

**Institute of Distance and Open Learning
Gauhati University**

MA in Political Science

Paper II

International Politics: Theoretical Aspects

Block 1

**Meaning and Approaches to
International Politics**



Contents:

Block Introduction–

Unit 1 : Introduction to International Politics

**Unit 2 : International Politics: Approaches and
Theories**

Contributors:

Barnalee Choudhury : Lecturer in Political Science
(Units 1 & 2) IDOL, GU

Course Co-ordination

Dr. Kandarpa Das : Director
IDOL, GU

Barnalee Choudhury : Lecturer in Political Science
IDOL, GU

Editorial Team

Content Editing : Jonaki Dutta
Counsellor in Political Science
IDOL, GU

Format Editing : Prasenjit Das
Editor in Charge
IDOL, GU

Language Editing : Binita Sarma
Counsellor in English
IDOL, GU

Cover Page Designing:

Kaushik Sarma : Graphic Designer
CET, IITG

July, 2010

© Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. Further information about the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University courses may be obtained from the University's office at BKB Auditorium (1st floor), Gauhati University, Guwahati-14. Published on behalf of the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University by Dr. Kandarpa Das, Director and printed at Maliyata Offset Press, Mirza. Copies printed 1000.

Acknowledgement

The Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University duly acknowledges the financial assistance from the Distance Education Council, IGNOU, New Delhi for preparation of this material.

Block Introduction:

In the contemporary period no state can avoid the involvement in International Politics. All the countries of the world have their own national interests for the fulfillment of which they try to maintain a good relation with others. These relations and interactions are studied under the scope of International Politics. It needs mention here that International Politics comprises the norms, rules, established practices and institutions governing the relation among the sovereign states. Though the interactions among nations are an old phenomenon, but as an academic discipline, International Politics has emerged after the First World War. With the changing situations at the international sphere, the nature of International Politics is changing and its scope is also widening. Various approaches or theories provide us directions for studying systematically the relations among nations. An approach is a set of standards governing the inclusion and exclusion of questions and data for academic purposes. This block is an attempt to introduce you with the dynamics of International Politics as well as its development as a field of study. Again as we mentioned earlier we need an approach or a theory to understand a phenomenon properly. So, through this block we are trying to provide you a clear idea of different approaches to the study of International Politics.

Unit 1 discusses the meaning and definitions of International Politics. With the changes in the society, the nature and scope of International Politics is also changing. In this unit we shall discuss the changing nature of International Politics and its development as an academic discipline.

Unit 2 deals with the different approaches to the study of International Politics. These approaches can be studied under two broad categories—traditional and modern. This unit discusses the role of different approaches in the study of International Politics.

This block includes the following two units:

Unit 1: Introduction to International Politics

Unit 2: International Politics: Approaches and Theories

Unit 1

Introduction to International Politics

Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Meaning of International Politics
- 1.4 Development of the Study of International Politics
 - 1.4.1 Development till the Second World War
 - 1.4.2 Development after the Second World War
- 1.5 Nature and Scope of International Politics
 - 1.5.1 Nature of International Politics
 - 1.5.2 Scope of International Politics
- 1.6 Summing up
- 1.7 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction

The scientific and technological advancement and improvements in the means of communication have brought the countries of the world closer. In modern times, the world has greatly shrunk as a result of the scientific and technological development. As a result, events occurred in a particular country influence the other countries of the world. Besides, the countries are mutually dependent on each other and no country can remain aloof. Therefore, International Relationship is as much a product of necessity as social existence itself. The study of International Politics is vital for the understanding of the interpersonal relations between states. As an academic discipline, International Politics has emerged after the First World War. With the changing situations at the international sphere, the nature of International Politics is changing and its scope is also widening. As a subject of study it concerns peoples and cultures throughout the world.

This unit specifically deals with the meaning of International Politics and its development as an academic discipline. Moreover, reading of this unit will also help you to understand the nature and scope of International Politics.

1.2 Objectives

International Politics comprises the norms, rules, established practices and institutions governing the relation among sovereign states. By the end of this unit you will be able to

- *discuss* the meaning of International Politics
- *examine* the various definitions of International Politics
- *describe* the developmental stages of International Politics
- *analyze* the nature and scope of International Politics

1.3 Meaning of International Politics

International Politics primarily studies interactions/relations among all the actors of the international community. It is concerned with the behaviour of international system or the interactions and relations among nations and other international actors present in the international environment. International Politics seeks to study mainly the political dimension of the relations among nations.

Jeremy Bentham first used the term 'international' in 1780 when he talked of 'International jurisprudence'. According to H. J. Morgenthau, 'International Politics includes analysis of political relations and problems of peace among nations'. Again Burton says that International Relations include the study of all such events and circumstances which affect more than one state. It is a system of peaceful communications whereby states consciously and in their own interest, would like to avoid conflict because the costs of conflicts are too high.

Hence it can be said that International Politics is a system of interactions among nations that involve the use of power. However, in the present time, International Politics also include the study of political, economic and cultural relations.

Stop To Consider:

International Relations and International Politics:

Here it is pertinent to know that International Politics is often confused with terms like World Politics, international affairs, International Relations etc. The term International Relations has a wider connotations than International Politics because it embraces all sorts of relations among peoples and groups in the world society viz, political, social, cultural, economic, legal, official as well as non-official. Thus, all international transactions – financial and commercial, international sports, technical co-operation, cultural visits, business visits, trade and economic relations, diplomatic relations etc form part of International Relations. On the other hand, ‘International Politics’ reduces the scope of study and is mainly concerned with the study of power-relations among nations and the study of other aspects of relations is incidental to this basic necessity. According to Prof. E. H. Carr, ‘International Politics includes only those aspects of International Relations in which some conflict of purpose or interest is involved’.

Despite the differences, many writers do not like to draw a line of demarcation between International Relations and International Politics. Scholars like Morgenthau and Kenneth Thompson use the term inter-changeably and regard International Politics as an inalienable part of International Relations.

The scope and complexity of the interactions among the countries of the world is changing making the study of International Relations a challenging subject.

Strictly defined, the field of International Politics concerns the relationships among the world’s governments. But these relationships cannot be understood in isolation. They are closely connected with other actors (such

as international organizations, multinational corporations, and individuals); with other social structures (including economics, culture and domestic politics); and with geographical and historical influences.

Though International Relations and International Politics are used interchangeably, as a field of study, International Relations have uncertain boundaries. As a part of political science, International Relations is about International Politics—the decisions of governments concerning their actions towards other governments. However, to some extent the field is interdisciplinary, relating International Politics to economics, history, sociology and other disciplines. Some universities offer separate degrees or departments for International Relations. However, in most of the universities, International Relations fall under Political Science. The focus is on the politics of economic relationships, or the politics of environmental management.

Politics is the process by which power is acquired, maintained and increased. Given the meaning to politics, International Politics may be described as a process of adjustment of relationships among nations in favour of a nation or a group of nations by means of power. Its focus is on three things: national interest, conflict and power. The first is adjective, the second is the condition and the third is the means of International Politics. International Politics, therefore, can be described as a set of these aspects of relations among independent political communities in which some element of conflict of interests is present. But at the same time, interests of some nations may be identical. It is, therefore, a phenomenon of recurring pattern of conflict and harmony, but cooperation is only possible only through control of conflict. Conflict at least can be channelised into a desired direction. Thus, International Politics is the study of the control of conflict and establishment of cooperation.

Political relations among nations cover a range of activities—diplomacy, war, trade relations, alliances, cultural exchanges, participation in international organizations and so forth. Particular activities within one of these spheres make up distinct issue areas on which scholars and foreign policy makers

focus attention. Example of issue areas include global trade negotiations, or specific ethnic conflicts such as the India-Pakistan and Arab-Israeli conflicts. But one kind of politics that can have an international character is not generally included in the field of International Politics i.e the internal politics of foreign countries.

It is necessary to understand the nature of International Politics in order to distinguish between International Politics and similar expressions like world politics, international affairs and International Politics. International Politics has been described as the process of influencing, manipulating or controlling major groups in the world, so as to safeguard and advance the interests of some against the opposition of others. This implies that International Politics is also described by some writers like Herbert Spiro as World Politics. But world politics is different from International Politics. World politics would be possible only when we are able to achieve a world state, which is still a far cry. Similarly, International Politics should not be confused with International Affairs, as the latter includes non-political matters also.

Another term often used as a synonym of International Politics is International Relations. The scope of the two yet not been well settled. Margenthau and K.W. Thompson, however, maintain that the core of International Relations is International Politics. The general approach to the study of International Relations has been in terms of international institutions, International Politics, power rivalries, international strategy and enforcement procedures which are studied under International Politics also. Yet both are not the same. The term international between nations, in fact, describes all aspects of relationships between nations—politics or non-political, peaceful or warlike, legal or cultural, economic or geographical, official or non-official. International Relations as such embrace the totality of the relationships among nations. On the other hand, the study of International Politics is only a sub-category of International Relations, although the most important one. For the time being, however, International Politics should be treated as theoretical aspects of International Relations.

Check Your Progress

1. Define International Politics?
2. Make a comparative analysis between International Politics and International Relations.
3. Write true or false
 - a) Jeremy Bentham first used the term 'international'.
 - b) International Politics includes analysis of political relations and problems.

1.4 Development of the Study of International Politics

The study of International Politics is a relatively recent arrival on the academic scene. Although the study of International Politics is considered to be a modern phenomenon, the principles and techniques of its study, at least in their rudimentary form, can be traced back to the dawn of history. The ancient civilizations like the Egyptians, Chinese, Greeks and Indians developed a code of inter-state conduct. However, the International Relations at that time were designed to serve a very limited purpose and truly speaking it was not international in character. The states of that period mostly established relations with the state of the same region, thereby making it regional relation. With Renaissance and Reformation, territorial state emerged and with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the tradition of International Relations between different states set in, which continues to the present time.

As an academic discipline, the study of International Relations gained recognition in the war (1919-1939) period. The first chair of International Politics, called the 'Woodrow Wilson Chair' was founded in 1919 at the University College of Wales. Several prominent professors like Alfred Zimmern, C.K. Webster, Reynolds, E.H. Carr, all well known historians, were the early occupants of the chair. This event marks the starting point of the development of International Politics as an Independent discipline. In

1919, the School of Foreign Service came into existence in Georgetown University, which was followed in 1924 by the establishment of the School of International Studies at the University of Southern California. During the period between the two world wars as many as eleven institutions relating to the study of International Relations came into existence.

International Politics as a field of study experienced phenomenal growth in the post-1945 period. Devastations of the two World Wars, increase in the number of sovereign nation states, emergence of many supra-national and non-state actors and the threat of new war have given new dimensions to the study of International Politics.

Thus, in the twentieth century the study of International Politics has passed through various stages of development. According to Kenneth Thomson, it has passed through four main stages of development. Let us now discuss the stages of development of International Politics.

1.4.1 Development till the Second World War:

As has been mentioned earlier, the interactions among nations can be traced back to the dawn of history. However the emergence of International Politics as an academic discipline is a recent phenomenon. Here we have attempted to study the development of International Politics in the period till the break out of Second World War and after.

