal objectives which can include both military action and humanitarian aid. Liberal interventionists therefore link humanitarian intervention to the goals of regime change and promotion of democracy to establish liberal values. The critics of the 'war on terror' however have argued that such goals were only means to establish American hegemony in the world and more particularly to secure oil supplies from the Middle East. Moreover, the interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq proved to be more problematic as both wars resulted in protracted counter –insurgency struggles. It has surfaced the doubts of imposing western style democracy and human rights from above as well as it has also resulted in increasing tensions between the Islamic world and the West. Thus if liberal values like human rights and multi-party democracy are not universally applicable, then it is difficult to establish standards for intervention that have a humanitarian basis. In such a situation it has become difficult mobilize support for humanitarian intervention since 2001. There has been example of non interventions in places such as Darfur,

Zimbabwe and Burma. Since 2004, the conflict in the Darfur region of Western Sudan has led to the deaths of at least 200,000 people and forced more than 2.5 million to flee their homes . Nevertheless, the UN has left the task of peacemaking to a relatively small African Union Force. More systematic intervention has been prevented due to the opposition of China and Russia, lack of public support for intervention in USA was the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq persisted and the UN's lack of resources and political will. Zimbabwe, during the regime of President Robert Mugabe in 2000, faced many problems like poverty, unemployment, political conflict etc. but it failed to mobilize support for Western intervention due to strong opposition of South Africa, which is a major power in the area. In Burma, known as Myanmar today, a military junta has been in power since 1988 which has been accused of gross human rights violations, forcible relocations of civilians, widespread use of forced labour including children and the brutal suppression of Political opposition. In this case also intervention has been restricted by the fact that it is not a threat to regional stability. Moreover, China has rejected any form of Western action in this area.

SAQ

What do you think are the reasons behind the increase of the Humanitarian intervention so markedly in the 1990s? (80 words)

1.7 Conditions for humanitarian intervention

Considerable attention has been focused on the attempt to establish if ever humanitarian intervention is justifiable. Although the doctrine of human rights provides a moral framework for humanitarian

intervention, human rights do not in themselves provide adequate guidance about justification for intervention. The moral challenges posed by humanitarian intervention include the following:

- It violates the established norm of non intervention. It is therefore difficult to reconcile humanitarian intervention with the conventional notion of state sovereignty under which states are treated as equal and self-governing entities.
- It goes beyond the just war idea that self defense is the key justification for the use of force. But in case of humanitarian intervention, the use of force is justified by the desire or action taken to defend or safeguard people from different societies. It allows states to risk the life of their military personnel in order to ‘save strangers’.
- It is based on the idea that the doctrine of human rights provides standards of conduct that can be applied to all governments and all peoples in spite of religious and cultural differences across the world establishing contrasting moral frameworks.

In an report ‘The Responsibility to Protect’ (R2P) produced by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) set up by the Canadian Government in 2000 outlines two criteria for military action. Firstly, if there is large scale loss of life actual or apprehended which may be the result of state neglect or inability of the state to act or a failed state situation. Secondly, in case of large scale ethnic cleansing these two criteria the ICISS asserts that there is not merely a right to intervene but also the responsibility of the international community to protect those who are in an imminent danger of becoming victims of these acts. Intervention is therefore justified if the state is unwilling or incapable to save its people from starving to death. The R2P has developed the concept of ‘responsible sovereignty’. The state is merely the custodian of a sovereignty that is ultimately located in the people. It recommended that moral content should be put into sovereignty that is, state’s right to sovereignty should be concerned with protecting its citizens.

SAQ

Can humanitarian intervention ever be reconciled with the norm of state sovereignty? (80 words)

1.8 Is humanitarian intervention justified?

Humanitarian intervention is one of the most disputed issues in global politics. While some justify it on the ground of humanity while others regard it as violation of sovereignty of a nation state. The positive aspect of humanitarian intervention may be discussed in this regard.

1. Indivisible humanity: humanitarian intervention is based on the belief that there is a common humanity. This implies that moral responsibilities cannot be confined merely to one's 'own' people or state rather it should extend to the whole of humanity.

2. Global interdependence: In the age of globalization, there is global interconnectedness and interdependence. States can no longer act as if they are islands. Events or incidents on one side will automatically have its impact on the other side of the world. The responsibility to act in relation to events in other side of the world has increased by a recognition of this interdependence among nations. Humanitarian intervention is therefore, justified on the grounds of enlightened self interest. For example to prevent a terrorist problem or a refugee crisis that may create political and social strains in other countries.

3. Regional stability: Humanitarian emergencies particularly in the context of a failed state tend to have radical implications for the regional balance of power, leading to instability and wider unrest. This

provides an incentive for neighbouring states to support intervention by major powers in order to prevent a possible regional war.

4. Promoting democracy: Intervention is also justified on the ground of violation of democratic rights of the people. Humanitarian intervention therefore, invariably take place in the context of dictatorship or authoritarianism. Promoting democracy is a legitimate goal of intervention as it will strengthen respect for human rights and reduce the chances of future humanitarian crisis.

5. International community: Humanitarian intervention not only provides evidence of the international community's commitment towards preservation of peace, prosperity, democracy and human rights but also strengthens these values by establishing guidelines for the way in which governments should treat their people, reflected in the principle of 'Responsible sovereignty'. Therefore, the first and primary goal of the state is to protect its citizens from various types of crimes, cruelties and violence.

On the other hand there are others who do not justify intervention in the internal affairs of other states. The following points may be considered in this regard.

1. Against international law: International law clearly authorizes intervention only in the case of self defence. Respect for state sovereignty is the most important means of upholding international order. If humanitarian intervention is permitted then, international law at best becomes confused and the established rules of world order are weakened.

2. National interest: As realists argue, states are always guided by its national interests. Their claim that military action is motivated by humanitarian considerations is invariably an example of political mendacity. On the other hand, if an intervention is genuinely humanitarian. The state in question would be putting its own citizens at risk in order to 'save strangers' violating its national interest.

3. Simplistic politics: The case for intervention is invariably based on a simplistic 'good or bad' image of political conflict. It ignores the moral complexities that attend all international conflicts.

4. Moral pluralism: humanitarian intervention can be seen as a form of cultural imperialism. It is based on an essentially western notion of human rights that may not be applicable in other parts of the world. It is difficult to establish universal guidelines for the behavior of the governments due to historical, political, cultural and religious differences among the various nations of the world.

STOP TO CONSIDER

The UN Justification: Threat to Peace and International Security

When we look at the involvement of UN in the cases of humanitarian intervention, the most important point to be noted is the tendency to link human rights and human rights violations within a country to Chapter VII of the UN Charter. In this way, the traditional understanding that humanitarian intervention is unlawful because it neither involves self-defence (Art. 51) nor enforcement action under chapter VII was overcome. Furthermore, the ban on UN intervention in domestic affairs without the consent of the target state regulated in Article 2(7) is eliminated since it makes an exemption in that “this principle shall not prejudice the application of the enforcement measure under Chapter VII.”

Here the most interesting point is that there is no reference to Article 55 and 56 of the UN Charter, which require member states to take joint and collective action for the achievement of universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all instead of referring to these articles, in recent UN authorization, a linkage between threat or breach of international peace and the situation at hand was made. By doing so, intervention was related to the international peace and security.

It may be mentioned here that there was no clear legal Security Council authorisation in case of Northern Iraq and Kosovo for the member states armed forces to intervene. In the case of Northern Iraq, the US, Britain and France launched Operation Provide

Comfort, by creating safe havens and imposing no-fly zones. In Kosovo, NATO countries conducted a full-scale operation against Yugoslavia. In this case, the UN Security Council had defined this situation as a threat to international peace and security. This broad interpretation of 'threat to peace and international security' in the Post cold war era has resulted in considering internal conflicts and humanitarian catastrophes with cross-border repercussions as constituting threats to international peace and security. However, some states object to this interpretation of humanitarian intervention authorized by the UN Security Council on the basis that Security Council may act arbitrarily in future cases. Furthermore, the argument that the Security Council, under the UN Charter and its practices, is not entitled to authorize humanitarian intervention based purely on human rights violations with no cross-border repercussions raise questions about the legal and structural limits of the Security Council on humanitarian intervention.

Intervention should not be judged in terms of its motives or intentions, or in terms of international law, but in terms of its outcomes. It remains as a question that can never be settled. However, there are certain examples of interventions that produced beneficial outcomes. For example, establishment of a 'no fly zone' in northern Iraq in 1991 prevented reprisal attacks and even massacres after the Kurdish uprising. It also allowed the Kurdish areas to develop a significant degree of autonomy. Similarly, the intervention in Kosovo in 1999 succeeded in its goal of expelling Serbian police and military from the area. It helped to end a massive displacement of population and prevented possible further attacks. These two operations were carried out by NATO, involving minimal casualties. Estimates of the civilians and combatants killed in Kosovo range from 1500(NATO) to 5700 (Serbia). Moreover intervention in Sierra Leone in 2000 was effective

in bringing an end a ten year long civil war that has killed almost 50,000 people. It also provided that basis for parliamentary and presidential elections held in 2007.

However, at the same many interventions have been far less effective. In many instances, UN Peacemakers have been sidelined (Congo) or in some cases interventions have been quickly abandoned (Somalia) or have resulted in counter insurgency struggles (Afghanistan and Iraq). The deepest problem here is that interventions may do more harm than good. For instance, to replace a dictator by foreign occupying forces may only increase tensions create a greater risk of civil war, which then subject civilians to a state of constant warfare. Thus, while political stability, democratic governance and respect for human rights may all be desirable goals, it may not be possible for outsiders to impose or enforce them. Many humanitarian interventions have failed because of adequate planning for reconstruction and an insufficient provision for resource building. Therefore, emphasis should be laid not merely on the ‘responsibility to protect’ but also on the ‘responsibility to prevent’ and the ‘responsibility to rebuild’.

1.9 Summing Up

Humanitarian intervention is mainly military intervention carried out with objectives of protecting people from human rights violations as well as to restore international peace and security. The idea of protecting non nationals developed in the 16th and 17th centuries. The liberal thinkers mainly related the concept of intervention for protecting the liberal values like rights, peace, democracy etc. the cases of intervention mainly increased in the post cold war period owing to various factors like change in the nature of international system, end of super power rivalry and so on. There many instances where humanitarian intervention were carried out without the proper sanctions of UN by multinational states more particularly under the leadership of NATO. There is a question regarding the justification of

intervention in the context of state sovereignty. Now this is one debatable question still prevalent. Nevertheless, emphasis should be laid not merely on the ‘responsibility to protect’ but also on the ‘responsibility to prevent’ and the ‘responsibility to rebuild’.

1.10 References and Suggested readings

Baylis, S. & Smith, S, *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001.

Basu, R, *International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues*, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2011.

Ghosh, Peu, *International Relations*, PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd, Delhi, 2020.

Heywood, A, *Global Politics*, Palgrave Foundations, New York, 2011.

Unit 1: Introduction to International Law: concept and growth

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Objectives

1.3 Meaning of International law

1.4 Growth of International law

1.5 Summing Up

1.6 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction

Through its diplomatic activities, Europe as a continent has contributed immensely to the development of international law. Most of its state to state relationships prior to the First and Second World Wars have now become part and parcel of diplomacy and international law. This is more so when the wars and diplomatic activities between and among European states before the formal international legal structures were codified in various conventions and other statutory documents. Therefore, the study of international law in this study, attempts to do so bearing in mind European contributions through diplomatic practices to international law. International law is an institutional practice with a long history and presence in the international system. It is usually relied upon to state the roles and limits of actors in the international system. This underscores the fundamental importance of international law in the study of international relations. Although international relations and international law appear to be separate disciplines, their degree of separation very much depends on how participants in these disciplines define their research interests and concerns. How be it, at the level of system-wide analysis, international law is an important resource for students of international relations. Studying international law is an important way to grasp the facts of international life, as well as the values underpinning it. It can be studied from any of the perspectives within international relations. International law has undergone a number of changes, which indeed have increased tremendously since 1945 with the emergence of international human rights law, international trade law, international criminal law, and international humanitarian law regimes; indicating the dynamics of the evolution of

international law in consonance with the trajectories of international relations. Contemporary theories of international relations have to develop, part way on account of the configurations established by these networks and domains of institutional practices provided by international law.

International law comprises those structural legal relations which are intrinsic to the co-existence of all kinds of subordinate societies and persons. It confers on legal personalities, including the state societies, the capacity to act as parties in international legal relations. It determines the systematic relationship between other systemic entities. A crucial element of the international legal system is the international public law, which focuses on the inter-governmentalism of international society. International public law is that part of international law, which regulates the interaction of the subordinate public realms within the international public realm. The principal participants in the legal relations of international public law are the 'states', represented by their 'governments', that is to say, by the controllers of their respective public realms. 'States' are considered to be those societies whose internal public realm is recognized as capable of participating in inter-governmentalism. International constitutional law determines the conditions of that participation and also the participation of other persons, on the basis of legal relations to which they are made parties. The Laws of the nations are an integral part of the international legal system. It is international constitutional law which determines the participants in the international legal system (for example, making a particular society into a 'state'), and determines the conditions of their participation. The geographical and material distribution of constitutional authority among subordinate legal system cannot be finally determined by those legal systems themselves, but only by a super ordinate legal system namely international constitutional law.

1.2 Objectives

Upon the completion of this unit, you will be able to:

- define and explain the concept "international law";
- explain the relevance of the study of international law; and
- identify the different component areas of international law.

1.3 Meaning of International law

International Law is defined as a body of principles & rules commonly observed by States in their mutual relationship with

each other. It includes the law relating to States & International organisations and also International Organisations inter se. It also includes the rules of law relating to international institutions and individuals, and non-State entities and individuals.

International law refers to the universal system of rules and principles concerning the relations between sovereign States, and relations between States and international organisations such as the United Nations. It consists of the rules and principles of general application dealing with the conduct of States and of international organisations in their international relations with one another and with private individuals, minority groups and transnational companies. It can also be described as a system of legal relations which condition social action of state and non-state entities. International law is primarily formulated by international agreement, treaties and conventions, which create rules binding upon the signatories, and customary rules which are basically state practices recognized by the community at large as laying down patterns of conducts that have to be complied with. The willingness to agree, accept and abide with international resolutions is crucial, particularly to the extent it will go in precluding international disputes.

According to Oppenheim, Law Of Nations Or International Law is “the Name for the body of customary and treaty rules which are considered legally binding by civilized states in their inter course with each other. There Are three components in this definitions.

1. Body Of rules governing the relations between states.
2. States Regard these rules as binding on them in their relation with one another And
3. Such rules derived from customs and treaties.

International law deals with international disputes, like any other system of law, the role of international law is to regulate relations and thus help to contain and avoid disputes in the first place. The substantial part of international law, therefore, does not concern dispute resolution but dispute avoidance. It focuses on the day-to-day regulation of international relations. In the daily routine of international life, large numbers of agreements and customs are made and observed.

Stop to consider

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL LAW AND MUNICIPAL LAW

Fundamentally, international law differs from domestic law in two central respects:

THE LAW-MAKING PROCESS

There is no supreme law-making body in international law. Treaties are negotiated between States on an ad hoc basis and only bind States which are parties to a treaty. The General Assembly of the United Nations is not a law-making body, and so its resolutions are not legally binding. This is not the case in municipal law.

ENFORCEMENT PROCESS

International law has no international police force to oversee obedience to the international legal standards to which States agree or that develop as international standards of behavior. Similarly, there is no compulsory enforcement mechanism for the settlement of disputes. However, there are an increasing number of specialized courts, tribunals and treaty monitoring bodies as well as an International Court of Justice. National laws and courts are often an important means through which international law is implemented in practice.

International Law Defined

In its narrowest sense, “international law” refers to laws applicable between “states” –a word that in international law writings typically refers to a country, or sovereign nation -state, and not to a country’s constituent elements. International law thus comprises legal obligations to which states have consented in order to regulate the interactions between them. This formulation traditionally concentrated on actions by states; at times, however, it also took into account the behavior of nonstate actors.

Contemporary international law includes those rules and norms that regulate the conduct of states and other entities which at any given time are recognized as possessing international personality. States are the main subjects of international law. At first, international law only regulated relations between independent states and mainly within diplomatic relations and war. Nowadays, there are more subjects of international law and its content has expanded as well. Problems of international concern need collective state action and modern technology has led to closer and more frequent contact between states and their peoples. As a result, the contact needed to be regulated by new rules. Another expansion is that international law also deals with matter which traditionally was regarded as being within a state’s domestic jurisdiction, like use of territory or treatment of inhabitants. This means individuals have international personality to some extent, because they have certain rights. International law has limited the sovereignty of states in favor of more recognition of human rights. The traditional definition of law (a system that regulates state relations) is not applicable anymore. International law has to change according to new developments.

International law, like any other law is a product of social processes, which determine society’s common interest and which organizes the making and application of law. International law takes a customary

form, in which society orders itself through its experience of self-ordering. The state of international law at any time reflects the degree of development of international society. This partly explains why international law has a threefold social function, which include the carriage of the structures and systems of society through time; the insertion of the common interest of societies into the behavior of society members and; the establishment of a possible future for societies, in accordance with society's theories, values and purposes. By extension therefore, international law is self-constituting of all-humanity and is actualized through the law of the common interest of international society. It is that element which binds the members of the community together in their adherence to recognized values and standards. It consists of a series of rules regulating behavior, and reflecting to some extent, the ideas and preoccupations of the society within which it functions.

International law is sometimes also called public international law. Public International Law (PIL) covers relations between states in all their myriad forms, from war to satellites, and regulates the operations of the many international institutions. It may be universal or general, in which case the stipulated rules bind all the states (or practically all depending upon the nature of the rule), or regional, whereby a group of states linked geographically or ideologically may recognize special rules applying only to them. The rule of international law must be distinguished from what is called international comity, which are implemented solely through courtesy and are not regarded as legally binding. Similarly, the mistake of confusing international law with international morality must be avoided. While they may meet at certain points, the former discipline is a legal one both as regards its content and its form, while the concept of international morality is a branch of ethics. This does not mean, however, that international law cannot be divorced from its values.

The above underlines the fact that the focus of international law is interstate relations and not relations between private entities and also the fact that domestic laws of any country cannot tell us what international laws are. Private entities, such as companies or individuals, however, can be subjects of international law. For example, international aviation is governed by international law because there are international treaties between states about it. Similarly, individuals can be prosecuted under international criminal law or claim rights against states under international human rights law because there are interstate treaties that make these possible. International law, therefore, regulates more than just interstate

relations. It also regulates other forms of relationships that states agree to regulate internationally. International law regulates the conduct of actors that make up contemporary international society. Areas of contemporary international law are numerous and includes: Airspace, Development, Bio-diversity, Climate change, Conduct of armed conflicts, Diplomatic and consular relations, Extradition, Finance, Fisheries, Human rights, Indigenous rights, Intellectual property, International crimes, Minority rights, Natural resources, Outer space, Ozone layer, Postal matters, Peace and security, Science and security, Sea, Trade, Use of force, Weapons.

Check your Progress

What do you mean by international law?

Sources of international Law

Traditionally, international law is made by sovereign states, for sovereign states. It deals with such matters as diplomatic relations, military issues and state territory. This focus on relations among states has proved to be both a source of strength and of weakness. The control exercised by states over the making and development of international law contributes in some ways, to its effectiveness. States are unlikely to develop legal norms unless they are in harmony with their national interests and unless they plan to abide by them.

On the other hand, control by states over international law means that useful or necessary changes will be delayed or obstructed if they conflict with the interests of states. The current efforts to control global climate change are a case in point. The countries that matter the most, the major polluters, are those that are most reluctant to cooperate effectively. Yet, without their consent, there can be no real progress.

Any system of law must have sources. The most accepted statement of the sources of international law may be found in Article 38(1) to the Statute of the International Court of Justice ("ICJ"). The ICJ Statute is to a large degree a reproduction of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice the ICJ's predecessor. Article 38(1) to the ICJ Statute states:

1. The Court, whose function is to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it, shall apply:
 - a. international conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting states;

b. international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law;

c. the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;

d. subject to the provisions of Article 59, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law.

As can be seen, there are three primary sources in international law: treaty, custom and general principles of law. Additionally, there are two subsidiary sources that may assist one in identifying norms derived from the primary sources: judicial decisions and "the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists" i.e. leading international law scholars.

TREATIES

International conventions are generally referred to as treaties. Treaties are written agreements between States that are governed by international law. Treaties are referred to by different names, including agreements, conventions, covenants, protocols and exchanges of notes. If States want to enter into a written agreement that is not intended to be a treaty, they often refer to it as a Memorandum of Understanding and provide that it is not governed by international law. Treaties can be bilateral, multilateral, regional and global.

CUSTOM

International custom – or customary law – is evidence of a general practice accepted as law through a constant and virtually uniform usage among States over a period of time. Rules of customary international law bind all States. The State alleging the existence of a rule of customary law has the burden of proving its existence by showing a consistent and virtually uniform practice among States, including those States specially affected by the rule or having the greatest interest in the matter. For example, to examine the practice of States on military uses of outer space, one would look in particular at the practice of States that have activities in space. Most of the International Court of Justice cases also require that the States who engage in the alleged customary practice do so out of a sense of legal obligation or *opinio juris* rather than out of comity or for political reasons.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF LAW

General principles of law recognized by civilized nations are often cited as a third source of law.

These are general principles that apply in all major legal systems. An example is the principle that persons who intentionally harm others should have to pay compensation or make reparation.

General principles of law are usually used when no treaty provision or clear rule of customary law exists.

Stop to Consider

SUBSIDIARY MEANS FOR THE DETERMINATION OF RULES OF LAW

Subsidiary means are not sources of law, instead they are subsidiary means or evidence that can be used to prove the existence of a rule of custom or a general principle of law. Article 38 lists only two subsidiary means - the teaching (writings) of the most highly qualified publicists (international law scholars) and judicial decisions of both international and national tribunals if they are ruling on issues of international law. Resolutions of the UN General Assembly or resolutions adopted at major international conferences are only recommendations and are not legally binding. However, in some cases, although not specifically listed in article 38, they may be subsidiary means for determining custom. If the resolution purports to declare a set of legal principles governing a particular area, if it is worded in norm creating language, and if it is adopted without any negative votes, it can be evidence of rules of custom, especially if States have in practice acted in compliance with its terms. Examples of UN General Assembly Resolutions which have been treated as strong evidence of rules of customary international law

SUBJECTS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A subject of international law (also called an international legal person) is a body or entity recognized or accepted as being capable of exercising international rights and duties. It refers to the entities or legal persons that can have rights and obligations under international law. This expression suggests that not all entities that operate within the international arena possess rights nor have obligations that are recognizable in international law. Some of the key features of 'subjects' of international law are:

- (i). the ability to access international tribunals to claim or act on rights conferred by international law;
- (ii). the ability to implement some or all of the obligations imposed by international law; and
- (iii). the power to make agreements, such as treaties, binding in international law;
- (iv). the right to enjoy some or all of the immunities from the jurisdiction of the domestic courts of other States.

Check Your Progress

1. Define International Law.
2. Discuss the various sources of International law

1.4 Growth of International law

International law is a distinctive part of the general structure of international relations. In contemplating responses to a particular international situation, states usually consider relevant international laws. International law is distinct from international comity, which comprises legally nonbinding practices adopted by states for reasons of courtesy (e.g., the saluting of the flags of foreign warships at sea). In addition, the study of international law, or public international law, is distinguished from the field of conflict of laws, or private international law, which is concerned with the rules of municipal law as international lawyers term the domestic law of states of different countries where foreign elements are involved.

The foundation of international law (or the law of nations) as it is understood today lie firmly in the development of Western culture and political organisations. As it were, the growth of European notions of sovereignty and the independent nation-state required an acceptable method whereby inter-state relations could be conducted in accordance with commonly accepted standards of behavior, and international law filled the gap. But although the law of nations took root and flowered with the sophistication of Renaissance Europe, the seeds of this particular hybrid plant are of far older lineage. They reach far back into history. While the modern international system can be traced back some 400 years, certain of the basic concepts of international law can be discerned in political relationships thousands of years ago. Around 2100 BC, for example, a solemn treaty was signed between the rulers of Lagash and Umma, the city-states situated in the area known to historians as Mesopotamia. It was inscribed on a stone block and concerned the established of a defined boundary to be respected by both sides under pain of alienating a number of Sumerian gods.

There was little scope for an international law in the period of ancient and medieval empires, and its modern beginnings coincide, therefore, with the rise of national states after the Middle Ages. Rules of maritime intercourse and rules respecting diplomatic agents soon came into existence. At the beginning of the 17th century, the great multitude of small independent states, which were finding international lawlessness intolerable, prepared the way for the favorable reception given to the *De jure belli ac pacis* [concerning the law of war and peace] (1625) of Hugo Grotius, the first comprehensive formulation of international law. Though not formally

accepted by any nation, his opinions and observations were afterward regularly consulted, and they often served as a basis for reaching agreement in international disputes. The most significant principle he enunciated was the notion of sovereignty and legal equality of all states. Other important writers on international law were Cornelius van Bynkershoek, Georg F. von Martens, Christian von Wolff, and Emerich Vattel.

The major instance known of an important, binding, international treaty is that concluded over 1000 years later between Ramses II of Egypt and the king of the Hittites for the establishment of eternal peace and brotherhood. Other points covered in that agreement signed (at Kadesh, north of Damascus) included respect for each other's territorial integrity, the termination of a state of aggression and the setting up of a form of defensive alliance. Since that date many agreements between the rival Middle Eastern powers were concluded, usually aimed at embodying in a ritual form a state of subservience between the parties or attempting to create a political alliance to contain the influence of an over-powerful empire.

The era of classical Greece, from about the sixth century BC and onwards for a couple of hundred years, has been of overwhelming significance for European thought. Its critical and rational turn of mind, its constant questioning and analysis of man and nature and its love of argument and debate were spread throughout Europe and the Mediterranean world by the Roman empire which adopted Hellenic culture wholesale, and penetrated Western consciousness with the Renaissance. However, Greek awareness was limited to their own competitive city-states and colonies. Those of different origins were Barbarians not deemed worthy of association.

The Romans had a profound respect for organisation and the law. Law knitted together their empire and constituted a vital source of reference for every inhabitant of the far-flung domain. The early Roman law (the *jus civile*) applied only to Roman citizens. It was formalistic and hard and reflected the status of a small, unsophisticated society rooted in the soil. It was totally unable to provide a relevant background for an expanding, developing nation. The need was served by the creation of the *jus gentium*. This provided simplified rules to govern the relations between foreigners, and between foreigners and citizens. The instrument through which this particular instrument evolved was the official known as the Praetor Peregrinus, whose function it was to oversee all legal relationship, including bureaucratic and commercial matters, within the empire. The progressive rules of the *jus gentium*

gradually overrode the narrow *jus civile* until the latter system ceased to exist. Thus the *jus gentium* became the common law of the Roman Empire and was deemed to be of universal application. It is this all embracing factor which so strongly distinguishes the Roman from the Greek experience, although, of course, there was no question of the acceptance of other nations on a basis of equality and the *jus gentium* remained a 'national law' for the Roman Empire.

Throughout Europe, mercantile courts were set up to settle disputes between tradesmen at the various fairs, and while it is not possible to state that a Continent Law Merchant came into being, a network of common regulations and practices weaved its way across the commercial fabric of Europe and constituted an embryonic international trade law. Similarly, maritime customs began to be accepted throughout the Continent. Founded upon the Rhodesian Sea Law, a Byzantine work, many of those rules were enshrined in the Rolls of Oleron in the 12th century, and other maritime textbooks, a series of common applied customs relating to the sea permeated the naval powers of the Atlantic and Mediterranean coasts.

The rise of the nation-state of England, France and Spain in particular characterized the process of the creation of territorially consolidated independent units, in theory and doctrine, as well as in fact. This led to a higher degree of interaction between sovereign entities and thus the need to regulate such activities in a generally acceptable fashion. The pursuit of political power and supremacy became overt and recognized, as Machiavelli's *The Prince* (1513) demonstrated. The city-states of Italy struggled for supremacy and the Papacy too became a secular power. From these hectic struggles emerged many of the staples of modern international life: diplomacy, statesmanship, the theory of the balance of power and the idea of a community of state.

It is the evolution of the concept of an international community of separate, sovereign, if competing, states, that marks the beginning of what is understood by international law. The Renaissance bequeathed the prerequisites of independent, critical thought and a humanistic, secular approach to life as well as the political framework for the future. But is the latter factor which is vital to the subsequent growth of int law. The Reformation and the European religious wars that followed emphasized this, as did the growing power of the nations. In many ways these wars marked the decline of a continental system founded on the supremacy of the state. Throughout these countries the necessity was felt for a new conception of human as well as state relationships. This search was precipitated, as has been intimated, by

the decline of the Church and the rise of what might be termed 'free-thinking'.

The growth of international law both its rules and its institutions is inevitably shaped by international political events. From the end of World War II until the 1990s, most events that threatened international peace and security were connected to the Cold War between the Soviet Union and its allies and the U.S. led Western alliance. The UN Security Council was unable to function as intended, because resolutions proposed by one side were likely to be vetoed by the other. The bipolar system of alliances prompted the development of regional organizations e.g., the Warsaw Pact organized by the Soviet Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) established by the United States and encouraged the proliferation of conflicts on the peripheries of the two blocs, including in Korea, Vietnam, and Berlin. Furthermore, the development of norms for protecting human rights proceeded unevenly, slowed by sharp ideological divisions.

Since the 1980s, globalization has increased the number and sphere of influence of international and regional organizations and required the expansion of international law to cover the rights and obligations of these actors. Because of its complexity and the sheer number of actors it affects, new international law is now frequently created through processes that require near universal consensus. In the area of the environment, for example, bilateral negotiations have been supplemented and in some cases replaced by multilateral ones, transmuting the process of individual state consent into community acceptance. Various environmental agreements and the Law of the Sea treaty have been negotiated through this consensus building process. International law as a system is complex. Although in principle it is "horizontal," in the sense of being founded upon the concept of the equality of states one of the basic principles of international law in reality some states continue to be more important than others in creating and maintaining international law.