- The first stage, upto the end of the First World War, was dominated by the monopoly of diplomatic historians, who generally avoided the study of current affairs. They adopted a chronological and descriptive approach and made no attempt to draw some principles from their study of historical facts. This historical orientation precluded the development of a theoretical care for the discipline. As such, no theory of International Relations could develop during the period. Their attempts brought to light certain interesting and important facts about past International Relations. This phase is also termed as the Diplomatic History Phase.

- During the second stage, starting after the end of World War I, the scholars of International Relations emphasized the study of current events and concerned themselves with the interpretation of the immediate significance of current developments and problems. It can be said that this approach was an attempt to do what had been ignored by diplomatic historians. But no attempt was made to relate the past. The review of newspapers, periodicals and journals was considered to be the right and necessary step for understanding the day to day relations among the nations. The result was that no well-conceived theoretical or methodological foundation could emerge by which the significance of current events could be understood in the context of the totality of history and the future of international conduct. This phase is therefore described as the 'Current events stage'.
- The third period also began after the First World War and continued to exist throughout the inter-war years and after. Shocked by the First World War, the prevailing scholarship adopted an essentially legalistic-moralistic approach and looked upon war as both an accident and sin, and suggested international institutions to provide alternative to this 'ultimate argument of kings'. It stressed the institutionalization of International Relations through law and organizations and firmly believed that international problems could be solved by international institutions. The Fourteen Points listed by American President, Woodrow Wilson were together regarded as a charter of reforms for relations among nations. In general, the temper and scholarship at the early inter-war period was characterized by a spirit of optimism. Hence, the concern of the scholars led to the creation of an ideal international society. The Paris Peace Conference and the subsequent establishment of the League of Nations gave strength to the optimism that it was possible to make efforts towards an improvement of International Relations. It must be remembered here that the main concern during the period

was not to understand the nature of International Relations but to develop legal institutions and organizational devices. In short, the concentration of research and academic interests was in the field of international law and organization. This period had strong faith in the goodness of human relations. It was believed that all international problems could be solved by developing a system of international law and by successfully organizing and working international organizations. This approach, too, was not sound, as it ignored the hard realities of international life. However, this era of liberalism and optimism did not last for long. The Third stage of development of International Politics is also regarded as the 'Legal-Institutional Stage' or the 'Law and Organization Stage'.

1.4.2 Development after the Second World War:

International Politics assumes very important role in the post World War II period with the emergence of the new independent nations in different parts of the world. The Second World War threw a challenge to the approaches of the interwar period and necessitated a search for a new approach to the study of International Relations. In this new environment, the fourth phase of the development of the study of International Relations started. In this phase, the emphasis has shifted from International Law and organization to faces and influences which shape and condition the behaviour of the states. It is no longer restricted to diplomatic history or the form and structure of international organization. Instead, our main concern now is fourfold: motivating factors of the foreign policies everywhere, techniques of the conduct of foreign policies, mode to the resolution of international conflicts, and the creation of a new international order based on socioeconomic justice. While during the inter-war years the League of Nations had been at the centre of international studies, now world politics is the setting in which International Relations are studied. Even the functions and purposes of the United Nations are now studied in a political rather than in a constitutional context. The purpose of studying the world issues now is not to praise or

condemn them but to understand them. An important aspect of the impact of the Second World War was the realization of the unsoundness of the earlier assumption that there was a global common interest in peace. Consequently, our attention shifted from the presumed availability of this common interest to finding what people and nations really wanted and why there was conflict among them. This is what marked a new phase in the development of the study of International Politics.

This phase is essentially concerned with theoretical investigation. Commendable efforts have, however, been made during the post-1945 period to develop scientific theories of International Relations. It started with the development of Realist theory in the late 1940s. Although a general and satisfactory theory of International Relations is yet to be evolved, these efforts have given rise to various new scientific approaches to the study of International Relations.

The emergence of Behavioural Revolution in politics has also influenced the approaches and methods to the study of International Politics in the post-Second World War period. The scholars of International Relations used inter-disciplinary approach, which was favoured by the Behaviouralists. Emphasis was also given to the development of more and more sophisticated tools and methods in the study of International Relations. Thus, in the fourth stage of development, International Politics became a very vast and complex field of study.

However, what is important for our present purpose is the fact that the study of International Relations has very much changed in its content and nature after the Second World War. Technological development, liquidation of colonialism, the rise of new nations, the emergence of new international values and crystallization of old ones, end of cold war, wave of globalization, the role of international morality and public opinion, and above all, the desire for seeking a theoretical order in the knowledge of international affairs brought changes in the nature of International Politics. In other words, the nature of International Politics cannot be studied in absolute isolation from what Joseph Roucek calls the sociological nature of the twentieth century.

In this connection, two other things must also be borne in mind when we study the development of International Relations in this twenty first century. One, that a proper understanding of the present nature of International Politics is not possible with a clear understanding of its nature in the pre-1945 period of last century; and two, that the change in the present nature of International Politics is not the total change in any contrasting terms. It is true that International Politics of today has freed itself from some of its old dimensions and has assumed some new ones. But it is also true that it has retained a few of its old dimensions.

Stop to Consider

International Politics and International Laws:

International law is understood as law between nations, but also those relating to international organizations, private companies and NGOs, private international law, state laws, relations between domestic politics and international law and other related questions. International law is diverse. Therefore it is impossible to talk about the role of International Law in universal and trans-historical terms. The same is true with International Politics. There are a variety of International Laws, depending on forms or 'sources', the particular area they are supposed to regulate, the way they are understood and perceived in different countries and in different historical periods and so on. Some scholars of International Relations, especially institutionalists and constructivists, have dealt with relevant treaties and decisions and resolutions of international organizations in such fields as international trade, global environment, disarmament, human rights and humanitarian intervention. Thus, the study of International Politics after behaviouralism generally showed lack of interest in the role of international law in the context of International Politics. However, many scholars believe that International Law is still relevant and plays an important role in International Politics. The scope of International Politics is much wider than that of International Law.

SAQ:

Do you think that World War II changed the scenario of International Politics? Give arguments in favour of your answer. (80 words)

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

1.5 Nature and Scope of International Politics:

In the previous section, we have dealt with the various stages of the development of International Politics. We have also found that with the development of the International Politics, subject-matter and the field of the discipline is also widening. Therefore, it can be said that the nature as well as the scope of International Politics is changing and widening with the passage of time. Now in this section we are going to discuss nature and scope of International Politics.

1.5.1 Nature of International Politics

International Politics, as the name suggests, is concerned with relations and interactions among nations. While politics is defined as struggle for power, International Politics has been defined as struggle for power among nations. According to Morgenthau, ‘International Politics like all politics is struggle for power. Whatever may be the ultimate aim, its immediate aim is always power’.

While discussing the nature of International Politics, it is pertinent for you to know the basic elements of it which are as follows:

- Nations are the primary actors in International Politics as groups are in politics. However, with the passage of time, several non-state, trans-national and supra-national groups and organizations have also come to play an important role here.

- Each nation has its own national interest for the fulfillment of which its policies are formulated. International Politics involves the art of preserving or securing goals of national interests by using control over other nations.
- Since every nation has its own national interest, the interests of various nations may be in conflict with each other at the international level. This results in disputes among various nations. Therefore, methods are worked out for accommodation, reconciliation and adjustment of the conflicts among the nations. Hence, conflict and co-operation, as well as coercion and persuasion are present in International Relations.
- In a conflicting situation, every nation wants to secure its own the goals. For securing these goals nations use power. That is why each nation is continuously engaged in the process of acquiring, maintaining and increasing power. Power is defined as the ability to influence, control and regulate behaviour and actions of other nations for securing intended results.
- Power is also considered as the means and end of International Politics. Nations use power for securing the goals and always seek to increase and maintain power.
- International Politics is also regarded as the process of conflict-resolution among nations. We have already learnt that there are conflicts of interests among nations at the international level. However, existence of conflicts compels the nations with similar goals to cooperate with each other. Thus, International Politics aims at resolving conflicts among nations.
- International Politics involves continuous interactions among nations. Because of the existence of conflicts, attempts must be made to adjust the relations among nations. Therefore, the nations are always are always engaged in the process of interactions.
- Foreign policy serves as a means for fulfilling national interests. Therefore, the relations among nations at the international sphere take the form of interactions among the foreign policies of the nations.

The above mentioned points describe the nature of International Politics. Now let us discuss the scope of the subject matter of International Politics. As has been mentioned earlier, the scope of International Politics has been widening with the passage of time. It encompasses much more than relations among nation states and international organization and groups. Globalisation, scientific and technological advancements have brought the nations of the world closer. If we examine the nature of International Politics today, it is found that it includes variety of transnational relationships at various levels, above and below the level of the nation states. Now, International Politics goes beyond the political relations among nations to include economical, geographical, historical, legal, sociological, psychological and cultural relations.

Stop To Consider:

Globalization and International Politics

By globalization we simply mean the process of increasing interconnectedness between societies such that events in one part of the world have effects on peoples and societies far away. In other words we can say that a globalized world is one in which political, economic, cultural, social events become more and more interconnected. On the other hand International Politics primarily studies interactions/relations among all the actors of the international community. International Politics seeks to study mainly the political dimension of the relations among nations, but to a limited extent. But in the contemporary period due to the advancement of science and technology International Politics gets a more expanded global character unlike its traditional dimensions. For example, the incident of 11th September 2001 probably more than any other events, brought into the mind how just globalized the contemporary world is. The incident followed by the war in Afghanistan (2001-2002) and the controversial attack on Iraq in 2003, and subsequent insurgency and Civil war, are some of the examples of the current International Politics which is more globalized. Because in the above mentioned incidents, states involved international coalitions and transitional violent networks in conflicts that linked events in different parts of the world.

1.5.2 Scope of International Politics

Already we have learnt the nature of International Politics. Regarding the scope of International Politics we can say that in the initial stages International Politics studied only diplomatic history. But soon the study of International Law was included in its scope. After World War I, with the establishment of the League of Nation, the study of international institutions was also included in its scope. After World War II, its field further widened and thus at present, International Politics have become very extensive.

The scope of International Politics includes the following major areas in the contemporary period:

- Nation-states occupy a primary place in International Politics. International Politics is all about the relations and interactions among two or more nations. Therefore, the scope of International Politics always includes the study of relations among the nations.
- National interests and National powers are two important areas of International Politics. Each nation's behaviour is guided by its own interest at the international sphere. Therefore, in the study of International Politics, national interest needs to be studied. Moreover, through the national interests, the nations try to maintain and enhance the national power. It has been observed by scholars like Morgenthau that International Politics can be understood only if viewed as 'interest defined in terms of power'. Hence, it can be said that, power is the basis of inter-state relations and as such it forms an important part of the subject matter of International Politics.
- National interest is closely associated with the Foreign policy of the nations. Foreign policies aim at securing the objectives of the national interests. In fact, a study of foreign policies of various nations alone can explain the nature of relations and interactions among the nations.
- International Politics also includes economic instruments and trade relations among various nations in the Modern period. Today, economic instruments like foreign aid, loans, global markets etc influence the course

of International Relations. Political relations are also guided and shaped by economic relations.