The growth of international law came largely through treaties concluded among states accepted as members of the "family of nations," which first included the states of Western Europe, then the states of the New World, and, finally, the states of Asia and other parts of the world. The law making conventions of the Hague Conferences represent the chief development of international law before World War I. The nuclear age and the

space age have led to new developments in international law. The basis of space law was developed in the 1960s under United Nations auspices. Treaties have been signed mandating the internationalization of outer space (1967) and other celestial bodies (1979). The Law of the Sea treaty (1982) clarified the status of territorial waters and the exploitation of the seabed. Environmental issues have led to a number of international treaties, including agreements covering fisheries (1958), endangered species (1973), global warming and biodiversity (1992). Since the signing of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1947, there have been numerous international trade agreements.

Stop to Consider

HUGO GROTIUS

The writings of the Dutch scholar Hugo Grotius, whose major work *On the Law of War and Peace* was published in Paris in 1625—a work so dense and rich that one could easily spend a lifetime studying it (as a number of scholars have) is of great importance. As a natural-law writer, he was a conservative, writing squarely in the rationalist tradition. In international law specifically, he had important forerunners, most notably the Italian writer, Alberico Gentili, who produced the first truly systematic study of the law of war at the end of the sixteenth century. Where Grotius did break important new ground—and where he fully earned the renown that still attaches to his name was in his transformation of the old *jus gentium* into something importantly different, called the law of nations.

1.5 Summing Up

After going through this unit we will be able to understand that, The international society is made up of states and non state actors. It is also made up of international organisations and other groups such as armed groups or business enterprises and individuals; whose status, powers, responsibilities and actions must however be recognized by states through international law. By implication, an essential element in the definition of international law, which provides a framework for focus, is not in its subject matter or the type of entities it regulates, but that it is law that is made by states collectively. No single state acting unilaterally can make international law; neither can a collection of corporations or individuals. International law rests with states acting together. International organisations, individuals, and corporations can all become subjects of international law and have limited powers and international personality recognized under international law. They can also help clarify what international law is by interpreting it or they can appear in international courts. But they cannot make international law. This means that there are no predetermined limits as to what areas

international law does or should regulate. This can only be determined through collective agreement amongst states.

1.6 References and Suggested Readings

Duplessis, I. (2008), “Soft international labour law: The Preferred Method of Regulation in A Decentralized Society” In: Clavet, R., Castro, G.D, Daugareilh, I., et. al. Governance International Law and Corporate Social Responsibility (Geneva: International Institute for Labor Studies).

Shaw, Malcolm N. (2008), International Law (London, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press).

Unit 2: International Organizations and world politics

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Objectives

2.3 International Organizations and world politics

2.4 Summing Up

2.5 References and Suggested Readings

2.1 Introduction

The creation of an international forum for multi-lateral negotiations came about with the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) in 1889, which is still active today and has membership of 157 national parliaments. The IPU was the predecessor to the League of Nations, created in 1919 after the end of the First World War; this later became the United Nations after the failure of the League to prevent international conflicts. (Thompson and Snidal: 1999: 693) The legacy of the IPU, the League of Nations, and other early international alliances was not the institutions' effectiveness as an actor, but rather as a forum, for nations to voice their opinions and promote dialogue. This was arguably their greatest achievement, as even after the failure of the League, nation States still felt the need for an institution that would allow them to share their ideas and provide an opportunity to settle disputes peacefully. Thus, emerged the United Nations, which to this day remains the only institution with universal membership. It is the largest of all international organisations, which is why it will be analysed for the purpose of this paper.

The aim of this unit is to investigate the role of an international institution as a stage for States to bring matters to the attention of the international community and how this is a victory in itself for international relations. This assertion will be verified by firstly examining the critiques of international institutions by using international relations theory, namely neo-realism, highlighting its limitations and breaking down its core assumptions. The paper will then follow with an analysis of neoliberal institutionalism and its discourses as an alternative to neorealism, as well as constructivism, and its theory of institutions being a socially constructed concept determined by the sharing of ideas; it will finally conclude with the idea that institutions play a crucial role in the international system.

2.2 Objectives

After going through this unit you will be able to

- discuss international institutions
- differentiate between international institutions and organisations.
- identify various types of international institutions.
- explain how international institutions are formed
- state the role played by international institutions

2.3 International Organizations and world politics

The first international organization in the post- Napoleonic era was formed after the Congress of Vienna in 1816— the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine. Since 1816, the number of international organizations in world politics has greatly expanded. As of 2013, the Union of International Associations cataloged 1,172 international organizations (IOs) functioning around the globe.¹ These organizations work in nearly every substantive area of international politics: trade, security, finance, environment, development, human rights, science, and culture. Clearly, international organizations pervade international life.

Definition of International institution

According to Simpson and Weiner (2011), an international institution is an organisation, establishment or foundation devoted to the promotion of a cause or programme especially one of public, educational or charitable character. International institution as defined by John Duffield is an institution that has occupied a central place in international relations, composed of countries that come together to achieve specific goals (Duffield, 2007). According to Simmons and Martin (2001: 192), the term international institution has been used in the last few decades to describe a wide range of phenomena, but particularly after the World Wars, to refer to formal international organisation, specifically, the organs or branches of the United Nations system.

Koremenos, Lipson, and Snidal (2001) on their part, defined international institutions as explicit arrangements, negotiated among international actors, which prescribe, proscribe, and/or authorise behaviour and these explicit arrangements are public, at least

among the parties themselves. According to this definition, these institutions are the fruits of negotiations and agreement. The definition however excludes tacit bargains and implicit guidelines; however important they are as general forms of cooperation.

Koremenos, Lipson, and Snidal (2001) further argue that the Realist School of thought's definition of international institutions are little more than ciphers for state power. States rarely allow international institutions to become significant autonomous actors. Nonetheless, institutions are considerably more than empty vessels. States spend significant amounts of time and effort constructing institutions precisely because they can advance or impede state goals in the international economy, the environment, and national security. States fight over institutional design because it affects outcomes.

John Klabbers views international institutions as social constructs created by people in order, presumably, to help them achieve some purpose, whatever that purpose may be. He further states that the aim of international institutions being created is to make ends meet (Klabbers, 2002:8).

From the definitions given above by various authors, international institutions can simply be defined as the coming together of two or more nations, to achieve a particular aim or aims, and these aims are achieved by countries belonging to these international institutions by pooling resources together. Note that cooperation is a major factor in international institution.

Stop to Consider

Lists of Some Major International Institutions

- a) World Bank
- b) International Monetary Fund
- c) World Trade Organisation
- d) World Health Organisation
- e) International Court of Justice
- f) World Health Organisation
- g) World Food Programme
- h) Food and Agriculture Organisation
- i) African Union
- j) European Union
- k) North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
- l) Economic Community of West African States

The Demand for IOs:

The study of what drives IO creation became systematic and routinized in the post- World War II era. The attempt to generalize from the creation of the United Nations

(UN), its attendant organizations, and more importantly, the European Coal and Steel Community, moved forward with the adaptation of functionalist ideas.⁴ IOs were argued to serve a functional purpose: minimize nationalism and attachment to territory, which had for centuries served as the basis for political conflict. The functionalist project could be a top-down process (as it was for Mitrany) or a bottom-up process, where IOs formed to facilitate citizen interaction on a large scale (as conceived of by Karl Deutsch and his associates⁵). Functionalism, which had developed as an anti-statist project in the interwar period, incorporated the behavior of sovereign governments. Rather than replacing territorially based states, the process of integration through organizations would take place with states designing cooperation in technical areas.

The purpose of an international institution could be to achieve international cooperation in dealing with issues of an economic, technical, social, cultural or humanitarian character or a combination of more than one of these. There could also be cooperation in the field of governance and security, as exemplified by the United Nations whose main aim is to promote peace, security, promoting social progress, better standards and human rights and developing friendly relations among nations.

Self Asking Question

How would you define international institutions?

Classification of International Organizations

Like most social phenomena, international institutions can be classified based on their commonalities ranging from their composition, objectives to their functions among others. Without prejudice to the foregoing, it is important to note that classifications of international institutions are not absolute categories, as some institutions by their nature and composition can be classified into more than one category. We shall consider a few classifications of international institutions based on the following: number, common history, interests and region or geography.

Classification Based on Number of Members

This method of classification is based on the fact that the membership of some international institutions is exclusive, while others are open to all countries. The United Nations is an example of an international institution because its membership is open to all sovereign countries, unlike other institutions. Other institutions are limited to only few

members or limited members, and this limitation may be derived from the purpose they intend to achieve. An example of such institutions is the G20 which comprises twenty members made up of the most industrialised nations in the world. They were formerly G7 which comprised of Western European countries and the United States. Later Russia was admitted into this exclusive group and its name changed to G7 + 1 and then G8, but now its membership has increased to twenty.

Classification by Common History

Some institutions can be classified by virtue of the shared common history of their member states, which has resulted in them grouping together to protect their common interests. The Commonwealth group is an example of an institution whose membership is limited to countries which were hitherto part of the British Empire, and these include the United Kingdom, former British colonies, protectorates and dominions. Another example is the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) which arose from issues of geo-politics and security during the Cold War era. Its membership is drawn from countries of Western Europe as well as the United States and Canada, who were locked in security posturing against the member states of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and its allies, then known as the Warsaw Pact countries. NATO as an institution has outlived the Cold War and has found relevance in the wake of new global security challenges. It has incorporated new member states and has been involved in security operations in Bosnia, Afghanistan and more recently Libya in 2011.

Stop to Consider

The Group of Eight (G8)

The Group of Eight (G8) was an inter-governmental political forum from 1997 until 2014. It had formed from incorporating the country of Russia into the Group of Seven, or G7, and returned to its previous name after Russia was disinvited in 2014. The forum originated with a 1975 summit hosted by France that brought together representatives of six governments: France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, thus leading to the name Group of Six or G6. The summit came to be known as the Group of Seven, in 1976 with the addition of Canada. Russia was added to the political forum from 1997, which the following year became known as the G8. In March 2014 Russia was suspended indefinitely following the annexation of Crimea, whereupon the political forum name reverted to G7. In 2017, Russia announced its permanent withdrawal from the G8. However, several representatives of G7 countries stated that they would be interested in Russia's return to the group. The European Union was represented at the G8 since the 1980s as a "nonenumerated" participant, but originally could not host or chair summits. The 40th summit was the first time the European Union was able to host and chair a summit. Collectively, in 2012 the G8 nations comprised 50.1 percent of 2012 global nominal GDP and 40.9 percent of global GDP (PPP). "G7" can refer to the member states in aggregate or to the annual summit meeting of the G7 heads of

government. G7 ministers also meet throughout the year, such as the G7 finance ministers (who meet four times a year), G7 foreign ministers, or G7 environment ministers.

Classification Based on Geographical Location

This is another classification of international institutions which concerns itself with groupings of international institutions based on the regional or geographical location of their members. Just as some institutions are universal, transcending geographical locations and cutting across the globe, others are regional and territorial in nature. The most significant example of an institution whose membership is drawn without prejudice to geographical location bias, include members of the United Nations group, such as the World Health Organisation, the International Criminal Court and the Food and Agriculture Organisation. However, on the other hand, regionally grouped international institutions include the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) which comprises of only states in the West African sub-region, the African Union (AU), the successor of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and the European Union (EU). However, in view of the recent admission of some Eastern European countries into the EU and the current consideration of Turkey's application for membership, the question has been raised whether the EU remains a regional institution.

Classification Based on Interests

This classification is based on the common interests of members of international institutions, which is deducible from the objective necessitating the formation of such institutions. As earlier discussed in this unit, the common interests of member states which necessitate the formation of international institutions vary significantly and include one or a combination of security, food security, health, settlement of disputes, economy, trade, disaster management, human rights, and global finance among so many others. For a better understanding of the classification of international institutions based on interest, it is important to consider a few major areas of common interests and examples of some international institutions which have been formed on the basis of these.

a) Security and Peacekeeping

An example of an institution based on security is the European Police Office (EUROPOL) whose mission is to assist law enforcement authorities of member states in fighting organised crimes. Another is

the International Police Office (INTERPOL) which has a membership of 190 countries. The Interpol focuses primarily on public safety, anti-terrorism, organised crimes, environmental crime, piracy, illicit drug production, corruption etc. Other examples include the UN Security Council and NATO.

b) Food Security

The World Food Programme (WFP) is an institution established to address hunger worldwide and it distributes food to about 90 million people per year and has 80 countries as its members. Also, the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) is part of the UN group and has a mandate of global food security, through research and the provision of expert advice on policy to its members.

c) Health

The World Health Organisation (WHO) aims at helping member states in attaining the highest level of health for their population. Also, another example is the United Nations and Aids (UNAIDS) whose singular objective is to provide an HIV/AIDS free world.

d) Education

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), also a member of the UN group, has its main mandate to build peace through education in all its ramifications.

e) Socio-Cultural Values

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) fall under this category as well, because one of its mandates is the promotion of respect for and protection of world's cultural heritage, etc.

Self Asking Questions

Mention five different criteria for classifying international institutions.

The Roots of International organizations

International organization is mainly a modern phenomenon. One mostly common characteristic of IGOS is that they were created in the last 50 years or so. Three main roots namely a belief in a community of human kind, big-power peacekeeping and functional cooperation have accounted for the current growth of international organizations. As regards the first of these factors the universal course for improving the condition of humanity had made scholars of old such as William Penn and Immanuel Kant conceptualize the ideas of international

organization. The United Nations (successor of the League of Nations) is the latest and most advanced development stage of universal concern with the human condition. It was established to maintain peace. It has also been involved in a wide range of issue of worldly concern. The idea that big powers have a special responsibility to cooperate and preserve peace is the second factor that in formed the emergence of international organization today, the five major powers (China, France, Great Britain, Russia, and the United States) constitute the permanent members of the UN Security Council. The UNSC is the main peace keeping organ. The third branch of the root system consist of the specialized agencies that deals with specific economic and social problems e.g. Telecommunication Union (Formally International Telegraphic) created in 1865 is the oldest serving IGO with global membership. There are at about twenty specialized agencies associated with the UN.

Roles for International Organizations

In view of the expanding number and importance of international organizations, the pertinent nouns question is what we want these organization to achieve ultimately.

Interactive Arena

Traditionally, IGOs are to provide an interactive arena in which members pursue their individual national interests. This is scarcely stated openly but it is clearly in the struggles within the UN and other IGOs,

However the use of IGOs to gain national advantage is somewhat contradictory to the purpose of these cooperative organizations and has both disadvantages and advantages.

Independent International Actor

Technically, what any IGO does is controlled by the wishes and votes of its members. In reality, many IGOs develop strong relatively permanent administrative staffs.

Supranational Organization

This means that international organization has authority over its members, which, therefore, are subordinate units. Theoretically some IGOs possess a degree of supranationalism and can obligate members to take certain actions but in reality, supranationalism is limited. Only very few states concede any significant part of their sovereignty to any IGO. But this limitation does not mean however that the authority of the IGOs cannot expand.

Functions of International Organisations

In this section, we shall look at the functions performed by various international institutions.

United Nations

The first international institution we shall be considering is the United Nations. The United Nations was actually formed at the end of the World War II as a successor of the League of Nations.

There are four major functions of the United Nations that we shall consider:

- to preserve international peace
- to solve economic, social, political problem through international Peace
- to promote respect for human rights
- render humanitarian assistant.

To preserve international peace

The main function of the United Nations is to maintain and preserve peace and security in all its member states. Chapter 6 of the Charter provides for pacific settlement of disputes through the intervention of the Security Council by means such as negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and judicial decision. The duty of the Security Council is to investigate any dispute or situation that will endanger international peace and security. In the post-cold war periods, a lot of appeals to the United Nations for peace keeping have increased. Notwithstanding the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and security., any member states or a country which is not a member of the United Nations can report any issue to the United Nations which has to do with any situation that will endanger international peace. Though the United Nations does not maintain its own military, it does have peace keeping forces which are supplied by its member states. On approval of the United Nations Security Council, these peace keepers are often sent to regions where armed conflict has recently ended to discourage combatants from resuming fighting. In 1988, the peace keeping force won a Nobel peace prize for its actions.

Render humanitarian assistant

In conjunction with some organisations such as the Red Cross, the United Nations provides humanitarian assistance to disasters afflicted areas, especially where wars or riots have taken place. These agencies include the World Food Organisation and the High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Health Organisation, UNAIDS, the United Nations helps to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. The member

states of the United Nations have all agreed to achieve these goals, reducing mortality rate and fighting diseases.

To solve economic, social, political problem through international

Peace The United Nations plays an important role in social and economic development through its united development program. This is the latest source of technical grant assistance in the world. The United Nations has however established what is called millennium development goals, the member states have all agreed to achieve this goals and reduce poverty.

To promote respect for human rights

One of the main reasons for setting up the United Nations was for the promotion of the human rights. After the genocide of the Second World War, the United Nations charter enjoined member states to promote universal respect for, and observance of human rights. The Universal declaration of human rights though not legally binding was adopted by the General Assembly in 1948, as a common standard of achievement for all.

World Bank

Soumya Singh highlighted seven functions of the World Bank which are:

- a. Granting reconstruction loans to war devastated countries
- b. Granting developmental loans to underdeveloped countries
- c. Providing loans to governments for agriculture, irrigation, power, transport, water supply, education, health, etc.
- d. Providing loans to private concerns for specified projects
- e. Promoting foreign investment by guaranteeing loans provided by other organisations
- f. Providing technical, economic and monetary advice to member countries for specific projects
- g. Encouraging industrial development of underdeveloped countries by promoting economic reforms.

The World Bank is a financial institution that provides financial and technical assistance programs such as bridges, roads, and school etc. The major function of the World Bank is to eliminate poverty and to provide assistance to the poor by offering loans, policy advice and technical assistance.

International Monetary Fund

The International Monetary Fund is a financial international institution that was created on July 22, 1946. The major function of the International Monetary Fund is to stabilise exchange rates and assist

the reconstruction of the world's international payment system. The functions of the International Monetary Fund however include:

- a. Fostering global monetary cooperation
- b. Secure financial stability
- c. Facilitate international trade
- d. Promote high employment
- e. Sustain economic growth by promoting international economic cooperation.
- f. Reduce poverty

European Union

The European Union was created in the aftermath of the World War II in response to economic, social and political devastations that resulted from nationalist division in Europe. The European Commission identifies three functions of the European

Union which are:

- Initiating proposal for legislation
- Guardian of the treaties
- Manager and executor of the Union policies and of international trade relationships.

The overall function of the European Union is to create and implements laws and regulations that integrate the member states of the European Union.

Every international institution has its aims and objectives and specific functions it performs. In this unit, we have discussed the functions performed by selected international institutions. However, some of these international institutions have their functions embedded in the treaty, constitution or charter establishing the institution while others do not. It is however suggested that international institutions should have their functions embedded in the charter, institutions or treaties establishing them.

The role international organizations should play in world politics is dependent on the theoretical framework and interpretation of what the institutional system entails. For neo-realists, international institutions are and will always be ineffective, as they cannot alter the anarchic structure of the international system, neo-liberal institutionalists argue the opposite as they believe institutions greatly influence State conduct by both creating strong incentives for cooperation whilst at the same time implementing disincentives, as observed in the case of nuclear proliferation; constructivists take a very different approach by questioning the core assumptions of the other theories and drawing attention to the relationship between the structure and the agency, as

well as the construction of state and institutional interests. This essay has sought to argue that we should look at the United Nations system objectively as a forum for nations to come together and tackle issues that are of concern to the international community. This was the primary objective of the institution in 1945, which is why forcing it to develop into an impartial effective governing force seems quite naïve and unrealistic. As stated by former Assistant Secretary-General Robert Orr, “as an actor, there is so little we can do, and often the people accusing us are the same ones who prevent us from being able to act.” (Weiss: 2008: 8) For this reason, perhaps instead of focusing on the failures and reform within the UN, we should concentrate on the attributes and virtues that it has as an effective centre for harmonizing discussions and developing common goals for States. Rather than reducing the solution to problems of structural reform and widening participation efforts, we could look at promoting the UN as the prime setting for diplomacy and negotiation, as this has undeniably been its role since the beginning.

2.4 Summing Up

The twentieth century witnessed the most rapid evolution of the international system. The bipolar system declined as other countries and transnational actors became more important as the expense of continuing confrontation strained America and soviet budget resources, and the relative power of the two super powers declined. The bipolar system ended in 1991 when the Soviet Union collapsed. During this century, nationalism also undermined the foundations of multiethnic empires. For example, the colonial empires dominated by Great Britain, France, and other European powers also came to an end. There are numerous new trends, uncertainties, and choices to make as we enter the twenty-first century. There is the possibility that some form of modified multi-polar system. The international organizations have become much more numerous and more central to the operation of the international system. In this unit, factors and trends that will affect the world system in the twenty-first century are examined. These include political structure and orientation security, international economic and the quality of life.

2.5 References and Suggested Readings

Rourke, J.T. and Boyer, M.A (2002). World Politics. United States: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.

Hirst, P. and Thompson G. (1996). *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Unit 3: Understanding international diplomacy: Theory and practice

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Objectives
- 3.3 Diplomacy: Understanding the concept
- 3.4 Understanding international diplomacy: Theory and practice
- 3.5 Summing Up
- 3.6 References and Suggested Readings

3.1 Introduction

Diplomacy is an essentially political activity and, well-resourced and skilful, a major ingredient of power. Its chief purpose is to enable states to secure the objectives of their foreign policies without resort to force, propaganda, or law. It follows that diplomacy consists of communication between officials designed to promote foreign policy either by formal agreement or tacit adjustment. Although it also includes such discrete activities as gathering information, clarifying intentions, and engendering goodwill, it is thus not surprising that, until the label ‘diplomacy’ was affixed to all of these activities by the British parliamentarian Edmund Burke in 1796, it was known most commonly as ‘negotiation’ — by Cardinal Richelieu, the first minister of Louis XIII, as *négociation continuelle*. Diplomacy is not merely what professional diplomatic agents do. It is carried out by other officials and by private persons under the direction of officials. As we shall see, it is also carried out through many different channels besides the traditional resident mission. Together with the balance of power, which it both reflects and reinforces, diplomacy is the most important institution of our society of states.

3.2 Objectives

3.3 Diplomacy: Understanding the concept

Diplomacy has existed since the beginning of the human race. The act of conducting negotiations between two persons, or two nations at a large scope is essential to the upkeep of international affairs. Among

the many functions of diplomacy, some include preventing war and violence, and fortifying relations between two nations. Diplomacy is most importantly used to complete a specific agenda. Therefore without diplomacy, much of the world's affairs would be abolished, international organizations would not exist, and above all the world would be at a constant state of war. It is for diplomacy that certain countries can exist in harmony.

Diplomacy, the established method of influencing the decisions and behaviour of foreign governments and peoples through dialogue, negotiation, and other measures short of war or violence. Modern diplomatic practices are a product of the post-Renaissance European state system. Historically, diplomacy meant the conduct of official (usually bilateral) relations between sovereign states. By the 20th century, however, the diplomatic practices pioneered in Europe had been adopted throughout the world, and diplomacy had expanded to cover summit meetings and other international conferences, parliamentary diplomacy, the international activities of supranational and subnational entities, unofficial diplomacy by nongovernmental elements, and the work of international civil servants.

The term diplomacy is derived via French from the ancient Greek *diplōma*, composed of *diplo*, meaning “folded in two,” and the suffix *-ma*, meaning “an object.” The folded document conferred a privilege—often a permit to travel—on the bearer, and the term came to denote documents through which princes granted such favours. Later it applied to all solemn documents issued by chancelleries, especially those containing agreements between sovereigns. Diplomacy later became identified with international relations, and the direct tie to documents lapsed (except in diplomatics, which is the science of authenticating old official documents). In the 18th century the French term *diplomate* (“diplomat” or “diplomatist”) came to refer to a person authorized to negotiate on behalf of a state.

Diplomacy is the means by which states through their formal and other representatives, as well as other actors articulate, coordinate and secures particular or wider interests using correspondence, private talks, exchange of view, lobbying, visits, persuasions, and other related activities. The art of diplomacy involves tact, and the use of intelligence, and in this role the work of the missions become paramount.

This unit discusses the nature of diplomacy, its history, and the ways in which modern diplomacy is conducted, including the selection and training of diplomats and the organization of diplomatic bodies.

The Nature of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is often confused with foreign policy, but the terms are not synonymous. Diplomacy is the chief, but not the only, instrument of foreign policy, which is set by political leaders, though diplomats (in addition to military and intelligence officers) may advise them. Foreign policy establishes goals, prescribes strategies, and sets the broad tactics to be used in their accomplishment. It may employ secret agents, subversion, war, or other forms of violence as well as diplomacy to achieve its objectives. Diplomacy is the principal substitute for the use of force or underhanded means in statecraft; it is how comprehensive national power is applied to the peaceful adjustment of differences between states. It may be coercive (i.e., backed by the threat to apply punitive measures or to use force) but is overtly nonviolent. Its primary tools are international dialogue and negotiation, primarily conducted by accredited envoys (a term derived from the French *envoyé*, meaning “one who is sent”) and other political leaders. Unlike foreign policy, which generally is enunciated publicly, most diplomacy is conducted in confidence, though both the fact that it is in progress and its results are almost always made public in contemporary international relations.

Joseph Stalin quoted in (Dallin, 1944: 71) had paid his respect to the art of diplomacy in these words:

A diplomat’s words must have no relation to actions, otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron
Stalin in this quotation expressed the traditional attitude of modern dictators towards diplomacy, namely, that it is a means of concealing a nation’s real aims and of providing a smoke-screen for actions of vastly different character. Joseph Stalin, in short, took a cynical view of art of diplomacy.

While the sentiments of Stalin have some justifications, they do not suggest the real nature of diplomacy, which consists of the techniques and procedures for conducting relations among states; it is in fact, the normal means of conducting international relations. In itself diplomacy, like any machinery is both neither moral nor immoral, its use and value depends upon the intentions and abilities of those who practise it.

Diplomacy functions through a labyrinth of foreign offices, embassies, legations, consulates, and special missions all over the world. It is commonly bilateral in character, but as a result of the growing importance of international conferences, international organizations, regional arrangements and collective security measures, its multilateral aspect have become increasingly significant. It may embrace a multitude of interests, from the simplest matter of detail in the relations between two states to vital issues of war and peace. When it breaks down, the danger of war, or at least a major crisis is real.

Nation-states deal bilaterally with one another and meet together in multilateral organizations not only because they have interests in common, but also because they have interests which conflict. Moreover the fact of independence breeds suspicion and doubts. History is full of examples of conflict, duplicity and reversals of policy and everyday fresh examples are emerging. Diplomacy is intimately concerned with these problems and is therefore viewed as an organized pattern of communication and negotiation which enables each independent state to learn from what it also objects to.

In modern international societies, diplomacy has become more than an instrument of communication and bargaining. It is an activity which, even if often abused, has a bias towards the resolution of conflicts.

Stop to Consider

Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

It is necessary to bear in mind that there is a defined distinction between foreign policy and diplomacy. The foreign policy of a state according to Childs (1948:64) is the substance of foreign relations, whereas, diplomacy is the process by which foreign policy is carried out.

Policy is made by different persons and agencies but presumably on major matters in any state, whatever its form of government; it is made at the highest levels, though subject to many different kinds of control. Then it is the purpose of diplomacy to provide the machinery and the personnel by which foreign policy is executed. One is substance; the other is method.

Contents of Modern Diplomacy

One of the most striking aspects of post-war diplomacy is the rapid growth in the volume of diplomatic activity since the end of 20th century and beginning of the present 21st century. To a large extent this has come about because of the expansion of multilateral and regional diplomacy, much of which is economic or resource related. The changes in volume can be seen in the number of treaties that are concluded among nations annually which doubled since the end of Second World War.

The broadening of the international agenda especially since the 1970s into issues concerning trade, technology transfer, aviation, human rights, transnational environmental and sustainable development questions has continued with the increasing addition of novel or revived threats. Examples of the later include global sea-level rise, stratospheric ozone depletion, environmental sabotage, terrorism attacks, money laundering, refugee dumping, transnational stock exchange fraud and black market nuclear materials trade. Underlying the expanded diplomatic agenda are a range of issues concerning the relationship between domestic and foreign policy, sovereignty and adequacy of agreements and arrangements at a bilateral, regional, international or global level.

The point can be made more generally in terms of the widening content of diplomacy. At one level the changes in the substantive form of diplomacy are reflected in terms such as dollar diplomacy, oil diplomacy, resource diplomacy, atomic diplomacy and global governance diplomacy. Thus what constitute the contents of diplomacy today goes beyond the sometimes rather narrow politico-strategic conception given to the term. Nor is it appropriate to view diplomacy in a restrictive or formal sense as being the preserve of foreign ministries and diplomatic service personnel.

3.4 Understanding international diplomacy: Theory and practice

The beginning of organized diplomacy is the relations among city-states of ancient Greece. By the 5th Century B.C. Nicholson (1939:21) stated:

“Special missions between Greek city-states had become so frequent that something approaching our own system of regular diplomatic intercourse had been achieved.”

Thucydides wrote much about diplomatic procedure among the Greeks. For instance, in his account of a conference at Sparta in 432 B.C. the Spartans and their allies considered what action should be taken against Athens.

Modern diplomacy as an organized profession arose in Italy in the late middle ages, the rivalries of the Italian city-states and the methods which their rulers used to promote their interests are described in masterful fashion in Machiavelli's *The Prince*.

However, for over three centuries, the mission was neither adequate nor standardized. Diplomacy was still the diplomacy of the courts, its object was to promote the interests of the sovereign abroad, by various

means, direct or devious, fair or foul and its standards were low and ill-defined. The ambassador then as now, was deemed to be the personal representative of his head of state in a foreign country. An affront to him was an affront to the head of state himself and hence to the nation that they symbolized.