- International Institutions and the regional organizations have come to occupy very important position in International Politics today. Besides UNO, several regional organizations like NATO, OAS, OAU, OPEC, ASEAN, EU, SAARC etc play very important role in the International Politics today. Moreover, several trading blocs like G-8, G-77, G-20, G-24 etc have also come to play an important role in International Relations and become a subject-matter of International Politics today. Again, several non-state international or supra-national or trans-national actors, NGOs, Human Rights Organizations, Peace movements have also come under the scope of International Politics.
- Several concepts have controlled the behaviour of the nations in the international environment. The concepts of Balance of Power, Regionalism, Disarmament and arms Control, International Law, World Public Opinion, diplomacy etc are the important principles, processes and concepts of International Relations. These have been continuously influencing the actual operation of the foreign policies of all the nations and hence have come to assume very important role in International Politics.
- The scope of International Politics has been widening with the inclusion of major contemporary issues and problems like international terrorism, protection of Human Rights, issue of Climate Change, environmental protection, ethnic conflicts, sustainable development etc.

Thus, it can be said that the core concepts of International Politics are international organizations, international law, foreign policy, international conflict, economic relations, military strategy, international political economy, peace and conflict studies etc. It also covers state sovereignty, ecological sustainability, nuclear proliferation, terrorism, human security etc.

Check Your Progress:

1. Describe the scope of International Politics.
2. Analyze the scope of International Politics.
3. Write a note on the changing nature of International Politics.
4. How does globalization affect International Politics? Give a critical view.

1.6. Summing up

After reading this unit, you are now in a position to discuss the meaning of International Politics. You have also learnt that International Politics assumes a very important role in the present time because no state can remain isolated from the rest of the world. Moreover, technological and scientific advancements have brought the nations of the world closer necessitating the study of International Politics. Now you are in a position to distinguish between International Politics and International Relations. International Relations has a wider meaning and is concerned with every form of interaction between and amongst nations. Such interactions can also occur between corporation and social groups. Moreover, this unit has also helped you in learning the development of International Politics as an academic discipline. In the post Second World War period, International Politics assumes new direction with the emergence of new nation states. You have also learnt that with the changing time and scope, the nature of International Politics is also changing. Now besides the states, several non-state, trans-national and supra-national groups and organizations are also playing very important role in the study of International Politics. It serves as a platform for the interaction of foreign policies of the nations. Moreover, economic associations and trade relationships have also come to play very important role in International Politics in modern times. Its changing scope can also be understood from the inclusion of contemporary issues and problems like international terrorism, the protection of Human Rights, the issue of Climate Change, environmental protection, ethnic conflicts, sustainable development

etc. In the next unit of this block we shall deal with at length the major approaches to the study of International Politics.

1.7. References and Suggested Readings

Mahendra Kumar: *Theoretical Aspects of International Politics*, Shiva Lal Agarwal & Co

Jashua S. Goldstein: *International Relations*, Fifth Edition, Pearson Education, 2003

C.W. Kegley (Jr), E. R. Wittkopt: *World Politics, Trend and Transformation*, seventh Edition, 1999

Prakash Chandra: *Theories of International Relations*, Third Edition, 2005

Urmila Sharma, S.K. Sharma: *International Relations, Theory and History*, 2000

* * *

Unit 2

International Politics: Approaches and Theories

Contents:

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Objectives
- 2.3 Idealist and the Realist approaches to International Politics
 - 2.3.1 Idealist Approach
 - 2.3.2 Realist Approach
- 2.4 Other approaches to International Politics
 - 2.4.1 System Theory
 - 2.4.2 Decision Making Theory
 - 2.4.3 Game Theory
 - 2.4.4 Communication Theory
- 2.5 Summing up
- 2.6 References and Suggested Readings

2.1 Introduction

An approach is a set of standards governing the inclusion and exclusion of questions and data for academic purposes. It implies looking at the problem from a particular angle and explaining the phenomenon from the same angle. For studying International Relations systematically, the scholars have adopted different approaches in different periods of time. Traditionally International Relations have been studied with the help of approaches drawn from History, Philosophy and Law. However, after 1940s there was a change in the international scenario which forced the political thinkers to formulate new approaches for studying new emerging situations. This has resulted in the development of several other approaches for studying International Relations.

In this unit an attempt has been made to discuss different approaches to the study of International Relations. The various approaches to the study of International Politics are divided by Hedley Bull into two categories——

a). classical or traditional and b). scientific or modern approaches. Reading of this unit will help you understand these approaches. In this unit, we will discuss traditional approaches to International Relations like historical and idealist approaches as well as modern approaches like communication, decision-making approaches etc.

2.2 Objectives:

The scope of International Relations has greatly expanded over the years. Therefore, the earlier methods used in the study of International Relations have failed to analyze the new emerging situations. Under such circumstances new approaches to the study of International Relations have emerged. After reading this unit you will be able to:

- *discuss* the idealist and realist approaches to the study of International Relations.
- *elaborate* modern approaches like system or decision-making approaches.
- *examine* game theory and communication approach.

2.3 Idealist and the Realist approaches to International Politics

Idealist and realist approaches to International Politics belong to the category of traditional approaches. These two approaches oppose each other. Each advocates a particular view of the totality of international reality and believes that it can be adopted as the means for understanding and explaining all aspects of International Relations. Since these two approaches belong to the category of traditional approach, they are normative by nature. Let us now discuss the two approaches in detail in the following sub-sections.

2.3.1 Idealist Approach:

Idealism is based on the general idea of evolutionary progress in society. It regards power politics as only an abnormal or passing phase of history.

Idealist approach is a very old approach in the field of International Relations. Its history can be traced to the declaration of the American War of Independence of 1776 and in the French Revolution of 1789. The echo of this approach can also be found in the writings of Condorcet, Rousseau and Kant and also in the ideas of leaders like Woodrow Wilson, A. Briand, Gandhi and Nehru. In 1795, Condorcet wrote a treatise which contained everything considered as the essential basis of idealism in International Relations. He envisaged a world order characterized by the absence of war, inequality, and tyranny and marked by constant progress in human welfare brought about by the use of reason, education and science.

Thus, in the positive sense idealism refers to a state of perpetual peace through the existence of 'world federation', while in the negative sense it stands for the absence of war, elimination of inequality in mankind and end of tyranny. Idealism presents a picture of the future international society based on the notion of reformed international system free from power politics, immorality and violence. The idealist approach to International Relations has always held out the promise of bringing about a better world with the help of education and international organization. The idealists argue that political struggles in the past had been not for power or influence but for incompatible principles and ideals.

The theoretical position of idealism in International Relations is the offspring of the liberal outlook of the Condorcet type. Idealism is also known as liberal idealism. At the core of idealism is an emphasis on the impact of ideas on behaviour, the equality and liberty of the individual and the need to protect people from excessive state regulation. From this comes a conceptualization of the individual as the seat of moral value and virtue and the belief that human beings should be treated as ends rather than means. Idealism emphasizes ethical principles over the pursuit of power and institutions over interests as forces shaping inter-state relations.

Stop to Consider:

Main advocates of idealism in post World War I period were Alfred Zimmern, Norman Angell, James T. Shotwell and Woodrow Wilson. Idealism advocated by these thinkers is based on the following assumptions:

Human nature is essentially “good” or altruistic, and people are therefore capable of mutual aid and collaboration through reason and ethically inspired education.

The fundamental human concern for other’s welfare makes progress possible.

Bad human behaviour, such as violence, is the product not of flawed people but of evil institutions that encourage people to act selfishly and to harm others.

War and international anarchy are not inevitable and war’s frequency can be reduced by strengthening the institutional arrangements that encourage its disappearance.

War is a global problem requiring collective or multilateral, rather than national, efforts to control it.

Reform must be inspired by a compassionate ethical concern for the welfare and security of all people, and this humanitarian motive requires the inclusion of morality in statecraft.

International society must reorganize itself in order to eliminate the institutions that make war likely, and states must reform their political systems so that self-determination and democratic governance within states can help pacify relations among states.

Political idealism in International Relations represent a set of ideas which together oppose war and advocate the reform of international community through dependence upon moral values and the development of international institutions and international laws. According to this approach morality is the means for securing the desired objective of establishing a peaceful world. The major features of idealism are as follows:

- a. Human nature is essentially good and capable of doing good things in International Relations.
- b. Human welfare and advancement of civilization is a major concern for everyone.
- c. Bad or undesired human behaviour is the result of bad environment and bad institutions, which can be eliminated by reforming the environment.

- d. War represents the worst feature of relations which can be eliminated by reforming the relations among nations. For that efforts are needed at the international level.
- e. International community should make an effort to eliminate various global features and practices that lead to war.
- f. International institutions should be established to preserve international peace, law and order for securing peace prosperity and development.

Although a tone of idealism dominated policy rhetoric and academic discussions during the interwar period, with the exception of the League of Nations and precedent-setting Washington Naval Disarmament Treaties, little of the liberal reform programme was ever seriously attempted. The difficulty with this approach is that such a system could emerge only by following moral principles in mutual relations in place of power, which is not possible in practice. Secondly, to bring about such an order the totalitarian forces must be crushed by all means through the use of democratic methods and the last necessity is the establishment of the world government.

The Idealist approach has faced with several criticisms. One of the criticisms against it is that such a system could emerge only when the nations follow moral principles in mutual relations in place of power which is far from practice. Again, to establish a world as visualized by the supporters of idealist approach, the totalitarian forces must be crushed. The main criticism against this theory is that it runs short of factual position. The nations do not behave as they are expected.

The outbreak of the World War-II provoked strong criticism of idealist paradigm. Critics alleged idealists as utopians who neglected the realities of power politics and blamed them for the outbreak of the War. The drawbacks inherent in the idealist approach have led to the emergence of the realist approach in International Relations. Now let us discuss the realist approach in the next sub-section.

Check Your Progress:

1. What is an approach? Discuss its importance in the study of International Politics.
2. Define Idealism to the study of International Politics. Discuss its salient features.
3. What are the drawbacks of Idealist approach to International Politics?

2.3.2 Realist Approach:

Realism in International Relations emerges out of the individual belief that others are always trying to destroy him and therefore, he must be ready to destroy others whenever needed in order to protect himself. The basic assumption underlying the realist theory is the perpetual existence of conflicts among nations in one form or the other. This approach held the belief that a contest of power is going on in the world and this can neither be controlled nor regulated by international law or world government. Political philosophies of Thomas Hobbes and Niccolo Machiavelli provided the ground for the emergence of realist approach.

Advocates of the new, ascendant paradigm known as realism, as a general philosophy, emerged to frame an intellectual movement whose message reads like the antithesis of idealism. In the International Relations, among the principal advocates of realism are E.H. Carr, George F. Kennan, Hans J. Morgenthau, Reinhold Niebuhr and Kenneth W. Thompson.