In the absence of well-defined rules of procedure, frequent dispute sometimes so bitter as to lead to duels or even to wars arose from questions of precedence and immunity. Ambassadors who attempted to entertain in a style befitting the dignity of their sovereigns often found themselves in dire financial straits, especially if the sovereigns whose dignity they were trying to enhance by sumptuous display neglected to pay them salaries.

The present diplomacy can be said to have started in the nineteenth century, which then demanded new methods as well as new personnel. These methods were defined in many international agreements and became an intricate and generally observed code. Under the aegis of the Holy Alliance and the Concert of Europe, buttressed by the operations of the balance of power system, the game was played according to the new rules with fair degree of success. By the early 20th century, the term democratic diplomacy had come into common use. It seemed to symbolize a new order in world affairs, one in which governments were fast losing their aristocratic learning and their aloofness and peoples were speaking to peoples through democratic representatives and informal channels. Actually, the new order was not as different from the old as it seemed in the atmosphere of hope that ushered in the present century.

While diplomacy has remained a rather esoteric profession, carried on by men of wealth, power and influence, it is being conducted with the assistance of a growing number of career officers, the elite guard of diplomacy, whose standard of competence and training are being steadily raised. Diplomacy is thus, being put more generally on a professional and non political basis.

There are in fact many functions of diplomacy that make diplomacy an essential ingredient for any peaceful and efficient change. The reason to negotiate with other persons has always been the same, to have better relations. Over the course of diplomacy being in existence, the structure of diplomatic posts has changed from a loose one to an organized institution made for a specific purpose. While the structure of diplomatic posts has changed, the functions always remained the same. There are four functions of diplomacy. The first function

involves “representing a state’s interests and conducting negotiations or discussions designed to identify common interests as well as areas of disagreement between the parties, for the purpose of achieving the state’s goals and avoiding conflict” (Ameri 1). Representations of a state as well as negotiation are the most important functions of diplomacy. Negotiations between two representatives are a key component in diplomacy, because in doing so the representatives find a common interest. Finding a common interest is vital in conducting negotiations because with a common interest representatives are able to devise a solution that is in the interest of both sides. G.R. Berridge that negotiation.

The United Nations and the changing world order

The UN, which replaced the League of Nations in 1946, was founded with 51 members. By the beginning of the 21st century, its membership had nearly quadrupled, though not all the world’s countries had joined. The new states were often undeveloped and technologically weak, with a limited pool of educated elites for the establishment of a modern diplomatic corps. After the larger colonies gained independence, smaller ones, where this problem was more acute, followed suit. The trend continued until even “microstates” of small area and population became sovereign. (For example, at its independence in 1968, Nauru had a population of fewer than 7,000.)

These small new states, which achieved independence suddenly, were unable to conduct much diplomacy at first. Many of them accredited ambassadors only to the former colonial power, a key neighbouring state, and the UN. For financial reasons envoys often were sent only to the European Community (EC), the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), or major powers that might extend military and financial assistance. Over time, the larger of the newly independent states built sizable foreign services modeled on that of the former colonial power or those of the similarly organized services of Brazil and India, which were not complicit in colonialism. (The Brazilian foreign ministry and diplomatic service are organized and staffed along European lines; they have long had reputations as the most professional such organizations in Latin America. The Indian Foreign Service, modeled on the highly respected Indian Administrative Service and initially staffed from its ranks, quickly emerged as a practitioner of competent diplomacy by a nonaligned, non-Western potential great power.) The microstates mounted a few tiny missions and experimented with joint representation and shared facilities, multiple accreditation of one envoy to several capitals, and meeting with foreign envoys in their

own capitals. A very few nominally independent states had no foreign ministry and relied on regional powers to represent them.

The new states shared the diplomatic forms of the industrialized democracies of the West but not their political culture. Many new states were ill at ease with the values of their former colonial masters and cast about for alternatives drawn from their own histories and national experiences. Others accepted Western norms but castigated the West for hypocrisy and challenged it to live up to its own ideals. Envoys began to appear in Western capitals dressed in indigenous regalia to symbolize their assertion of ancient non-Western cultural identities. As they gained a majority at the UN, the newly independent states fundamentally altered the organization's stance toward colonies, racial issues, and indigenous peoples. Beyond the East-West division of the Cold War, there developed a "North-South" divide between the wealthier former imperial powers of the north and their less-developed former colonies, many of which called for a worldwide redistribution of wealth.

The UN was no more successful at healing the North-South rift than it was at healing the East-West one. It was, according to former Indian permanent representative Arthur Lall, "a forum and not a force." Useful mainly for its specialized agencies and as a forum for propaganda and a venue for quiet contacts, it played only a marginal role in major questions and conflicts, though secretaries-general and their deputies made intense efforts to solve serious but secondary problems such as the resettlement of refugees and persons displaced by war. In the end, the UN has remained only, as Dag Hammarskjöld, UN secretary-general from 1953 to 1961, remarked, "a complement to the normal diplomatic machinery of the governments" that are its members, not a substitute.

Regional organizations sometimes were more successful. The European Union (EU) was effective in promoting trade and cooperation with member states, and the Organization of African Unity and the Arab League enhanced the international bargaining power of regional groupings of new states by providing a coherent foreign policy and diplomatic strategy. By contrast, the extreme political, economic, and cultural diversity of Asia made it harder to organize effectively; the Organization of American States suffered from the enormous imbalance between the United States and its smaller, poorer, and less-powerful members; and the nonaligned movement was too disparate for long-term cohesion. None of these entities solved the problem of harmonizing the views of the

industrialized democracies, the Soviet bloc, and those newly independent countries struggling for wealth, power, and cultural identity.

The exponential growth in the number of states complicated diplomacy by requiring countries—especially the major powers—to staff many different diplomatic missions at once. As state, transnational, and quasi-diplomatic entities proliferated, so did the functions of diplomacy. Although leaders met often, there was more, not less, for diplomats to do. Thus, the size of the missions of major powers increased enormously, to the point where some U.S. diplomatic missions were three times larger than the foreign ministry of the state to which they were accredited.

Subnational entities, representing peoples aspiring to statehood or to the creation of radically different regimes in their homelands, also complicated the crowded international scene. Foremost among these entities was the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), which had observer status at the UN, membership in the Arab League, and envoys in most of the world's capitals, many with diplomatic status. The African National Congress (ANC) and the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO) also conducted a long and varied diplomacy before achieving power in South Africa and Namibia, respectively.

New topics of diplomacy also abounded, including economic and military aid, commodity-price stabilization, food sales, aviation, and allocations of radio frequencies. Career diplomats tended to be generalists drawn from foreign ministries, and specialists increasingly came from other agencies as attachés or counselors. Disarmament negotiations, for example, required specialized knowledge beyond the scope of military attachés. Environmental abuse gave rise to a host of topics, such as the law of the sea, global warming, and means of preventing or abating pollution. The complexity of diplomatic missions increased accordingly. By the 1960s, for example, U.S. missions had instituted “country teams,” including the ambassador and the heads of all attached missions, which met at least once each week to unify policy and reporting efforts and to prevent different elements under the ambassador from working at cross-purposes.

Not only were there new tasks for diplomacy to perform, but there was also a new emphasis on old tasks. The widening Cold War entailed more espionage, of which ambassadors were officially ignorant but which was conducted by attachés and chauffeurs alike; thus, large

embassies appeared in small but strategic countries. Propaganda, the export of officially sanctioned information, and so-called “cultural diplomacy”—as typified by the international tours of Russian dance companies and the cultural programs of the Alliance Française, the British Council, and various American libraries—expanded as well. Cold War competition also extended to international arms transfers. Gifts or sales of weapons and military training were a means of influencing foreign armed forces and consolidating long-term relationships with key elements of foreign governments. The increasing complexity and expense of modern weapons systems also made military exports essential for preserving industrial capacity and employment in the arms industries of the major powers. Diplomats thus became arms merchants, competing with allies and enemies alike for sales to their host governments.

The multiplicity of diplomatic tasks reflected a world that was not only more interdependent but also more fragmented and divided. This dangerous combination led to a search for a new international system to manage the Cold War in order to prevent a nuclear holocaust. Neither the UN nor the Western policy of containment provided an answer. As the two blocs congealed, a balance of terror in the 1960s was followed by an era of détente in the 1970s and then by a return to deterrence in the 1980s. But the 45 years of the Cold War did not produce an organizing principle of any duration. Great power conflict was conducted by proxy through client states in developing areas. Wars, which were numerous but small, were not declared, and diplomatic relations often continued during the fighting.

Self Asking Question

Analyse the role of negotiation played by the diplomacy in the global politics

New styles of diplomacy

One result of the breakdown of old premises, specifically in new states, was that diplomatic immunity changed into breached, and diplomacy became a dangerous profession. disorder changed into now not the chief killer of diplomats, nor become overindulgence at court docket; the new hazards had been murder, maiming, and kidnapping. Diplomats were a target because they represented states and symbolized privileged elites. protection precautions at embassies had been doubled and redoubled however had been never sufficient if host governments became a blind eye to breaches of extraterritoriality. As the 20 th century drew to a near, assaults on diplomatic missions and

diplomats grew in scale and frequency. Terrorists succeeded in taking the staffs of some diplomatic missions hostage and in blowing up others, with superb loss of existence. a few embassies came to resemble fortresses.

A few new states additionally adopted the Soviet tactic of offensive behaviour as a tool of coverage. The latest “new diplomacy” appealed, as the Soviets had done in the course of the interwar period, over the heads of government to humans within the opponent’s camp; it attempted to discredit governments with the aid of attributing unsightly motives; and it now and again trumpeted most needs in calculatedly offensive language as conditions for negotiation. Public international relations of this ilk turned into frequently noisy, bellicose, and self-righteous. The problematic courtesy of sharply understated, unpublished notes in which a government “viewed with problem” to carry strong objection changed into employed by means of best part of the diplomatic community. using derogatory phrases along with war criminal, imperialist, neocolonialist, hegemon, racist, and mass assassin no longer exceedingly proved more likely to enrage than to conciliate those to whom those phrases were implemented.

As international relations raised its voice in public, propaganda, abetted by technology, have become a key device. Radio free Europe and the Voice of the united states broadcast one message to the communist bloc; proselytizing Christian church buildings and so-known as “national liberation actions” capitalized upon transistor radios to unfold their messages to other regions. In towns, television became essential, as images provided an immediacy that words by myself could not bring. Statesmen misplaced no opportunity to be filmed, and ambassadors emerged from the shadows to seem on news programs or earlier than legislative committees to expound their us of a’s policy. Mass demonstrations have been staged for the benefit of tv and featured banners in English, which had end up the most important global language. whilst the us invaded Panama in 1989, the Soviet Union protested on the yankee-owned tv company Cable news community, which was watched via most foreign ministries and international leaders.

Thus it is seen that Diplomacy is an essentially political activity and, well-resourced and skilful, a major ingredient of power. Its chief purpose is to enable states to secure the objectives of their foreign policies without resort to forces, propaganda, or law. It follows that diplomacy consists of communication between officials designed to promote foreign policy either by formal agreement or tacit

adjustment. Although it also includes such discrete activities as gathering information, clarifying intentions, and engendering goodwill, it is thus not surprising that, until the label 'diplomacy' was affixed to all of these activities by the British parliamentarian Edmund Burke in 1796, it was known most commonly as 'negotiation' -by Cardinal Richelieu, the first minister of Louis XIII, as negociation continuelle. Diplomacy is not merely what professional diplomatic agents do. It is carried out by other officials and by private persons under the direction of officials. As we shall see, it is also carried out through many different channels besides the traditional resident mission. Together with the balance of power, which it both reflects and reinforces, diplomacy is the most important institution of our society of states.

In international politics, negotiation consists of discussion between officially designated representatives that is designed to achieve the formal agreement of their governments to a way forward on an issue that has come up in their relations. Negotiation, as noted in the Introduction to this book, is only one of the functions of diplomacy and, in some situations, not the most urgent; in traditional diplomacy via resident missions, neither is it the activity to which most time is now generally devoted. (Although when diplomats 'lobby' some agency of the state to which they are accredited, as they have always spent much of their time doing, the only differences from negotiation are that the dialogue is configured differently and any successes are not formally registered.) Nevertheless, negotiation remains the most important function of diplomacy. This is, in part, because the diplomatic system now encompasses considerably more than the work of resident missions, and negotiation becomes more and more its operational focus as we move into the realms of multilateral diplomacy, summitry, and that other growth sector of the world diplomatic system- mediation. Furthermore, it hardly needs labouring that it is the process of negotiation that grapples directly with the most threatening problems, whether they be economic dislocation, environmental catastrophe, war, or - as at the time of writing - global financial meltdown.

Issues and challenges

The issues and preoccupations of the new millennium present new and different types of challenges from those that faced the world in 1918 and again in 1945. With the new realities and challenges have come corresponding new expectations for action and new standards of conduct in national and international affairs.

Until the Second World War, war was an institution of the states system, with distinctive rules, etiquette, norms, and stable patterns of practices. The number of armed conflicts rose steadily until the end of the cold war, peaked in the early 1990s, and has declined since then. The nature of armed conflict itself has changed, with most being internal struggles for power, dominance, and resources rather than militarized interstate confrontations. Battle lines, if they exist at all, are fluid and shifting rather than territorially demarcated and static. The line between war as a political act and organized criminality has become increasingly blurred. Even most ‘internal’ conflicts have regional and transnational elements. Because they merge seamlessly with sectarian divides, contemporary conflicts are often rooted in, reproduce, and replicate past intergroup atrocities, thereby perpetuating hard-edged cleavages that are perceived as zero-sum games by all parties. Thus all sides are trapped in a never-ending cycle of suspicions, atrocities, and recriminations. The net result is that non-combatants are now on the frontline of modern battles. The need to help and protect civilians at risk of death and displacement caused by armed conflict is paramount. Diplomats will be judged on how well they discharge or dishonour their international responsibility to protect.

The multiplication of internal conflicts was accompanied by a worsening of the abuses of the human rights of millions of people. Conscious of the atrocities committed by the Nazis while the world looked silently away, the UN adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. The two covenants in 1966 added force and specificity, affirming both civil-political and social-economic-cultural rights without privileging either set. The United Nations has also adopted scores of other legal instruments on human rights and in his major reform report in 2005 Annan elevated human rights alongside security and development as the three great normative mandates of the organization. The parallel expansion of the reach and scope of international humanitarian law, and the rise of domestic, regional, international, and non-governmental institutions championing, monitoring, and enforcing human rights and international humanitarian law, has generated additional tasks and challenges for diplomacy.

In 2007, the foreign ministers of seven countries—Norway, Brazil, France, Indonesia, Senegal, South Africa, and Thailand—issued the Oslo Ministerial Declaration calling for more attention to health as a foreign policy issue. They noted that ‘Health is deeply interconnected with the environment, trade, economic growth, social development, national security, and human rights and dignity.’ They linked health to

human security: ‘While national security focuses on the defence of the state from external attack, national health security relates to defence against internal and external public-health risks and threats’, adding that ‘These are risks and threats that by their very nature do not respect borders, as people, animals, and goods travel around the world faster than ever before.’ Among their concerns were a recognition that investment in health was fundamental to economic growth, development, and poverty eradication; imbalances in the global health workforce market (the persistent lack of skilled health workers and their uneven distribution within and among countries); and the protection of peoples’ health in situations of crises. More frequent travel and contact among people from different countries and continents have been accompanied by the risk of major global pandemics like HIV/AIDS, avian flu, SARS, and so on, creating pressures for governments to harmonize national and cross-border surveillance mechanisms and emergency responses. This also requires international data collection and standardization of measures.

Brink Lindsey described the 1990s as the age of abundance with rising incomes, growing capital markets, and accelerating flows of money and investment. Untroubled by want and scarcity, Americans fought over values both domestically, leading to culture wars, and internationally, leading to expanding interest in human rights and the international protection agenda. By the end of the first decade of the 21st century, the age of scarcity seemed to have made a stunning comeback with alarmist scenarios of food, fuel, and water scarcity, fragile financial and banking systems and vulnerable ecosystems.

Financial crises of the 1990s in Asia, Latin America, and Russia and of 2008–2012 in the US and Europe showed how much, and how quickly, regional crises take on systemic character through rapid contagion. They also highlighted the unequal distribution of costs among the victims of financial crises. Hence the claim by Michel Camdessus, the former managing director of the IMF (1987–2000), that to the duty of domestic excellence and rectitude we must add the ethic of global responsibility in the management of national economies. He goes on to describe the widening inequality within and among nations as ‘morally outrageous, economically wasteful, and socially explosive’. A considerable portion of national and international diplomacy in 2007–2012 was devoted to grappling with the financial crisis.

The movement of people in large numbers, whether seeking fresh opportunities in new lands through migration or escaping cycles of

violence, famine, persecution, natural disasters, or poverty, has been a major political problem domestically in many countries and a major diplomatic challenge internationally. Diasporas represent both a domestic element in the changing demographic composition of the citizens of a country, and a foreign policy complication if troubles from home country are imported. Examples of this abound: Tamils in Canada and Sri Lanka, Sikhs in Canada, Jews in most Western countries and the Middle East conflict, Iraqi exiles in the lead-up to the 2003 invasions of Iraq, and Cubans in Florida.

Stop to Consider

Permanent Traditional Diplomacy

Permanent traditional diplomacy is when permanent traditional structures are used in diplomatic discussions. That is, all diplomatic discussions must involve the state's Ministry of Foreign Affairs through its minister, Ambassadors, Charge de affairs, Protocol, Information Attaches, etc. The head of government would normally allow the Foreign Affairs Minister make all the pronouncements, on behalf of the state whenever the Head of Government wants to make such pronouncements. The Minister or the Legislature must also have an input. In case of change of government, this structure is not altered, although personnel may change such as the Ministers and Ambassadors sometimes. No matter how radical or revolutionary a regime may be it cannot afford to change the structure all a time.

3.5 Summing Up

Throughout the course of history diplomacy has been a paramount element in the upkeep of peace and in the creation of positive change. Without diplomacy much of the world's affairs would not exist. There are many examples of how diplomacy has affected countries, and even individual citizens. An example of how negotiation positively can affect someone is Clinton's negotiation with Kim Jung Il in North Korea. Their peaceful negotiation resulted in the release of two American citizens. An example of how power can corrupt diplomacy is Libya and Switzerland. With the introduction of power, in other words oil, countries such as Libya with the leader Ghaddafi are able to have a stronger presence in the world and say things that can normally not be said. Power corrupts, however diplomacy seeks to rid corruption and reinforce the international system as well as international law. It is for diplomacy that international organizations can exist. In a diplomatic way, an international organization is merely a many members finding a common ground on a particular subject. In the United Nations for example, all the members try to find a common interest for positive change. Although it is sometimes perceived to be slow change, the method of diplomacy causes fewer casualties than

any other one. If diplomacy were not in existence, international organizations would not exist. The world would be at a constant state of war, and war would in fact never end because they normally end with diplomatic negotiations.

Check Your Progress

1. Define Diplomacy.
2. Discuss the role of diplomacy in global politics.
3. Discuss the function of diplomacy.

3.6 References and Suggested Readings

Adam, Watson,. Diplomacy the dialogue between states. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1983.

Berridge, G. R. Diplomatic Theory From Machievelli to Kissinger. New York: Palgrave, 2001. "Diplomacy – The U.S. Department of State at Work." U.S. Department of State. Bureau of Public Affairs, June 2008. Web. 2 Sept. 2009. <<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/46839.pdf>>.

Eban, Abba Solomon. New diplomacy international affairs in the modern age. New York: Random House, 1983.

Kissinger, Henry. Diplomacy (A Touchstone Book). New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.

Kwong, Maj Tang Mun. "The Roles of Diplomacy and Deterrence in the 21st Century." Journal V27 N1 Jan-Mar (2001)

UNIT 4

Global governance

Non-Governmental Organizations: Nature and Importance

2.1. Introduction

2.2 Objectives

2.3 Non Governmental Organisations

2.3.1. Amnesty International

2.3.2. International Committee of the Red Cross

2.3.3 Green Peace

2.4 Nature of Non-Governmental Organizations

2.5 Importance and Role of Non-Governmental Organizations

2.6 Summing Up

2.7 References

2.1 Introduction

A non-governmental organization (NGO) is any non-profit, voluntary, citizens' group which is organized on a local, national or international level. Task-oriented and driven by people with a common interest, NGOs perform a variety of service and humanitarian functions, make the Governments aware of the concerns of the citizens, advocate and monitor policies and encourage political participation through provision of information. Some NGOs are organized around specific issues, such as human rights, environment or health. They provide analysis and expertise, serve as early warning mechanisms and help monitor and implement international agreements. The term "nongovernmental organization" has no generally agreed legal definition. In many jurisdictions, these types of organization are called "civil society organizations" or referred to by other names. This unit will help you understand the role played by the NGO's, the consequent

challenges and the contribution NGO's have made in various fields for the upliftment of humanity and working towards strengthening of civil society and global governance.

2.2 Objectives

NGOs in any country all over the world including international development agencies seek collaboration with government and development organizations for acquiring appropriate solutions to development problems and to enhance people's participation in government programmes. After going through this unit you will be able to

- Examine the non governmental organisations like Amnesty International, ICRC, Green Peace etc.
- Analyse the nature of non governmental organisations
- Examine The importance of non governmental organisations in contemporary world

2.3. Non Governmental Organisations

We have already discussed that Non-Governmental Organizations are non profit, voluntary, citizens' groups organised on local, national or international level. Here in this section, let us discuss some of the major Non-Governmental Organizations like Amnesty International, International Committee of the Red Cross and Green Peace. This section will also enlighten you about the contributions made by these Non-Governmental Organizations and challenges facing by these NGOs.

2.3.1. Amnesty International

Amnesty International (commonly known as Amnesty and AI) is an international non-governmental organization. Its stated mission is "to

conduct research and generate action to prevent and end grave abuses of human rights and to demand justice for those whose rights have been violated." Amnesty International was founded in 1961 with the mission to draw attention to human rights abuses and campaigns for compliance with international laws and standards. It works to mobilise public opinion to exert pressure on governments to take action against those that perpetrate abuses.

By the mid-1960s Amnesty International's global presence was growing and an International Secretariat and International Executive Committee was established to manage Amnesty International's national organisations, called 'Sections', which had appeared in several countries. Apart from the work of the library and groups, Amnesty International's activities were expanding to help prisoner's families, send observers to trials, make representations to governments, and finding asylum or overseas employment for prisoners. Its activity and influence was also increasing within intergovernmental organisations; it was awarded consultative status by the United Nations, the Council of Europe and UNESCO before the decade ended. In 1977, Amnesty International was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for its contribution in securing the ground for freedom, justice, and thereby also for peace in the world. In 1978, Amnesty International received the United Nations Human Rights prize for its outstanding contributions in the field of human rights.

- **Aims and Objectives of Amnesty International**

The object of Amnesty International is to contribute to the observance of protecting and protesting the abuse of Human Rights throughout the world as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In pursuance of this objective, and recognizing the obligation on each person to extend to others rights and freedoms equal to his or her own, Amnesty International adopts as its mandate:

- a. To promote awareness of and adherence to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other internationally recognized human rights instruments, the values enshrined in them, and the indivisibility and interdependence of all human rights and freedoms

b. To oppose the grave violations of the rights of every person to freely hold and to express his or her convictions and to be free from discrimination on grounds of ethnic origin, sex, colour or language, and of the right of every person to physical and mental integrity, and, in particular, to oppose all kinds of human rights abuse by appropriate means irrespective of political considerations:

- **Contribution:**

Amnesty International has contributed immensely in the field of human rights. For example with regard to the Assyrians persecutions in the context of their human rights, urgent Action was taken in April 1985 when 153 members and supporters of the Assyrian Democratic Movement (Zowaa) were arrested and three of the leaders were executed by the Iraqi government without trial. There are some other actions taken by Amnesty International in order to promote human rights and to express concern such as home government approach, symbolic events and theme and country campaigns, etc. Amnesty supporters around the world took action to demand an end to the violence against ordinary Burmese people who simply wanted to have a say in the administration of their country.

Amnesty International's campaigns to stop violence against Women over the world laid down the following objectives in its effort to stop violence against women. These are as follows:

- Implementation of existing laws that guarantee access to justice and services for women subjected to violence including rape and other forms of sexual violence
- New laws to be enacted that will protect women's human rights.
- Demands to end laws that discriminate against women
- Demands the ending of violence against women perpetrated by a state and its agents.

Amnesty International campaign is to end human killings. Its work with Moazzam Begg has focused exclusively on the human rights violations committed in Guantánamo Bay and the need for the US

government to shut it down and either release or put on trial those who have been held there. Moazzam Begg is one of the first detainees released by the US without charge. Amnesty International has a long history of demanding justice. In the case of the Counter Terror with Justice Campaign it called for both an end to human rights abuses at Guantánamo and other locations. It also called for the detained to be brought to justice, in fair trials and respect the due process. Amnesty International has done considerable research on the Taleban case and campaigning to stop violence against women and to promote women's equality.

The organisation still continues to take a strong line against abuses by religiously based insurgent groups and governments imposing religious strictures, Islamic or otherwise, in violation of human rights law. Amnesty International stands for the protection of human rights abuse all over the world without any discrimination.

- **Challenges:**

Amnesty International has worked with human rights defenders for decades. During the functioning of the organization, the organization has witnessed and worked against a range of repressive tactics that governments of every political group deployed by the AI to silence human rights defenders. Patterns of repression varied over time and across context: in Latin America, for example, "disappearances" and "death squad killings" replaced politically motivated imprisonment in the 70s and 80s as the favoured tactics for suppressing dissenting voices, tactics which allowed the military governments of the time to cover their tracks and deny all responsibility. Disappearances, death squad killings and politically motivated imprisonment are used against defenders in many countries around the world, particularly those experiencing armed conflict or severe civil unrest. In such situations, death threats are the common means of intimidation, in which the police or judiciary neither investigate nor punishes. Defenders working on human rights issues traditionally neglected or marginalized often face obstacles. The rights they uphold are contested or controversial, either because they challenge dominant social norms or because they

are seen as threatening to the established political, religious or economic order. The challenges faced by the group of human rights defenders includes those working on economic, social and cultural rights, sexual and reproductive rights and those defending the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender people. Human rights defenders in many countries stand at a risk of being detained or abducted. Detention safeguards are often flouted and many may be held without charge. Others may have spurious charges brought against them, a pattern Amnesty International has increasingly observed in countries where the authorities seek to tarnish the image of the defenders and reputation by portraying them as criminals, terrorists or delinquents. In some cases charges are clearly fabricated. In others, legitimate activities such as convening a demonstration or lodging an official complaint have been characterized as public order offences or acts of libel. Defamatory tactics are also used to delegitimize the work of defenders. The media often collude in spreading slanderous accusations and attacks on their personal integrity and political independence. Bureaucratic barriers are applied in politically motivated ways to hamper the work of organizations working for the defense of human rights by

- denying the organizations legal registration
- restricting their meetings
- obstructing fact-finding visits
- forcing them to cease operating, either directly or by preventing access to sources of funding.

2.3.2. International Committee of the Red Cross

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) is an impartial, neutral and independent organization whose humanitarian mission is to protect the lives and dignity of victims of war and internal violence and to provide them with assistance. It directs and coordinates international relief activities in situations of conflict. It also

endeavours to prevent suffering by promoting and strengthening humanitarian law and universal humanitarian principles. The ICRC was established in the year 1863 on the recommendations made in the meeting of the Geneva Conventions with the initiative of HenryDunant's.

- **Objective:**

First and foremost role of The ICRC to ensure that they care for members of the enemy armed forces as well as their own and guarantee medical establishments and the protection they are entitled to enjoy. Some countries do not have the necessary infrastructure like lack of surgical infrastructure necessary to care for war wounded, in others, access to existing hospitals is denied to certain victims for political reasons, or is simply not available because of geographical factors and inadequate means of transportation. In accordance with the principles of the Geneva Conventions, the ICRC first attempts to solve such problems by either providing medicines, dressing materials and surgical equipment to local structures or by negotiating with the authorities to obtain access to surgical care for all the wounded. The ICRC also helps to set up first aid posts and transportation facilities where possible, send surgical teams to work within existing structures, or open new ICRC administered facilities for surgical care and rehabilitation.

- **Contribution:**

The ICRC is carrying out humanitarian activities in zones of armed conflict or internal violence which has always been a dangerous undertaking. The ICRC currently has more than 11,000 staff members working in 79 contexts worldwide. They travel to areas marked by fighting or cross front lines between opposing parties to reach the persons they are mandated to protect and assist. For the ICRC, the security of its personnel is a crucial responsibility. While working in contexts of armed conflict or situations of violence evidently implies being confronted with significant levels of risk, it has always sought to develop approaches and instruments of security management to

minimise the security threats faced by its personnel to the limited extent possible. The contribution of the ICRC in the case of the land mine victims is significant. In June 1999 the ICRC launched an appeal for 105 million Swiss francs (U.S. \$69 million) to fund its activities for mine victims over the next five years. The financial appeal covers all the following activities of ICRC's relating to mine victims.

- To promote universal adherence to and full implementation of the Ottawa Treaty and amended Protocol II to the 1980 U.N. Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.
- To reduce the risk of mine-related incidents through mine awareness programs currently being conducted by the ICRC in six countries.
- To provide mine victims with treatment and physical rehabilitation in 23-limb-fitting centres that the ICRC is running in 11 countries, and to continue its support for similar centres run by ministries of health, National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and NGOs in many other countries
- To collect and analyze, wherever possible, data for use in the development of appropriate mine action programs.
- The ICRC also provides direct medical assistance to health facilities and appropriate training for doctors and nurses treating mine victims. Between 1979 and the end of 1998, the ICRC manufactured over 130,000 artificial limbs, over 175,000 pairs of crutches and about 9,000 wheelchairs. In 1998 alone, the ICRC manufactured over 11,500 prostheses, of these, more than 6,500 were for mine victims. During the same year it produced over 17,200 pairs of crutches and more than 700 wheelchairs. Since February 1994, the ICRC and Red Crescent Movement have been actively involved in a drive to impose a total ban on anti-personnel mines, running public awareness campaigns and encouraging diplomatic and military circles to support their efforts. These efforts are undertaken to coordinate

and improve the care given to victims, and to extend preventive mine awareness programs.