Realism regards politics as the struggle for power and seeks to explain it with the help of such factors as power, security and national interest. Conflicts of interests among the states are assumed to be inevitable. According to realism, the main challenge before the state is to survive in a hostile environment. To this end, no means is more important than the acquisition of power, and no principle is more important than self-help. In this conception, state sovereignty gives the heads of state the freedom and responsibility to do whatever is necessary to advance the state's interest and survival.

As it has been mentioned earlier, realism opposes the principles of idealism. For realism, respect for moral principles is a wasteful and dangerous interference in the national pursuit of national power. A state's philosophical or ethical preferences are neither good nor bad -what matters is whether they serve its self-interest. Thus, the game of International Politics revolves around the pursuit of power: acquiring it, increasing it, projecting it and using it to bend others to one's will. At the extreme, realism appears to accept war as normal and rejects morality as it pertains to relations between individuals.

The basic assumptions of Realism are as follows:

- People are by nature narrowly selfish and ethically flawed, and cannot free themselves from the sinful fact that they are born to watch out for themselves.
- Of all people's evil ways, none are more prevalent or dangerous than their instinctive lust for power and their desire to dominate others.
- The possibility of eradicating the instinct for power is a utopian aspiration.
- International Politics is—as Thomas Hobbes puts it a struggle for power, “a war of all against all”.
- The primary obligation of every state is to promote its national interest, and to acquire power for this purpose.
- The nature of the international system dictates that states acquire sufficient military capabilities to deter attack by potential enemies.
- Economics is less relevant to national security than its military might; economics is important primarily as a means of acquiring national power and prestige.
- Allies might increase a state's ability to defend itself, but their loyalty and reliability should not be assumed.
- States should never entrust the task of self-protection to international security organizations or international law and should resist efforts to regulate international conduct.

Morgenthau is the most popular of all the realist thinkers. He has offered a realistic theory of International Relations. According to him, 'International Politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power. Whatever, the ultimate aims of International Politics, power is always the immediate aim.' Morgenthau in his realist theory laid down six principles which are as follows:

- a) Politics is governed by objective laws which are based on human nature and psychology. We can understand the political phenomena by developing a political theory based on human psychology and reason.
- b) Morgenthau lays great emphasis on the concept of national interest which he defines in terms of power. He states that politics cannot be understood in moral and religious terms but only on rational basis.
- c) According to him, interest is not fixed and is moulded by the environments.
- d) He believes that the universal moral principles cannot be applied to state's actions and these must be modified according to the circumstances of time and place.
- e) Morgenthau does not find any identity between moral aspirations of a nation and the moral law which governs the universe and asserts that all political actors pursue their national interests.
- f) He is of the view that political sphere is as autonomous as the spheres of economist, or the lawyer or the moralist.

The Realist approach is also subjected to criticism because of the boldness with which its proponents stated assumptions about political behaviour. Moreover, the concept of 'national interest' has been the object of considerable criticism as there is no operational meaning to the concept. Thus this approach suffers from ambiguity.

The Realist thinkers are also criticized for their efforts to draw from the past a series of political concepts for the analysis of the contemporary international system. Pursuit of limited national objectives, the separation of foreign policy from domestic politics, the conduct of secret diplomacy, the use of balance of power as a technique for the management of power, and the pleas for nations to place reduced emphasis on ideology as a conditioner of international conduct, have little relevance to the international system today. By urging that nations return to the practices of an earlier period, some realist writers overestimate the extent to which such change in the present international system is possible.

In emphasizing power as the principal motivation for political behaviour, the Realists have made themselves the objects of criticism. According to the critics, no universally acceptable definition of power has been offered by the Realists. Prominent realist thinker, Morgenthau considers power as a psychological relationship. But psychological relationships themselves are very vague. In addition, the Realists have been criticized for allegedly having placed too much emphasis on power, to the relative exclusion of other important variables.

Despite the shortcomings of realist approach, it is still relevant in analyzing international problems, especially in times of global tension. This happened, for example, in the early 1980s when the cold war competition between the United States and Soviet Union entered an embittered new phase and their arms race accelerated.

Stop to Consider:

Traditional or Classical Approaches

Traditional or Classical approaches were mainly used in the field of International Relations till the middle of the twentieth century. These approaches mainly emphasize the descriptive analysis of International Relations. The traditional approach was adopted by most of the scholars till the scientific approach made its appearance. These approaches are basically qualitative, normative and value-based. Some of the traditional approaches are —— Historical and Institutional approaches besides idealist and realist approaches.

Historical approach stands for historical study of the development of International Relations. The scholars advocating this approach believe that the study of the past is essential for understanding the present nature of International Relations. The distinguishing feature of this approach is its focus on the past or on a selected period of time as well as on a sequence of events within a particular phase so as to find out an explanations of what institutions are, and are tending to be, more in the knowledge of what they have been and how they come to be, what they have been and how they came to be. Between 1800 and 1914, the study of diplomatic history was regarded as the approach to the study of International Relations.

Institutional approach was very popular during the period between the two world wars. This approach emphasized on creating supranational institutions for harmonizing International Relations. It also advocated for the development of international laws for eliminating war and emphasized on establishing peace and order by eliminating weapons. The major aim of this approach was to study international organization, their structures, legal frameworks, powers and functions.

The philosophical approach regarded the state as an agent of moral improvement of International Relations and stood for attainment of perpetual peace. The legal approach on the other hand laid emphasis on the need of having a system of world law to regulate the behaviour of the nation states and insisted on a code of international law to ensure world peace and security.

SAQ

Make a comparative study of the idealist and the realist approaches to the study of International Politics. (80 words)

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

2.4 Other Approaches to International Politics

Traditional approaches to the study of International Politics have failed to a large extent to analyze international situations because of their inherent drawbacks. As a result, modern approaches to the study of International

Relations have come up. In this section, let us discuss some of the modern approaches to the study of International Politics.

2.4.1 System Theory:

This approach emerged in the field of International Relations in the twentieth century. It can be regarded as a result of Behavioural Revolution in social sciences. There has been no unanimity among the scholars regarding the meaning of a system. This approach seeks to analyze International Relations as a system of interactions which are interdependent and interrelated. It studies International Relations as a system of behaviour of international actions.

It should be remembered here that a system is probably the most widely used term in political science and International Relations today. System describes (a) a theoretical framework for the coding of data about political phenomena; (b) an integrated set of relationship based on a hypothetical set of political variables, e.g., an international system involving world government; (c) a set of relationships among political variables in an international system, and (d) any set of variables in interaction. International Relations involve describable regularities in the interactions among nations and as such it can be explained and analyzed as international system. Morton Kaplan views international system as ‘an analytical entity for explaining the behaviour of international actors and the regulative, integrative and disintegrative consequences of their policies’.

System analysis describes a variety of techniques, such as cost-effectiveness studies, that are designed to allow rational choices in decisions regarding the allocation of resources. But in the literature of political science, ‘System analysis’ has often been used interchangeably with ‘System theory’ in so far as it is employed to describe conceptual frameworks and methodologies for understanding the operation of political systems. It aids in determining a political system’s capacity for maintaining its equilibrium in the face of stress and for adapting to changes that are forced internally and externally.

Again, a system may be loosely or tightly organized. It may be stable or unstable. Smaller systems (or subsystems) may exist within larger systems. Every system, in some sense, involves communications which do not permit the flow of information leading to a self adjusting process. Every system has inputs and outputs; the output of one system may become the input of another with which it is coupled. When systems are coupled in two directions, we speak of the occurrence of “feedback”. Some inputs may affect the state of the system and create disturbances in its equilibrium, after-which the system returns to its former normal state. Other inputs may have such an impact as to transform the characteristic behaviour of the system; instead of returning to its former state of equilibrium, it might achieve equilibrium at a different level and under different characteristic operating conditions.

The system theory was first expounded by McClelland in 1955. The system theory in International Relations has been elaborately discussed by Morton A. Kaplan, Stanely Holfmann, Kenneth Bulding and Harold Guetzkow.

Of all writers who discussed the system theory in International Relations in detail, Morton A. Kaplan has made the greatest effort to specify rules and patterns of interaction within his model of the international system. Kaplan has constructed six models of hypothetical international systems which provide a theoretical framework within which hypotheses can be generated and tested. Within each model he has developed five sets of variables: the essential rules, the transformation rules, the actor classificatory variables, the capability variables and the information variables. The so-called “essential” rules are essential because they describe the behaviour necessary to maintain the equilibrium in the system. The actor classificatory variables set forth the structural characteristics of the actors. Capability variables indicate armament levels, technologies and other elements of power available to actors. Information variables refer to the levels of communication within the system.

Kaplan maintains that there is some coherence, regularity and order in International Politics. According to him, International Politics implies two things: international system and nation-state system. Nation States are the

main actors in International Politics but their rule changes with the change of international system. Kaplan identified six models of international system in his analysis of International Politics.

The first model of Kaplan is the balance of power system which roughly corresponds to that which was prevalent in the western world in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The operation of balance of power system has six important rules which may be enumerated as follows: (1) Each State can increase its power without war, (2) The primary obligation of each national actor must be to itself by protecting its interests even at the risk of war, (3) One actor should not eliminate an important national actor, (4) The national actor should oppose any coalition acquiring a preponderant position, (5) The national actor should prevent others from subscribing to supra-national principle, and (6) Defeated actor should be permitted re-entry into the system. The balance of power system worked well as an absolute system for two (18th and 19th) centuries in Europe and appeared as a rule of universal applicability. But since the beginning of the twentieth century these rules are not operating well.

The second model is described by Kaplan as a bipolar system. He believes that the breaking of balance of power system may result in the bipolar system—the ‘loose bipolar system’ and the ‘tight bipolar system’. In the loose bipolar system each block has a leading actor. What followed just after the Second World War was the loose bipolar system. In this system both supranational actors as well as national actors participate. The loose bipolar system is characterized by two major block actors (North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Warsaw Treaty Organization), non-aligned actors (India, Egypt etc.) and universal actor (United Nations). However, this system has a considerable degree of inherent instability.

The third model as has been identified by Kaplan is tight bi-polar. The loose bi-polar system may be transformed into a ‘tight bi-polar system’. In this model, non-aligned states or non-members of either block would either disappear or shall have little importance. Even the universal actor shall not be in a position to mediate between the two block actors and may possibly cease to exist. However, the tight bipolar system has failed to materialize.

According to Kaplan the fourth model is Universal system. It would be possible when the United Nations becomes sufficiently strong to check war and when the block system ceases to exist. It would be like a world federation with governmental powers, yet leaving sufficient authority to the nation states.

The fifth model of Kaplan is called 'hierarchical international system'. It may come into existence when a universal actor absorbs the whole world and only one nation is left as the universal actor with unchallenged authority. In this unipolar system, national actors will be just territorial/administrative subdivisions of the international system rather than independent political units. This system can be both directive and non-directive. It will be directive if it is formed as a result of world conquest by a national actor. But it would be non-directive if power is distributed among nations according to the hierarchy under the overall domination of a single national actor.

The sixth model projected by Kaplan is the 'unit-veto system'. The essence of this system is that all states will be equally able to destroy each other. This system is possible in a condition in which all actors come to possess weapons of such a nature that any actor is able to destroy another actor, even though at the risk of his own destruction.