The ICRC is currently running 25-limb-fitting and rehabilitation programs in 13 countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Iraq, Kenya, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan and Uganda. In a number of countries, the National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, supported by their International Federation, have undertaken the responsibility to cure the mine-injured people through rehabilitation, health and social welfare programs. In addition to these activities, the ICRC and national societies are conducting mine awareness programs in several countries in order to reduce the number of landmine incidents in mine-affected area.

STOP TO CONSIDER

NGOs in the Contemporary Period

NGOs have proliferated in number, and have become increasingly more vocal on many domestic and international issues in the last few decades. Nongovernmental organizations have become active in international politics in great variety, but they are all issue oriented and advocacy organizations to some degree. NGOs are independent to choose their own programs and targets, but they need help from numerous institutions as well as the state to pursue its line of action. Now, NGOs are addressing different issues such as the rights of indigenous peoples, prisoners, refugees, children, women, consumers, endangered animals etc. At the same time, many international NGOs active in areas which seek to protect 'global commons', global poverty and human rights. Therefore, the growth in the number of NGOs may reflect the increase in decline of state authority; on the contrary they might also signal the increasing scope of democratic space as well as resilience of the state and its institutions. Infact NGOs represent a 'signal the shift away from a politics based on national and class interests to a politics based on moral values and emotions'

- **Challenges:**

The most important operational function of ICRC's is to ensure access to victims of armed conflict and other situations of violence. However, in a changing conflict environment, granting access is becoming difficult because of security constraints. To overcome the constraints faced by the ICRC in its mission and to remain close to the victims and to communicate with all the existing or potential parties to a conflict, the ICRC has developed a network of more than 230 delegations, sub-delegations and offices throughout the world. It has been working constantly to expand its network of contacts with all weapons bearers, and the ones who can influence them. However, such contacts seemed useless without the capacity to fulfil the expectations created by the ICRC's presence and mandate. It is only by being effective in the field and taking action to relieve the suffering of those affected by armed conflict that the ICRC can gain its acceptance. Today, a humanitarian response is provided by a wide range of actors viz. international and local humanitarian agencies, governmental or nongovernmental, and, in some regions, military units. The ICRC as per the norms of its mandate stands for humanitarian action that is neutral and independent. Without being biased to any party involved in an armed conflict, ICRC seeks to bring protection and assistance to those in needs. It is a real challenge for ICRC to ensure that this identity is clearly perceived and respected by all concerned, especially the belligerents. The most important work of the ICRC is to encourage parties involved in armed conflicts to implement international humanitarian law in order to prevent and alleviate suffering. The task of alleviating the sufferings of the poor victims of conflicts in a fair and just manner is a big challenge for the organization.

Check Your Progress

1. Amnesty International was founded in the year _____. (Fill in the blanks)
2. What was the main mission of Amnesty International?

3. In which year did Amnesty International get the Nobel Peace Prize?
4. In the year ____ Amnesty International received the United Nations Human Rights prize. (Fill in the blank)
5. Mention one objective of Amnesty International.
6. Analyse the challenges faced by Amnesty International.
7. When did ICRC is established?
8. Write a note on the contributions made by ICRC.
9. The ICRC stands for humanitarian action that is neutral and independent. (write true or false)
10. Amnesty International demands the ending of violence against women perpetrated by a state and its agents. (write true or false)
11. Amnesty International was founded in the year _____. (Fill in the blanks)
12. What was the main mission of Amnesty International?
13. In which year did Amnesty International get the Nobel Peace Prize?
14. In the year ____ Amnesty International received the United Nations Human Rights prize. (Fill in the blank)
15. Mention one objective of Amnesty International.
16. Analyse the challenges faced by Amnesty International.
17. When did ICRC is established?
18. Write a note on the contributions made by ICRC.
19. The ICRC stands for humanitarian action that is neutral and independent. (write true or false)
20. Amnesty International demands the ending of violence against women perpetrated by a state and its agents. (write true or false)

SAQ:

Do you think that the role played by the International NGOs help in the process of Human Development. Give arguments in favour of your answer. (100 words)

.....
.....

2.3.3 Green Peace

Greenpeace is a non-governmental environmental organization. It has its offices in over 40 countries with an international coordinating body in Amsterdam, Netherlands. Greenpeace states its goal as to "ensure the ability of the Earth to nurture life in all its diversity". It focuses on worldwide issues such as global warming, deforestation, overfishing, commercial whaling and anti-nuclear issues. The methodology used by Greenpeace to achieve its goal includes direct action, lobbying and research. Greenpeace has evolved from the peace movement and anti-nuclear protests in Vancouver, British Columbia in the early 1970s. In the late 1970s the different regional Greenpeace groups formed Greenpeace International to oversee the goals and operations of the regional organizations globally. During the 1980s Greenpeace received international attention when the French intelligence agency bombed the Rainbow Warrior in Auckland Harbour, one of the most well-known vessels operated by Greenpeace, killing one. Over the years Greenpeace has evolved into one of the largest environmental organizations in the world.

- **Objectives:**

Greenpeace is an independent global organization that acts to protect and conserve the environment and promote peace by:

- Addressing the important threat affecting our planet: climate change by bringing an environment revolution.
- Create a global network of marine reserves to protect our oceans by challenging wasteful and destructive fishing.
- To protect the world's remaining ancient forests on which by many animals, plants and people depend.
- To work for disarmament and peace by eliminating all nuclear weapons.
- To create safer alternatives to hazardous chemicals in products and manufacturing for a toxic free future.

- **Contribution:**

The aim and objective of Green Peace lies in its effort to protect environment from the threats emanating from diverse perspective. The core values are reflected in its environmental campaign work. Taken worldwide by this organizations witnesses the environmental destruction in a peaceful manner and seeks solution by upholding non-violent confrontation to raise the level and quality of public debate. In developing the campaign strategies and policies, they undertake great care to reflect their fundamental respect for democratic principles and seek solutions that will promote global social equity. Based on the core values upheld by the organisation, it has made important contribution in the field of environment protection. On July 2010, followed by a ten-year Greenpeace campaign, Europe banned the trade in illegal timber .This was considered a great leap forward in the struggle to protect the world's forests and climate. Over the last 25 years the efforts of Greenpeace to expose and oppose nuclear waste shipments from France to Russia end in victory when Russia puts an end to the practice. The illegality of the shipments was confirmed when French officials admitted that the stated intention to reprocess and return the fuel is false. As a result of massive pressure from consumers via social media and nonviolent direct action by Greenpeace activists Nestle Company agreed to stop purchasing palm-oil from sources which destroy Indonesian rainforests. Greenpeace opposed the plan for a third runway at Heathrow airport because it ran contrary to the efforts to reduce carbon emissions in the UK, and co-purchased, with 91,000 supporters, a plot of land that would have made the runway impossible to build. Indian computer manufacturer Wipro announced the launch of a new PVC and BFR-free computer, after several years of pressure by Greenpeace on tech companies to provide toxic-free electronics. Apple cleared the last hurdle by removing toxic PVC plastic in its new Mac book and iMac, capping the "Green my Apple" campaign making Apple products safer, easier to recycle and causing less pollution at the end of their life due to pressure exerted on it by Greenpeace activists.

Currently Greenpeace considers global warming to be the greatest environmental threat and working for the environmental protection. Greenpeace has called for global green house gas emissions to peak in 2015 and to decrease as close to zero as possible by 2050. For this Greenpeace has called for the industrialized countries to cut their emissions at least 40% by 2020 (from 1990 levels) and to provide substantial funding for developing countries to build a sustainable energy capacity, to adapt to the inevitable consequences of global warming and to stop deforestation by 2020.

- **Challenges:**

Over the years Greenpeace has faced numerous challenges in its functioning. In 1994, Greenpeace published an anti-nuclear newspaper advert which included a claim that nuclear facilities Sellafield would kill 2000 people in the next 10 years, and an image of a hydrocephalus affected child said to be a victim of nuclear weapons testing in Kazakhstan was posted. The Advertising Standards Authority viewed the claim concerning Sellafield as unsubstantiated and did not accept that the child's condition was caused by radiation. As a result the advertisement was banned. Several Lawsuits have been filed against Greenpeace for loss of profits as well as reputation damage caused by Greenpeace campaigns. Some corporations, such as Royal Dutch Shell, BP and Electricite de France have reacted to Greenpeace campaigns by spying on Greenpeace activities and infiltrating Greenpeace offices. Greenpeace activists have also been targets of phone tapping, death threats, violence and even state terrorism.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Democracy, Education and NGOs

There is an intimate relationship between democracy and functioning of NGOs. Before the existence of democracy, NGOs are not allowed to be registered and operate. Only in a democratic country the NGOs, could play an effective role. The roles are specially directed towards the people oriented programs such as health, family planning,

environment and non-formal education. It is clear that since democracy provided an opportunity to NGOs, it could be said that the existences of NGOs is intimately linked with democracy. At present NGOs are playing a very important role to provide health services to the population in rural areas. Similarly it has done remarkable work in the field of literacy, family planning, population, environmental conservation and development of nonformal education. Since 1950s, many schools and colleges have been opened. But still more than 50 percent of the adult population is illiterate in the developing countries .It is a fact that Education For All (EFA) could not be provided through schools alone. Non formal education should be developed to provide literacy education combined skill training to all. As a matter of fact the NGOs have shown that they are more effective and efficient to provide education for all especially through non-formal education.

SAQ:

Make a critical estimate of the activities undertaken by Green peace.

(80 words)

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

2.4 Nature of NGOs

You have already learnt that an ngo is a non profit making body. They are voluntary in nature and either service oriented or development oriented organisations. Ngos assist in the empowerment of the people. They pursue a specific cause be it social or environmental. You should also learn here that an ngo needs funds to carry out its objectives. The volunteers working in an ngo does not get any economic benefit but they need funds to develop their activities. It has already been mentioned that ngos are voluntary organisations. These are created by

people having common interest. Again, ngos are autonomous bodies regulated by their own policies and procedures. These voluntary autonomous bodies are free from government interference. You must remember here that ngos are not profit making organisations. They work for social welfare aspects like education of children, protection of animals, wildlife, environment, improving the status of women, health environment etc. ngos do not depend on government funds. They create and maintain their own funds. Their funds come from public as well as private business organisations.

Some of the characteristics of an international NGO are as follows:

1. Global presence - Most of the large international NGOs characterized by global presence covering both developing countries and industrialized countries.
2. Independence - International NGOs are non-partisan and take independent positions, based on principle and mission.
3. Partnerships with local organizations - The preferred mode of operation of International NGOs' is to work with and through local governments and community based groups.
4. Collective action - International NGOs take collective action on issues of importance, ranging from advocacy to advance policy change (e.g. reform of U.S. foreign assistance) to the establishment of normative standards that promote more effective field programs

2.5. Role of international NGOs

International NGOs play an important role in strengthening civil society in developing countries and promoting the role of civil society actors in the global arena. International NGOs have helped to establish, develop and scale up local NGOs; provided them training in organizational governance, strategic planning, financial management, fundraising, advocacy, etc. and helped them by, helping them gain access to global expertise, and linking them to funding and networks. Although the relationship between international NGOs and local

organizations are often fraught with power imbalances, international NGOs have played a significant role in building an infrastructure of local capacity including the professionally-managed local NGOs to implement development programs. Many international NGOs are born of humanitarian responses and maintain strong capacities to respond rapidly to natural disasters and conflict situations. Their long-term presence in countries gives them useful contextual knowledge to improve the quality of emergency responses and mark the transition from relief to rehabilitation to development. In addition, international NGOs played a leading role in the development of global normative standards for humanitarian action.

Many international NGOs have developed a capacity to influence policy (via policy analysis, evidence building and advocacy). The engagement of the NGO has increased in the field of public education and policy advocacy. This is driven by the NGO's understanding of the nature of poverty and their commitment to address root causes of poverty. Coupled with an ambition to contribute to change at a much larger scale, international NGOs are leveraging for more consistent and effective development policies and practices on the part of industrialized countries. Because of their long presence in many developing countries International NGOs have identified innovations and promising practices in one context, shared the ideas across borders, and help adapt approaches to other contexts involving areas like basic education or maternal health, or principles like gender equity or partnership. By adopting and refining approaches they absorbed from working in thousands of poor communities, international NGOs have helped to establish values like community participation, gender equity and local ownership as cornerstones of good development practice. International NGOs have introduced people-centered and rights-based approaches into the mainstream of development thinking. The ngos have contributed in various ways by playing different roles.

- The role that international NGO's play in strengthening the civil society is an important contribution.

- International NGOs respond rapidly to humanitarian crises throughout the world.
- International NGOs have helped in the formulation of policies in the developing countries.
- International NGOs raise substantial resources for development and relief efforts and enable their supporters to express solidarity with people in some of the poorest communities in the world.

STOP TO CONSIDER

Role of UN and NGOs in the issue of Environmental Conservation and Development

At the beginning of the 21st century environmental issues have emerged as a major concern in front of world community. The environmental degradation is emerged as a major threat to the development of human race. At the mean time the process of in Environmental Conservation and Development is going on. In India, the concept of environment protection can be seen starting from the period of Vedas. In the contemporary period Sundarlal Bhauguna through Chipko movement campaigned for protection of environment. Annahazare campaigned for rain water harvesting. Arundhati Roy and Medha Patkar campaigned against major dams. The past few years have witnessed a sweeping change in the attitudes, approaches and policies of the United Nations system with regard to relations with NGOs and their participation in the work of the UN. While this has been most visible in the recent series of UN world summits and conferences, measures to strengthen cooperation with NGOs are being taken across the entire UN system and in virtually all areas of its activity: policy research and analysis; policy dialogue and normative work; monitoring and advocacy; operational development activities; humanitarian work, particularly responding to emergencies and to the needs of refugees; promoting human rights, democratization, disarmament and peace; and information dissemination and raising public

awareness of the issues and challenges on the UN's agenda.

Check Your Progress

1. The international coordinating body of Green Peace is situated in which place?
2. To ensure the ability of the Earth to nurture life in all its diversity is the goal of Greenpeace. (write true or false)
3. Greenpeace works for the protection of human rights. (write true or false)
4. Greenpeace evolved from the peace movement and anti nuclear protests in _____, British Columbia. (fill in the blanks)
5. Greenpeace protect and conserve the environment and promote peace through working for disarmament and peace by eliminating all nuclear weapons. (write true or false)
6. What is 'Green My Apple' campaign?
7. Mention the challenges faced by Greenpeace.
8. State the relationship between democracy, education and ngo.
9. Ngos play an important role in strengthening the civil society. (write true or false)
10. Write a note on the role played by the ngos.

SAQ:

Can you name some NGO's in your locality? Give brief account of their activities. (100 words)

.....
.....

2.5. Summing Up

After reading this unit, you are now able to understand the meaning of ngos. You have already learnt the objectives and contributions of major ngos like Amnesty International, ICRC, Green Peace etc. you have also learnt about the various challenges facing by these ngos. This unit has also enlightened you about the role played by the ngos. International NGOs have played an important role in extending humanitarian services. Many international NGOs have achieved significant growth in the past decade. However, most of them are not very effective in terms of their contribution to social change in ways that make greater and more lasting contributions to fight and eradicate poverty. In the ongoing competitive sphere international NGOs are concerned about building their brand, maintaining a distinct identity and preserving their institutional strengths. These aims often conflict with their intention to be a partner, facilitator, connector and catalyst for local action. International NGOs like Amnesty, Greenpeace, and ICRC have helped to raise awareness of the consequences of poverty and conflict, environment and have generated enthusiasm for personal engagement in developing countries. At the same time, international NGOs have become increasingly professionalized and less able to accommodate volunteers and visitors in their programs. This hampers international NGOs' ability to tap into the growing desire, especially of young people, to personally connect with poor communities and fight for the cause of fighting poverty and other social issues faced by the countries.

2.6. References and Suggested Readings

www.amnesty.org

www.greenpeace.org

www.ifrc.org

<https://www.corpseed.com/knowledge-centre/roles-and-functions-of-ngo-in-india>

<https://learning.candid.org/resources/knowledge-base/ngo-definition-and-role/>

<https://www.drishtias.com/daily-news-editorials/role-of-ngos>

<http://ecoursesonline.iasri.res.in/mod/page/view.php?id=32502>

<https://www.infocomm.ky/what-is-an-ngo-characteristics-of-an-ngo-types-of-ngo-ngo/>

<https://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/organization/nongovernmental-organization-in-india-1284-words/4665>

Unit 5

Global Civil Society : Concept and Importance

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Objectives

5.3 From civil society to global civil society

5.3.1 Theoretical underpinnings and evolution of civil society

5.3.2 Definition of global civil society

5.4 Role of global civil society in International Relations

5.5 Relevance of the idea in the contemporary times

5.6 Summing Up

5.7 References and Readings

5.1 Introduction

The term civil society must be familiar to many. However the term global civil society has only recently gained currency. Like most terms in the social sciences the term global civil society also is quite contested in terms of its meaning and its origins. However we do need to acknowledge the fact that the concept has gained considerable leverage and significance in international relations. In spite of the ambiguity in meaning, global civil society has been seen to play a proactive role in international relations and in world politics.

From the nomenclature of the term itself it becomes quite evident that the idea has been influenced and shaped by the phenomenon of globalization. We shall learn more about this concept in this chapter.

5.2 Objectives

This unit is an attempt to understand the concept of global civil society and its importance. After going through this unit you will be able to –

- Understand the origin of the idea of global civil society
- How it is related with the phenomenon of globalization
- What role it plays in International Relations

- Why the idea has gained importance in the contemporary period
- Debate on its relevance in the current time

5.3 From civil society to global civil society

5.3.1 Theoretical underpinnings and evolution of civil society

If we break up the term ‘global civil society’ we broadly get two terms – ‘global’ and ‘civil society’; it becomes easier to grasp the meaning of the term when we dismantle the term semantically. The idea of civil society is not a new one. However there have been multiple meanings assigned to the term and successive chronological evolutions have shaped its connotations in the recent past.

On tracing the origins of the term we find that the idea of civil society can be said to have roots in the *societas civilis* in the Aristotelian tradition¹. For decades this term has been used to imply the occurrences of the society and the polity. Though there have been differences in meaning the term has almost always hinted and denoted at the instances of social and political life beyond the family. And it largely referred to issues of mutual existence, to communal living beyond the solely particular, and to the common and the political, often normative than anything else.²

The advent of the Enlightenment helped in shaping the meaning of the term, with the help of the works by John Locke, Montesquieu, Immanuel Kant and a few others. The term during this period developed a broad positive connotation which largely related with the ideas of peace, individual freedom, dignity, rule of law, tolerance, universalism and diversity. And with such ideas at the foundation of the idea the concept involuntarily developed as contradictory to the state.

Furthermore the coming in of Marxism in the 19th century helped concretise the distinction between the two, mainly through the writings of Marx and Hegel. The term was kind of relegated to the background for a while and saw a resurgence around the 1980s, when it was used to denote people’s movement against dictatorial regimes mainly in

¹ Kocka, Jürgen, 2004, Civil Society from a Historical Perspective European Review, Vol. 12, No. 1, 65–79 (2004) Academia Europaea, Printed in the United Kingdom

² ibid

East Central Europe. In other parts of the world the meanings of the term though similar were quite varied which denoted the socio-political and intellectual tendencies of peoples and societies among other things.

Then jumping on to the process of globalization, the idea of civil society has undergone considerable paradigm shifts in terms of its meaning and implications. As we have just read about the origins of civil society we need to understand that quite obviously the idea of the ‘global civil society’ is a derivative of the native concept of ‘civil society’. The dawn of globalization and the ushering in of a supranational sphere has helped in the manifestation of the concept with its roots in cosmopolitanism and internationalism.

5.3.2 Definition of global civil society

John Keane who has been working on the idea of a global civil society provides us with intriguing insights of the concept. Keane authored a book with the title – *Global Civil Society?* in 2003. The following are some of the ideas expressed in his work. Reading this paragraph will help us understand how the idea in question emerged and became important in International relations.

Global civil society is a vast, interconnected, and multi-layered social space that comprises many hundreds of thousands of self-directing or nongovernmental institutions and ways of life. It can be likened—to draw for a moment upon ecological similes—to a dynamic biosphere. This complex biosphere looks and feels expansive and polyarchic, full of horizontal push and pull, vertical conflict, and compromise, precisely because it comprises a bewildering variety of interacting habitats and species: organisations, civic and business initiatives, coalitions, social movements, linguistic communities, and cultural identities. All of them have at least one thing in common: across vast geographic distances and despite barriers of time, they deliberately organise themselves and conduct their cross-border social activities, business, and politics outside the boundaries of governmental structures, with a minimum of violence and a maximum of respect for the principle of civilised power-sharing among different ways of life.³

³Keane, John 2003, *Global Civil Society?* Cambridge University Press

<http://www.untag->

smd.ac.id/files/Perpustakaan_Digital_1/CIVIL%20SOCIETY%20Global%20Civil%20Society.pdf,

The above paragraph help us understand two aspects quite clearly:

- a) The structural ambiguity and vastness of the idea
- b) It's relation to the state and the international system

As already stated it is difficult to assign a concrete meaning to the term. Generally the term civil society denotes the spaces besides the state, the market and the family. It implies a space where individuals and groups advance collective or social interests. Now, with the coming in of globalization, the range of civil society organisations has been considerably expanded. This process has also been augmented by the rise of non-state actors which have also challenged the Westphalian world order. These non-state actors basically include the NGOs, INGOs, MNCs, TNCs among a few others. Other civil society organisations may include different kinds of social movements, labour unions, religious organisations, environmental organisations, associations of indigenous people, diaspora organisations etc. These groups/associations have been playing an increasingly vital role in international relations. Globalization has again led to the shrinking of time and space and has converted the world into a global village. The world has been transformed into an interconnected space where even a small event in one corner can impact all nations; thus the people and organisations world over have come to be more aware and alert and have been playing crucial roles in deciding and impacting international affairs, diplomacy and international/national policy making. These people and organisations have taken up all significant matters which impact world politics from market policies and tariffs to the environment, from trade barriers to development to the reduction of poverty and climate change etc. This revolutionizing of the role and area of action of the civil society and civil society organisations has largely been the aftermath or impact of the process of globalization. Consequently, the nature and idea of civil society has also undergone a paradigm shift thus expanding and transforming it into a 'global civil society'.

We also need to understand that the idea of a global civil society is complementary to democracy. That is because the concept of civil society is democratic in it's roots. Global civil society initiatives are primarily aimed at organizing political networks with the underpinnings of democratic accountability for socio-political and people-centric actions.

Global civil society therefore acts as an agency which may direct, suggest or even hold authorities including states and governments for

specific actions and decisions if they tend to go against the larger good of peoples and communities. With the accentuated communication networks and financial resources made available, global civil society has now emerged as a formidable force in international politics.

Stop to Consider:

- ❖ The implication and evolution of the term.
- ❖ The structural ambiguity of the concept.
- ❖ The types of organisations which comprise the global civil society organisations – viz. INGOS, social movements, labour unions, religious organisations, environmental organisations, associations of indigenous people, diaspora organisations

5.4 Role of global civil society in International Relations

The sphere of international relations was revolutionized by the phenomenon of globalization. Economic, political and social relations between and among states became a commonplace thing. However globalization did not bring about uniform impact all over the world. Though the phenomenon was welcomed by many primarily as a new method of development and financial exchange, not all states felt that way. Especially the under-developed and developing parts of the world which acted as hinterlands and resource-providers for their developed counterparts were not all in favour of globalization. Economic exploitation, neocolonialism, capitalism became the way of the globalised world. As a result the fault lines between the developed and developing/under developed became more severe. The deepening of economic inequalities between the Global North and Global South gave rise to other grave problems like resource drain, undue political interventions into smaller and less developed states, climate-change

concerns, financial instability of states and social conflicts rooted in cultural clashes.

It was deduced that the state, capitalism and neo-liberalism have been at the root of such worsening conditions as development is always favoured above human beings and profit over environment. It was primarily at such junctions that global civil society organisations have made their presence felt.

Global civil society organisations and initiatives have thus time and again taken up issues and matters of transnational and global importance and acted upon them. In doing so they have emerged as a method of transnational activism focused on generating national and international responses to such issues.

Though the global civil society organisations have been questioned about their apparent legitimacy in doing so and they have also been seen as challenges to the nation state, but even then their importance in international relations cannot be compromised. In recent decades most international regulatory bodies have forged closer relations with such organisations specifically to substantiate this question of legitimacy.

*For instance, the Committee on World Food Security within the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation has reserved seats for different types of organisations, including non-governmental organisations and social movements, research centres, financial institutions, private sector associations and private philanthropic foundations. While the role of civil society organisations in these contexts is predominantly based on a consultative status, they allow the civil society organisations to have a seat at the table*⁴

These organisations have now embedded themselves at the root of transnational activism and mobilization and have been creating the much needed counter responses to global inequalities, undue exploitations and global issues of environment. This activism has mainly come as a response to the development agenda which has been largely accentuated by the process of globalization. Thus, an analysis will reveal that the concept of global civil society is founded on the phenomenon of globalization. Globalization has provided the framework for the emergence and operation of the organisations of the global civil society organisations.

Besides political activism, global civil society organisations have also actively come out in support of vulnerable groups of people like the refugees, racial and ethnic minorities, the LGBTQ community, religious groups etc. In short they have acted like a type of extra-

⁴ Marchetti, Raffaele, 2016, Global Civil Society, <https://www.e-ir.info/2016/12/28/global-civil-society/>

judicial authority which comes to the rescue of people and groups worldwide. These organisations are now perceived as significant and states have also recognized them; besides the states also act in a comparatively cautious manner due to the presence of these organisations.

Stop to Consider :

- ❖ The relation of globalization with global civil society.
- ❖ The question of legitimacy of global civil society organisations.

5.5 Relevance of the idea in the contemporary times

Though the role of global civil society is quite often understated and unrecognized it however plays a crucial role in international relations and hence its relevance cannot be denied. In fact the concept plays a deciding part in transnational and international relations and also has a commanding influence on domestic and international policy making.

Firstly global civil society provides a democratic framework for the operation of international relations. Given that international politics is an uneven power arena, the states with greater political leverage often call the stakes when it comes to matters of international or transnational concern frequently and habitually compromising the interests of the smaller states and people at large. In such circumstances these civil society organisations provide the much needed voice against such political domination and exploitation thus making the relations more democratic by placing the states on a more or less on an equal footing. It helps in building a democratic and participatory sphere of action.

Secondly, these organisations also greatly help in the dissemination of information across territories and boundaries and also help in generating a global public opinion especially on matters such related to human rights, and the environment. The mobilization of people for or against causes has been facilitated by such organisations as result of which global public opinion can now exercise a considerable influence on issues.

Thirdly, global civil society helps or facilitates global governance. Given the pluralistic nature of the states and people of the world, these organisations are increasingly emerging as facilitators of global governance. For instance they help in bridging the gaps between grass-roots organisations and the national governments or inter-governmental organisations. Their supranational character allows them the liberty to intervene in these ways and thus provide for better channels of functioning between other agencies and the state.

Fourthly, these organisations play an especially imperative role by voicing the concerns of those sections of the society who are often overlooked for political and economic gains. For instance these organisations have often provided a channel for the indigenous people, the refugees, the internally displaced people and people of the LGBT community among others. For instance, the Médecins Sans Frontières, CARE, Oxfam, Caritas, Refugees international, Save the Children and the International Rescue Committee have been working hard for the cause of such groups of people.

Fifthly, the global civil society is highly relevant because they provide an alternative framework of action. They stand out as an alternative mechanism trying to generate political and institutional responses in a highly dynamic socio-political and economic environment. They give ways of action outside of mainstream politics and most importantly they provide for people's participation. In doing so, they often take a stand for the greater interests of communities world over.

Stop to Consider :

- ❖ How global civil society facilitates a democratic framework in international relations.
- ❖ How it helps in the generation of global public opinion.
- ❖ How it helps in global governance.
- ❖ How it represents the interests of the vulnerable sections of the society.
- ❖ How they help in organizing an alternative model of politics and governance.

Check your Progress:

- a) Who authored the book *Global Civil Society*?
- b) Write two characteristics of the concept of global civil society.
- c) Name two international NGOs which are working for vulnerable groups.
- d) Write true or false:

Global Civil Society helps in global governance.

- e) Is the concept of global civil society related to globalization?
Yes/No

5.6 Summing Up

We have thus understood that global civil society as a concept is largely believed to have arrived after the phenomenon of globalization. It may also be said to be a result of globalization. This idea basically refers to those organisations outside the family, states and market which have been successful in giving rise to an alternative framework of action in international relations. These global civil society organisations have now begun to exercise a formidable influence on policy-making thereby democratizing the entire sphere of international politics.

We however have to acknowledge that the idea is still quite an ambiguous and contested one, mainly because we have not been able to mark the peripheries of the concept. The idea is a comparatively new one and hence not very clear as to what exactly it denotes. The idea has versatile connotations and can be expanded to include a multitude of associations and organisations. Also, the idea owing to its newness is still evolving and hence is difficult to rigidly substantiate. Nevertheless the role and importance of the concept cannot be compromised due to these factors. Global civil society organisations have now emerged as an important and indispensable component of international relations.

5.7 References and Readings

Kocka, Jurgen, 2004, *Civil Society from a Historical Perspective*, European Review, Vol. 12, No. 1, 65–79 (2004) Academia Europaea, Printed in the United Kingdom

¹Keane, John 2003, *Global Civil Society?* Cambridge University Press
http://www.untag-smd.ac.id/files/Perpustakaan_Digital_1/CIVIL%20SOCIETY%20Global%20Civil%20Society.pdf,

Marchetti, Raffaele, 2016, *Global Civil Society*, <https://www.e-ir.info/2016/12/28/global-civil-society>

Glasius, Marlies, *Introducing Global Civil Society*, 2003
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297399712_%27Introducing_Global_Civil_Society%27