Thus, the sixth models of international systems proposed by Morton Kaplan have only limited merit. The balance of power system is impracticable in contemporary times. Kaplan was wrong in predicting that the balance of power system leads first to loose Bi-polar system and then to a tight Bi-polar system. The course of evolution of International Relations in the post-World War II reflected that the opposite was true. He also overlooks the fact that the concept of national interest has already undergone a transformation so as to be compatible with the universal interest.

Again, the fourth hypothetical models of Kaplan also appear to be totally impracticable. It is really doubtful that the existing international organization, the United Nations, to become a really powerful and effective universal actor. Likewise, unit veto system is also far from practicable.

His models ignore the role of the economic, technological, personal, geopolitical and political factors of international organizations.

Therefore, it can be said that the system theory is only a theoretical tool which has many operational difficulties. Again, being behaviourally oriented, it is value- neutral. Another major shortcoming with system analysis is its attempt to reduce things to quantitative variables. But human material is complex and the behaviour of statesmen is difficult to predict. Moreover, system theory ignores the psychological and social forces affecting the operations of a system.

Stop to Consider

Genesis of System Approach

Genesis of system approach can be found in natural resources. This idea is developed from biology and then adopted by the social scientists. The German biologist Ludwig Van Bertalanffy was the first to state the formulations of the general systems theory way back in 1930s. He defined system as a set of 'elements studying in interaction'. The post-Second World War era period witnessed, in the USA particularly, a fundamental shift in the writings of numerous American scholars when they began to borrow a lot from other social and natural sciences so as to give new empirical orientation to political studies which helped ultimately to examine numerous concepts, out in the process enriched their findings.

2.4.2 Decision-Making Theory:

Decision-making approach is a very popular approach in International Politics. Decision-making is simply the act of choosing among available alternatives, about which a certain amount of uncertainty exists. It furnishes a comprehensive and useful checklist of the factors which one ought to take into account in any attempt to analyze policy making, either as a process in a specific case. Its central focus is upon something much smaller than the whole political system.

The intellectual origins of the decision making theory go back to the eighteenth century. In 1738 Daniel Bernouli produced formulations of the decision-making theory. Anthony Downs in 1957 produced formulations of governmental decision-making in terms of economic theories also contributed to the growth of the decision- making theory. In the late 1950s and early 1960s several writers like William Riker, James Robinson and Herbert Simon brought about an enrichment of the decision making approach to the study of political science. Thinkers like Richard C. Synder, H.W. Bruck and Borton Sapin have made significant contributions towards the growth of this approach in the later period.

Decision making is a process or a sequence of activities involving stages of problem recognition, search for information, and definition of alternatives. The object of the decision making theory is to devise a conceptual framework that can help us in the reconstruction of the situation as defined by the decision makers. The setting consists of internal and external parts. The internal settings include domestic politics, public opinion, personalities and organizations. The external setting implies all the relevant factors in the total situation of the international system existing at a particular time e.g. the factors beyond the territorial boundaries of the state, the decision of other states and the nature of their society.

There is difference of opinion among the theorists of this approach and different lines are followed by them. The first line places emphasis on environmental factors which mean how the environments influence the decision making. The environment has two aspects—one which the decision makers can see and the other which is beyond their perception and estimation. This aspect was emphasized by Herold Sprout and Margaret Sprout. The second includes the personality factor. The study of the personality of the decision makers can be helpful in explaining things at least so long as the same decision makers continue to control the foreign policy. This factor was emphasized by Alexander George and Juliettee George. Third line of approach is related to a study of those actors who actually participate in the formulation of foreign policy. There are at least five elements

which influence the foreign policy making: the public opinion, interests groups, the media of mass-communication, and specific agents in the executive branch and specific committees of a legislature.

According to Synder, there are two fundamental purposes of decision-making approach. They are

- To help identify and isolate the ‘crucial structures’ in the political realm where action is initiated and carried out and where decisions must be made
- To help analyze systematically the decision-making behaviour ‘which leads to action and which sustains action’.

While discussing the decision-making approach, Synder has also pointed out certain variables of decision-making approach. They are:

- Decision Actors: This approach focuses enquiry on a class of actors called decision-makers, who make the decisions and are actually responsible for them.
- Decision-makers as actors in a situation: The behaviour of the decision-maker has to be studied in terms of action analysis and they should be treated as actors in a situation.
- The setting: It is important to take into account the environment or the situation in which they formulated and implemented the decisions.
- Decision situation: It should also be taken in to account as to whether the situation was certain, risky, stressful, crucial, hostile, threatening, short of time, controllable or uncontrollable.
- Decision Process: Snyder’s model gives key importance to the study of decision-making process.

Decision making theory in International Politics should be taken as the interaction of foreign policies and that for the understanding of the interaction

the only useful approach can be to study it in the context of foreign policy decisions. But the theory suffers from several shortcomings. In the first place it is too empirical. It completely ignores the norms values or high principles which exercise profound influence on International Politics. Moreover, the theory offers a 'state-centric' model of International Politics. It merely tries to prove that the decision makers tend to fit incoming information into their existing theories and images. Furthermore, the theory mainly focuses on the motives and actions of the decision makers and completely ignores the role of other factors which influence the pattern of International Politics. Finally, it ignores the objective nature of international developments. It does not supply any criteria either to explain the patterns of power politics or to prescribe the rulers of international behaviour.

The decision-making framework is intended to show how and why a nation acts in the International Politics. However, a general study of the International Relations cannot be fruitfully made with the exclusive help of the decision-making theory even though it is very useful as a tool in the foreign policy analysis.

SAQ:

To what extent the variables put forwarded by Synder affect the decision-making process? Discuss. (80 words)

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

2.4.3 Game Theory

Game theory is a specialized form of decision-making theory and a controversial one. This theory attempts at applying different models of game to International Politics. When we deal with international strategic situations, game theory helps us to clarify our thought about available choices, suggests

novel possibilities which might not otherwise have occurred to us, and induces us to penetrate to a deeper, more generalized level of comprehension at which more powerful analytic methodologies might usefully be brought into play.

The theory of game has been developed mainly by the mathematicians and the economists. Martin Shubnik, Oscar Morgenstern and Karl Deutsch were among the first two, who recognized the importance of game theory. It is a method of analysis and also of reflecting the best course of action. This theory attempts to give a decision regarding what action is rational in a particular situation. Game theory is based upon an abstract form of reasoning arising from a combination of mathematics and logic. Nearly all game theorists would agree that the theory with which they deal is addressed to what is “rationally correct” behaviour in conflicting situations in which the participants are trying to “win”, rather than to the way individuals actually do behave in conflicting situations.

Each game is characterized by the following elements:

- Conflict: In the game of International Relations, nations are in conflict with each other. Each one tries to defeat the other. In other words, International Politics is a game between opponents.
- Rules of the Game: The opponents in International Relations observe certain rules or norms which condition their behaviours like in every game.
- Rational behaviour: The players are guided by rational behaviour and each tries to choose the best course of action that can bring him maximum gains.
- Strategy: The concept of strategy is a core concept of game theory. A strategy means a skillful plan or the previously decided set of moves to be taken when the anticipated moves of the opponents require them.

The model which the theory employs is that of a game of strategy and not a game of chance. Game theory envisages several types of games. The basic game is known as the ‘two person-zero sum’ game. In this game, there are

only two players. The struggle is decisive, the victory destroys the loser. Another type of game is called the 'constant-sum game'. The game in which both the players try to acquire equal benefit is known as the 'non-zero sum game'. In this game there is both conflict and co-operation between the players. It is a game in which neither side loses and both may win.

The game theory is particularly applicable to the study of those social phenomena in which the actors are struggling hard for their own advantage but do not have any real control over the factors which are crucial in deciding the outcome of the game. The range of such phenomena is extremely wide and covers all the economic, political, military and social aspects. The game theory has been applied to all these aspects, in varying degrees.

Game theory is a model of rational behaviour. If used as a descriptive model it can provide a standard by which policy actions can be judged as rational or irrational. But it fails to tell us why states as actors sometimes behave irrationally. It assumes that participants have similar objectives, norms and leadership characteristics, a situation that obviously can never be obtained in reality. Further, it assumes that decision makers are perfectly rational and a moral in their decisions and have perfect information or intelligence available to them. But conscious rational decisions appear to be an exception rather than a rule.

The real weakness of the game theory is that it can be applied with some success to cases of 'two-person zero sum' games. But in International Politics, there are few such situations. Most often there are mixed games in International Politics. Some have questioned the validity of the game theory in its zero-sum form. The main objection is that the game theory in this form has contributed very little to problems like limited war, deterrence, surprise attacks, atomic blackmail, and massive retaliation. International Politics does not relate only to war. The concept of zero-sum game is losing its importance since the conflicting parties no more want war. The balance of nuclear power and devastating nature of wars have placed a premium on negotiations rather than confrontation. Hence, to avoid the pit-falls of zero-sum game, some other game theories such as 'chicken game' and the game of "philosopher's dilemma" are developed. But they too have their own limitations.

Stop To Consider

Other Modern Approaches to International Politics:

The scientific or modern approaches to International Politics attach more importance to the methods and techniques. The advocates of this approach try to build up theory of International Relations on the basis of logical, mathematical and empirical grounds.

Equilibrium approach:

Equilibrium approach is an approach which according to Quincy Wright, is a relationship among the forces operating upon or within an entity or group of entities so that the whole manifests in some degree of stability. George Liska and Morton Kaplan are the main exponents of the equilibrium approach.

Equilibrium is of two types: static and dynamic. In static equilibrium a self-maintaining system of automatic compensatory reaction occurs after disturbances, restoring the original conditions. This type of equilibrium is found in constitutional cases as well as in general cases. Since all elements are inter-dependent and inter-related, a process of action and reaction ultimately leads to dynamic equilibrium. A country with relatively equal distribution of power provides the example of constitutional or institutional order or equilibrium. It is a theoretical norm and an actual tendency towards equilibrium. According to George Liska, multiple equilibrium involves political, economic, military, socio-cultural aspects of a society. It is a desirable step towards stability.

Morton Kaplan states that equilibrium approach can define balance of power system in the true sense of the term. According to George Catlin, equilibrium is not a process but an actual condition. Equilibrium assumes that International Relations tend towards stability and equilibrium. However, one of the defects of this approach lies in the fact that since the variables of International Politics are not measurable in exact proportion, the possibility of empirical verification is very limited.

Besides, Karl Deutsch developed Quantitative theory and developed certain measurable indices of community development. Behavioural approach tries to analyze International Relations as a strife between various national characters.

SAQ

In your opinion which kind of game is more applicable in contemporary world politics? (60 words)

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

2.4.4 Communication Theory

The communication theory, relatively the latest in the study of International Politics, is related to cybernetics—the science of control and communication system. If politics is a system, the control of the system depends on communications and the ability of the state is related to its ability to deal with the information. The communication system is of great importance in understanding a political system because no operation of political system can communicate with each other. Communication links together the parts of the system and also the present with the past and the future, so that demands are followed by politics.

Communication has been used both in narrow and broad sense. In the narrow sense it includes the procedures by which one mind may affect another. In the wider sense it involves not only oral speech but all human behaviour. In a still wider sense it is used with reference to the ways in which the political environment excites signals in the central nervous system—together with the ways in which the human beings operate upon the physical environments.

It may be observed that the term ‘political communication’ as an approach to the analytical study of International Relations is different from the term communication used in relation to the media of dissemination of information. As students of International Relations we are not concerned with the channel of communication like press, radio, though they may form a part of the study of political communication. On the other hand we are concerned with

the study of communication approach in relation to the study of international political system.

Political communication envisages certain concepts pertaining to operating structures viz, flow, processes and outcomes. As regards to operating structure every system has 'reception system' dealing with the intake of information. It also covers other functions like scanning operation, selection of information and data processing. The intake, along with the relevant past experiences, is used by the decision making part. The 'flows and processes' deal with the channels and other terms like loads and loan capacity. Load relates to the overall intake of information of any given time. Load capacity is related to factors like responsiveness (taking account of and handling incoming information), fidelity (accuracy with which information is transmitted in the various processes), voice and distortions (the distortions that tend to affect the accuracy of information transmitted). The outcome manifested in the form of decisions is the result of inputs.

For a proper understanding of the operation of communication we must understand other terms like feedback, lag, gain and lead. Feedback refers to the message about the actions which are returned to the system and enable the decision makers to assess their success or failure. Lag is a measure of delay in reporting and acting on information about the consequences of the decisions and actions. Gain represents the extensiveness of a system's response to the information. Lead refers to the capacity to respond to the forecasts of future consequences.

The element which leads to the integration in the system is the communication process. Lasswell formulated it as "who says what in what channel, to whom with what affect." In other words when we make use of psychological methods to influence others, we essentially engage in an exercise in 'communication'.

According to Karl Deutsch, there are three processes of cybernetics which can be applied to politics. First, the use of models in social sciences that help man to understand complex processes. Second, as the existing models

are incapable of effectively representing the crucial relationship in social sciences, the cybernetic model should be developed so that these crucial relationships can be isolated, identified and measured. Third, cybernetics model can be offered to politics in general as well as International Politics. In the international sphere Deutsch is concerned with security politics in the context of peace and war. Referring to Security Community, a group which has developed the institutions and processes to assure peaceful changes, he says, it is the result of integration process which includes psychological role-taking and process leading to mutual interdependence and mutual responsiveness.

The communication theory is of great importance in so far as it tries to explain the International Relations in terms of a single objective, viz., national interest. It asserts that International Politics is no more important and the state is fast losing its status as a monolithic sovereign body. The theory does not look at power as the key factor in the political phenomena and emphasizes the dependable condition of human efforts and expectations for the attainment of the good of the society. Moreover, this theory makes use of quantitative data which could be used as complementary tool to check, and confirm the judgement of the political analysis. Thus it provides a deeper and a systematic understanding of the various events.

But probably the most important contribution of the communication theory is that it has greatly widened the concept of political process by including the role of the individual and the groups within the political framework of the state. At the international level, it has emphasized that the consideration like boundaries of state, political and military security (which were the dominant objectives and motivations of state) have lost their importance in the present context because of the concept of single system of interdependent world.

Check Your Progress:

1. Discuss various types of approaches.
2. What is systemic approach? Analyze its main models.
3. Analyze the three types of game forwarded by the game theory.
4. Critically examine the communication theory in the study of International Politics.

2.5 Summing up

After going through this unit now you are in a position to illustrate different approaches to the study of International Politics. In this context it is pertinent to mention here that an approach is similar to a theory. It includes generalization, explanation and prediction of international scenario just like a theory. Here you have also learnt that the difference between a theory and an approach lies in the fact that a theory tries to give a complete picture of International Politics, whereas approaches are partial and through them International Politics can be studied in parts or compartments. Nevertheless, there are various approaches to study International Politics systematically. All you know that in International Politics the sovereign nation state is the actual or real participant. And the approaches to the study of International Politics analyze the structure and the mechanism of these nation state systems. However no approach is free from criticism. After reading this unit, it can be said that, the various approaches and theories of International Relations have become increasingly inter-disciplinary, behavioural, comparative and scientific. Considering the changing scenario of International Politics many different approaches have emerged to analyze international system from various contemporary perspective, for example social constructivism theory, feminism theory, environmental approaches etc. In this changing scenario International Politics has transformed from state centric study to the study of global strategic phenomenon.

2.6 References and Suggested Readings

Kumar Mahendra: *Theoretical Aspects of International Politics*, Shiva Lal Agarwal & Co.2000

Goldstein, Jashua S.: *International Relations*, Fifth Edition, Pearson Education, 2003

Kegley C.W. (Jr), E. R. Wittkopt: *World Politics, Trend and Transformation*, Seventh Edition, 1999

Chandra Prakash: *Theories of International Relations*, Third Edition, 2005

Sharma Urmila, S.K. Sharma: *International Relations, Theory and History*, 2000

* * *

**Institute of Distance and Open Learning
Gauhati University**

MA in Political Science

Paper II

International Politics: Theoretical Aspects

Block 2

Power and Ideology in International Politics



Contents:

Block Introduction–

Unit 1 : Power in International Politics

Unit 2 : Ideology in International Politics

Contributors:

Olindita Gogoi (Unit 1)	:	Lecturer, Peace and Conflict Studies Dept. of Political Science, GU.
Barnalee Choudhury (Unit 2)	:	Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU

Course Co-ordination

Dr. Kandarpa Das	:	Director IDOL, GU
Barnalee Choudhury	:	Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU

Editorial Team

Content Editing	:	Jonaki Dutta Counsellor in Political Science IDOL, GU
Format Editing	:	Prasenjit Das Editor in Charge IDOL, GU
Language Editing	:	Binita Sarma Counsellor in English IDOL, GU

Cover Page Designing:

Kaushik Sarma	:	Graphic Designer CET, IITG
---------------	---	-------------------------------

July, 2010

© Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. Further information about the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University courses may be obtained from the University's office at BKB Auditorium (1st floor), Gauhati University, Guwahati-14. Published on behalf of the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University by Dr. Kandarpa Das, Director and printed at Maliyata Offset Press, Mirza. Copies printed 1000.

Acknowledgement

The Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University duly acknowledges the financial assistance from the Distance Education Council, IGNOU, New Delhi for preparation of this material.

Block Introduction:

Power and Ideology are two central concepts in International Politics. Both of them play a vital role in moulding the national behaviour of a State. These two serve as important instruments of achieving and fulfilling the aspiration of a nation. In this block we are going to discuss Power as a central theme of International Politics and Ideology as an instrument of promoting and securing national interest of a country. According to Morgenthau, International Politics is struggle for power. In the contemporary period it is observed that power determines the one nation's influence in the international arena. Power moulds the external behaviour of a nation. However, due to the advancement of science and technology and growing interdependence among the nation, the influence of power in International Politics diminishes. Again, ideology determines the national character, it represents one nation's separate identity in the international arena. Ideology is a kind of beliefs and disbeliefs of a nation, on the basis of which one nation seeks to maximize its national power. However, like power, ideology also lost its strength in the international arena in the post-cold war period. Thus this block is an attempt to explore role of power and ideologies in International Politics and their growing importance along with their negative perspective in two units.

Unit 1 discusses at length the concept of power. In International Politics we find that power is a debated concept. Because, political scientists principally use power in terms of a political actor's (state's) ability to exercise influence over other actors within the international system and we know that mechanisms of influence can include the threat or use of force, economic interaction or pressure, diplomacy, and cultural exchange. This unit shall provide an idea of changing status of power and its influence in International Politics. The unit also discusses elements of national power as well as maintaining balance of power among the nations. Again we know that national security is one of the important concepts of all nations. It is through power security of a nation is ensured. However, development of science and technology and advancement of new weaponry system make it impossible for a state to remain self-sufficient. In this unit we shall discuss the collective

security system. Moreover, this unit is also an attempt to introduce you with the dynamics of balance of power and the techniques of maintaining balance of power.

Unit 2 discusses with the concept of ideology. Ideology means a cluster of ideas and in International Politics it provides justification and rationalization to any policy. It also sets goals for political actions in International Relations. In this unit we shall discuss ideology as a concept of securing and promoting national interest in the international arena. The unit also make an effort to introduce you to different types of ideologies which are followed by a nation and their role in International Politics and also to explore the relationship between national interest and ideology.

This block includes the following two units.

Unit 1: Power in International Politics

Unit 2: Ideology in International Politics

Unit 1

Power in International Politics

Contents

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Power as a Concept
- 1.4 International Politics as a Struggle for Power
- 1.5 Measurement and Limitations of National Power
- 1.6 Balance of Power
 - 1.6.1 Six ways to maintain Balance of Power:
 - 1.6.2 Re-emergence of Multi-Polar System:
- 1.7 Idea of Collective Security
- 1.8 Summing up
- 1.9 References/Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction

In International Politics we find that power is an essentially contested concept. This means that there is a debate on the concept of power. Political scientists principally use power in terms of a political actor's (state's) ability to exercise influence over other actors within the international system. This influence can be coercive, cooperative or competitive. Mechanisms of influence can include the threat or the use of force, economic interaction or pressure, diplomacy, and cultural exchange. In politics thus, power is defined in terms of the ability to influence the outcome of the struggle for power. In a very broad sense power can be defined as the ability or capacity to control others and get them to do and also to see that they do not do what one does not want them to do. This unit will help you understand how power gets manifested in different ways.

In this unit we will discuss about power as the central concept in International Politics. You will also learn that there are numerous elements of power and it is wide ranging. They are natural, social and ideational. Power and power relations are intangible (i.e. incapable of being perceived by the sense of touch), in nature thereby making it impossible for political and social scientists to accurately measure and quantify power. The state exercises power through methods like persuasion, rewards, inducement, manipulation, and threat. This unit will further help you to appreciate and identify with the two important theories of Balance of Power and with the concept of Collective Security which help to explain the traditional relations amongst the independent nations of the world. This unit thus seeks to present the concept of power as a central concept in International Relations but one that is astonishingly difficult to measure or define.

1.2 Objectives

Power plays the same role in International Politics as money plays in market economy. It is often seen that political theorists make use of words like influence, authority, control, persuasion, might, force, coercion etc to indicate power. After reading this unit you will be able to:

- *explain* the meaning of the concept of power
- *comprehend* the different dimensions and forms of power
- *discuss* the various elements or sources of power.
- *examine* the concept of Balance of Power and Collective Security.
- *recognize* the new dynamics in the analyses of power with the changes in International Politics.

1.3 Power as a Concept

Power means the capacity or the ability of a political actor to influence another actor to change its will and behaviour to the advantage of the former. According to Hans J. Morgenthau, the chief exponent of the realist theory

“Power is a psychological relationship between those who exercise it and those over whom it is exercised. It gives to the former control over certain actions of the latter through the influence which the former exerts over the latter’s mind. Man’s control over the minds and actions of other men”.

Meaning and Definition of Power:

In International Politics states are the primary political actors and every state political actor possesses some amount of power to influence other political actors or states. The ability of power to influence others comes from certain sources or possessions of states. The sources or possessions are size, strength of economy, military forces, people’s support, leadership, natural resources and so on. These sources or possessions are called capabilities. They are tangible and intangible capabilities. The tangible capabilities are territory, population, military forces etc. while the instances of intangible capabilities of a state are national will, popular support, diplomatic skill etc.

In order to properly understand the concept of power, we may refer to some of the leading definitions on the topic.

- According to David Easton, “Power is the relationship in which one person or a group is able to determine the actions of another in the direction of the former’s own ends.”
- George Schwarzenberger defines it as “the capacity to impose one’s will on others by reliance on effective sanctions in case of non-compliance.”

It is important for you to remember here that no state possesses absolute power. The power of a state is always relative to other states. A state’s capabilities are compared to those of the rival states. The mere possession of sources or capabilities does not make a state powerful unless they are properly mobilized and utilized. The examples of states like China, Germany and Japan prove the above point, i.e. mere possession of sources may not guarantee power or the power to influence others while its proper utilization

and skillful application does. According to Erich Kaufmann “the essence of the state was development, increase and display of power”.

We have already learnt that all the states try to fulfill their national interests. States generally use power as a means to fulfill their national interests. This is known as the realist approach because it emphasizes the importance of national interest as viewed by the statesman of a particular nation in concrete terms and also because it takes power as the only means for the furtherance of national interest. When power is accumulated by a state for its own sake, it becomes an end in itself. Such states develop a lust for power and seek unending enhancement of power. Power is also primarily an end in itself. But it can also be a means to other ends. Thus we can view power as both a means and an end in International Politics. It is a means because national interest is served through it and it is an end because the long-lasting possession of power ensures the long-lasting fulfillment and preservation of national interest. Possession and expansion of power is thus necessary to safeguard specific and desired future interests. Power is vital and universal in all aspects of relationships and it is neither good nor bad.

Characteristics of Power

The status of a state in the international sphere is determined by its political power. Power, in the words of Prof. Hartmann, is the strength or capacity that a sovereign state can use to achieve its national interests.

Power is the capacity to produce intended effects. In politics, power can be viewed as the capacity of a community to shape its own destiny. Power can also be seen as the ability of an individual or group to get its way against the opposition.

Power is a universal phenomenon in human society. It's a vital aspect of social organization. Some political thinkers feel that all human relations, in fact, involve a power relation. It has very deep roots and reaches into all aspects of the life of a community.

Power is central to the study of politics. Politics is nothing but struggle for power. All states possess power which is the most important and essential element of the state. No state system can work in the absence of power.

Thus we can summarise the characteristics of power as follows

- Power is the capacity to influence the behaviour of others.
- Power is a certain kind of human relationship.
- Power is situational. It depends on situation, circumstances and position.
- Power depends on its use.
- Power must be backed by sanction.
- Power is not absolute, but relative only.

Stop to Consider

Fallacies of Power as pointed out by Robert Dahl

Robert Dahl has pointed out three fallacies of power:

- The Lump of Power Fallacy
- Fallacy of Confounding Power with resources
- Fallacy of Confounding Power with Rewards and Deprivations

Power is not a single, solid, unbreakable lump. It is a variable like money. It has more than one value. Power is possessed by all in greater or lesser degree. A government with political power and resources possesses the greatest degree of power.

Every kind of power has a resource. For example coercion comes from the resource viz. 'threat to use physical force'. Here threat is not power, but the resource of coercion (power).

The inducement power comes from the resources like rewards and deprivations. They are not the power itself. Thus rewards, punishments, true or false information, threat, armed forces etc are various resources of different kinds of power or influence.

Elements of Power

Every form of power has its source or sources from which the capacity of power to influence others is derived. Power resources are elements that an actor can draw on over the long term. The examples of such resources are e.g. total GDP, population, territory, geography and natural resources. Less tangible long term power resources include political culture, patriotism, education, and scientific and technological base. Power resources shape an actor's potential power. State's power is a mixture of many ingredients or elements such as natural resources, industrial capacity, legitimacy, military preparedness and people's support of governance. Mere possession of elements does not give rise to the acquisition and growth of power unless they are effectively utilized. The elements of power are categorized under:

- a. Natural Elements
- b. Social Elements
- c. Ideational Elements

Let us discuss the elements of power now

a. Natural Elements

The geographical area, resources, population come under the natural category. States with large arable land with variety of raw materials and large population have great possibility of becoming a great power. States with small land area and little and limited resources cannot aspire to be a great power. USSR's large size helped defeat the armies of Napoleon and Hitler. As natural element population is a vital source of power of a state. A state with large population can be more powerful than a state with small population. Manpower is used both in military action and economic production. To have economic power from economic growth, a large labour force is required. Such force comes from a large population. A large number of consumers constituting markets are also required for the growth of economy. Of course large population by itself does not guarantee military and economic strength of a state. Such strength depends upon the

modernization of military forces and the improvement of the productive forces through industrialization. Unskilled, illiterate population cannot be the sources of both military and economic power of a state. Manpower development and manpower use are the problems of primary importance in many developing countries. These problems have to be solved to increase national power.

It is moderate climate not extreme one which is helpful for a state to develop its power by engaging in modern industrialization with greater advantage. Topographical features like mountain ranges, channels oceans becoming natural boundaries of states increase military power. Location is also a major factor of power. The USA, Japan and England derived great advantages from their locations and became powerful. For both military and economic strength raw materials are essential. It is the naturally found Uranium which is used for making nuclear weapons. A state having agricultural products, mineral resources and manufactured goods can influence other states not having such resources by adopting power of inducement. Power of inducement comes from offers of economic and military aids towards or from depriving such aids and rewards. Great powers treat the Arab countries with importance because of their oil. The possession of iron, coal and oil makes a state comparatively more powerful.

b. Social Elements

The second category includes elements of economic development, political form and structure and national morale. A state's power is greatly determined by its industrialization. A state may have natural resources but if they are not mobilized and utilized through technology and efficient economic organization, it will remain powerless. In addition to consumption, industrialization must produce surplus for exporting to the foreign market. Economic prosperity can assure high standard of living of the people thereby making them loyal and contented. The loyal, contented and devoted people become formidable source of power of a state. A rich state can influence other comparatively

poor countries by giving them economic aid and rewards. The economically prosperous states can not only sell their products but also buy the products of other countries. By this way through trade relations, these states can influence attitudes and acts of other states. The underdeveloped countries generally need capital and technology for their industrialization. Only the economically prosperous countries can transfer such capital and technology and through such economic help the foreign policies of the less developed countries are controlled and influenced.

Deprivation of aids and rewards is a harsh method of inducement. Such deprivation is a sort of punishment meted out to a state or states that have failed to behave as desired by the punishing state. The use of economic power in controlling or regulating other states depends upon the kind of foreign policy pursued by a state. The change of international situation also necessitates change in foreign policy. It is the proper implementation of foreign policy of diplomacy that makes a state powerful with the capacity of persuasion. Propaganda along with diplomatic skills thus becomes an important element of power. The military strength of a state depends upon the determination of a government. Totalitarian and democratic forms of government can become powerful in influencing other states. The persuasive power of democratic state is moulded by the public opinion. People's willingness to consider nation's well being above their individual one is national morale. Individuals have to have the quality of sacrifice of exhibiting such willingness. Nation's morale strengthens the morale of the military forces. National morale differs from state to state at different times. Nation's morality is associated with political ideology.

c. Ideational Elements

The elements of the third category are ideals, intelligence and leadership. The question of the will of the nation is closely related to the question of ideology. Every political system has an ideology which can be defined as a system of ideas about the world and how it functions. Ideology played an important role specifically in the fascist and totalitarian states. For example, the ideology of Nazi Germany and imperial Japan. In such cases the emphasis is more on the group than on the individual. But the democratic ideology

gives more importance to the individual and his welfare. Ideas commonly held by the people unify the nation. They help the government to get support and sympathy from the people. Ideologies always involve some amount of propaganda for its own advancement. Ideas and ideologies form the ideational part of elements of state power. According to Bertrand Russell, ideas form a significant element of the power of a state.

Intelligence is also an important element of ideational power. By intelligence is meant the activity designed to produce that specific kind of knowledge which contributes to the wisdom and acumen of governmental decisions concerning foreign affairs. This knowledge itself can be regarded as power. Knowledge is power in both the times of war and peace. During war, the advance knowledge of the time, place, strength and weakness of an enemy attack may contribute to victory. Similarly in peace times the correct and reliable knowledge of the strength and weaknesses of other states can be helpful in bringing forth negotiations, as states can know the possibility and extent of bargaining counters and leverage and also know what kind of rewards and threats may be effective.

Another central factor in relation to the ideational elements of power is the quality and wisdom of leadership, both political and military. The political sphere involves the making of important policy decisions and military strategies. Their decisions determine the success or failure of a state in terms of its policies and hence its power. The presence of the leaders with the strength of wisdom renders a country powerful.

However, no single element is responsible for the growth of power of a state. It is the combined utilization of all the elements that helps grow power.

Stop to Consider:

Realists tend to consider military force or capabilities as the most important element of national power. They see other elements like economic strength, diplomatic skill and moral legitimacy as important only to the extent that they are tangible into military power. The Communist revolutionary leader Mao Zedong had opined in this regard “All power grows out of the barrel of the gun”.

Forms of Power

The general forms of power that are used by the states in International politics are

- a. Trained control
- b. Rational Persuasion
- c. Manipulative Persuasion
- d. Inducement
- e. Coercion
- f. Physical force (threat to use military force and actual use of military force)

International Politics is primarily an art of manipulation to achieve the national goals of a state by using one or more forms of power, other than rational persuasion. Hence rational persuasion as a moral form of power has hardly any place in the contemporary International Politics. International Politics witnesses the wide use of deception, inducement, coercion, threat of use of physical force and actual use of military force.

Controlled training can be understood as that kind of power which is exercised by means of communication consisting of a signal or indication (cue). The power by means of communication that provides information (either correct or misleading) about the advantages and disadvantages of alternative courses of action can be called persuasion. And power which brings about a change in the nature of the alternatives themselves by adding advantages to an alternative or imposing new disadvantages on an alternative is called inducement.

The concept of authority and legitimacy is closely related to the concept of power. The legitimate power is called authority. Such legitimate power is recognized as the legal form of power and hence accepted by those over whom it is exercised as just and legitimate.

Power varies greatly from one state to another. The most powerful states are those that can exert a large amount influence on international events. Great powers are generally those states which are most powerful. Great

powers may be distinguished by the criterion that they can be defeated militarily only by another great power. Great powers generally have the world's strongest military forces and the strongest economies. The states which are great powers by meeting these criteria are USA, China, Japan, Russia, France, Britain and Germany. The great powers thus include the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and who are also the possessors of nuclear weapons. In today's international politics we also have the emergence of several smaller scale nuclear states. Middle powers exist below the great powers in terms of their influence on world affairs. They are not highly industrialized, some have specialized capabilities but they are small. Some aspire for regional dominance and many have considerable influence on their regions. Middle powers may include Canada, Italy, India, Brazil and South Korea in the first tier. A second tier could include Indonesia, Taiwan, Australia, Spain, Argentina Israel Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and South Africa. A third tier may include Belgium, Sweden, Nigeria, Vietnam, Serbia, Greece, Netherlands and North Korea.

Power is thus the actual or potential influence or coercion, a state or other actor can assert relative to other states or non-state actors because of the political, geographic, economic, financial, technological, military, social, cultural or other capabilities it possesses.

1.4 International Politics as a Struggle for Power

You have grasped by now that power is central to International Politics and that it is the ability to get another actor to do what it would not otherwise have done or not to do what it would have done. From this it can be explained that higher the capacity to affect others, more powerful is the actor concerned. International Politics is governed to a great extent by this capacity to affect others. There is therefore, a constant struggle for this capacity to affect, in other words a 'struggle for power'. In the realist perspective, the capacity of the actors to affect others is generally understood in terms of the use of material resources to get others to do

what they otherwise would not in other words fulfill the national interest. The realist approach is based on three assumptions; first, statesmen desire to pursue their national interests, second, the desire of every nation lies in the expansion of its economic, political, military and cultural power (influence) and third, states use their power also defined as influence, in the protection and furtherance of their interests like sovereignty and territorial integrity.

For Morgenthau, the essential basis of realism can be traced to human nature. The world and the political laws in particular is an outcrop of this very nature. This world, according to Morgenthau is one of opposing interests and of conflict among those interests. We can trace conflict and evil to the two human traits of selfishness and lust for power. More than selfishness, the lust or urge for power is more overriding and permeating in human nature. This lust for power manifests itself, whenever man acts in relation to other man and is insatiable. Morgenthau opined that the lust for power is the essence of all politics. We already know that power is the guiding force behind the pursuance of interests and their fulfillment, selfishness and lust leads to competition and so there is a struggle for power in International Politics. In simple words, what one actor wants for himself, the other actor wants too or already possesses and there is the beginning of struggle.

Stop to Consider:

Morgenthau positions his international theory in 'six principles of political realism'.

They are as follows:

1. That politics like society in general is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature.
2. That in International Politics, realists emphasize interest defined in terms of power
3. That interests defined in terms of power is an objective category that is universally valid, applicable to states throughout the world.
4. That there is a tension between the moral command and the requirements of successful political action, but that as a practical matter, universal moral principles must be filtered through the concrete circumstances of time and space

5. That political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with moral laws that govern the universe.
6. That interest defined as power is an understanding that gives International Politics a separate standing and thus emancipates it from other fields of study.

Morgenthau considered the theory of International Politics to be an illustration of general theory of politics. He thereby opined that whether in domestic or in international field, all politics is a struggle for power despite the inherent differences in the domestic and international environment in which politics operates. In the domestic environment the struggle for power and conflict is managed by the existence of a centralized authority. But in the international context the absence of such an overriding, centralized and overarching authority makes it a fertile ground for conflicts and struggles to erupt and continue. This unique environment in the international field is maneuvered by the state's drive for power which in turn determines the nature of foreign policies of states. For every state it becomes imperative therefore, to retain power once it has been acquired, expand it and demonstrate it. In Morgenthau's words "Politics is a struggle for power over men and whatever its ultimate aim may be, power is its immediate goal and the modes of acquiring, maintaining and demonstrating it determine the technique of political action."

SAQ

Explain how the concept of power is central to the understanding of International Politics. (60 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.5 Measurement and Limitations of National Power

National power cannot be precisely measured as it involves many visible and invisible factors and diverse capabilities. It is exceedingly difficult to produce a single measure of power capturing all capabilities like political, social, cultural, geographic, economic, technological and military that would enable the political analyst to rank states in order of their power positions. There is no agreement on the weighting or relative importance of these capabilities and it is also impossible to quantify factors like cultural and social capabilities in any meaningful fashion. Measurement of power is always a comparative one. Power of a nation may be greater in relation to one nation and weaker in relation to another. It is also not correct to measure power considering one single factor like militarism, nationalism etc. Because of Over-evaluation or under-evaluation it is difficult to have correct calculation of power of a nation. War is also not the criterion for calculating national power. It is the relativity of power that puts limitation on its use. The development of nuclear weapons has given rise to nuclear deterrence. In such situation the nuclear capacity of a nation is to be measured in terms of its retaliatory power after the first attack. The overestimation of power is dangerous. It happens when other power is not taken into account.

Limitation of Power

A great power status or small power status is not necessarily stable. A super power compared to great powers has no limitation in the capacity to influence the smaller powers. Great powers cannot impose their will upon a super power. A great power is limited by another great power. Of course a super power can be limited by another super power and it happened during the Cold War, between the USA and the erstwhile USSR. The Parity of power prevailed among the traditional great powers. But it does not happen among the members of an alliance where super power is also a member. In the modern world order all states big or small are recognized as states with sovereign equality. But such sovereign equality does not mean that all states can claim equality in terms of their resources, economic development and

military power. All states cannot also play equal role in world politics. For this reason the concept of great power with greater capacity to influence others is still valid, though with the obligation of refraining from indulging in undue interference in the affairs of the small states. What is important now is to measure the relative strength of the various states. Here the criterion is not the traditional great power concept of imposing will upon smaller states. The measurement must be done on the basis of potential power at present. On the basis of the different capabilities of the states, they are categorized as 'great' 'secondary', 'middle' and 'small' powers. The size and population are taken as the main criteria in measuring the capabilities of states. It is pertinent to remember here that some of the most important limitations of the national power are- balance of power, international morality, world public opinion, international law and United Nations.

Check Your Progress

1. What are the main elements on which the power of a state depends? Which according to you is the most important element to enhance the power of the state?
2. Is power measurable? How can the power of a state be limited by another?
3. Power has different resources. Elaborate.

1.6 Balance of Power

In the international political system, states have varying amounts of power. Each state tries to maximize its power. The most reliable brake on the power of one state is the power of other states. But on the whole in international system there is a tendency to be in balance. To maintain this balance various states group themselves to prevent the other opposing group from becoming stronger. Such a balance ensures peace and the independence of small states. It has given to rise to the concept like balance of power. Prof. Fay

defines it as – just equilibrium in power among the members of the family of nations as will prevent any one of them from becoming sufficiently strong to enforce its will upon the others. The term *balance of power* refers to the general concept of one or more states power being used to balance that of another state or group of states. This kind of balance is called *simple balance*. In such simple balance two opposing groups are more or less equally powerful.

The *multiple balance* exists among many states or group of states balancing one another. The multiple balance is possible only in peace times. A major crisis may change the multiple balance into simple balance. Balance of power desires the distribution of power to guarantee victory against any possible enemy. In practice a state wants to have more power for both peace and security than what the balance or equilibrium demands. States in practice prefer preponderance not equilibrium or equal distribution of power. The competing states hence seek disequilibrium. Balance of power is associated with power factor in International Politics. No state can ignore it. Every state wants to balance the power of the aggressor state. Some of the techniques of balance of power are- alliances and counter- alliances, compensation and partition, armament and disarmament, buffer states, intervention and war, divide and rule etc.

Stop to Consider:

Quincy Wright enumerates five basic assumptions of Balance of Power. They are:

- States are committed to protect their vital interests by all possible means including war. The vital interests include independence, territorial integrity, security, preservation of domestic, political and economic system and so on.
- Second assumption of the balance of power is vital interests of states are or may be threatened.
- Third assumption is that the balance of power helps the protection of the vital interests either by threatening other states with aggression or by enabling the victim to achieve victory when an aggression occurs.

- Fourth assumption is that the relative power position of various states can be measured to a great degree to be used for ones own advancement.
- The fifth assumption is that the statesman formulates their foreign policy decisions on the basis of an intelligent understanding of power considerations.

The theory of balance of power argues that counterbalancing occurs regularly and maintains the stability of the international system. Alliances play a key role in the balance of power. Building up one's own capabilities against a rival is a form of power balancing, but forming an alliance against a threatening state is often more quicker and effective. When such a counter balancing coalition has a geopolitical element that is physically hemming in the threatening state, the power balancing strategy is called containment. e.g. containment of Soviet Union by USA during the Cold War.

1.6.1 Six Ways to Maintain Balance of Power

The amassing of armaments, seizing more and more territory, setting up of a neutral buffer state situated between two large and unfriendly nations, formations of alliances, intervention and altering the distribution of power by detaching allies from the opposite side, are the six ways which states adopt to maintain a favourable balance of power.

A. The Balancer or the Laughing Third Party:

The balancer or the laughing third party saves the balance of power from its breaking down by joining the weaker side. England once was a successful balancer or the laughing third party. No such balancer emerged after the Second World War. The automatic theory of the balance of power desires to regard balance of power as natural law working automatically or semi automatically.

B. Balance of Power as Diplomatic Contrivance:

When power balancing is the goal of foreign policy, it becomes a deliberate choice and act and not automatic or semi-automatic. Diplomatic contrivance (set up) takes the upper hand in establishing equilibrium of power.

C. Effect of Nuclear Weapons on Balance of Power and Security:

The effect of nuclear weapons has brought a radical change in the nature of war as an instrument of foreign policy. There is now balance of deterrence caused by balance of terror. Use of nuclear weapons in full scale war shall annihilate both the warring groups. There shall be no victor or vanquished. It is the possibility of mutual destruction that generates terror and in turn there is balance of deterrence preventing nuclear states from using nuclear war as an instrument of national policy.

D. Peace in the 18th and 19th Century preserved by the Balance of Power:

Scholars argue that the balance of power preserved peace during the 18th and 19th century and the independence and security of the small states were ensured. The balance of power localized and limited the wars in the 19th century. The preponderance of the British power during 1815-1914 was also regarded as a factor for the existence of peace.

E. Preponderance of Power and Peace during the Inter-War Period:

The preponderance of power of the allies could preserve peace during the inter war period. The Second World War broke out when the axis powers could counter balance the preponderance of the allies. From such inter-war phenomena Organski concludes that periods of balance of power are periods of war fare and those of preponderance of power are periods of peace. So it is imbalance of power not balance of power that preserves peace.

F. The Balance of Power System cannot be Successful at Present:

The balance of power might have been successful in the past but at present it is argued that it has less chance to succeed, as there is no balancer. The international system is no longer multi-polar, it has even transformed from bipolar to unipolar and there is no existence of an international aristocratic family which is replaced by democracy with power of the public.

Check Your Progress

1. How will you interpret the idea of balance of power? Is balance of power relevant in present times?
2. Explain the rationale behind the strategy of collective security.
3. Differentiate between balance of power and balance of terror?

1.6.2 Re-Emergence of Multi-Polar System

Russia's recent growing economic strength based on oil and gas support, nuclear capability of China and France and possession of nuclear weapons by several other countries like India, Pakistan, Israel has led gradually to the re-emergence of the multipolar system after the end of the Cold War. The old patterned alliances have been weakened by bilateral alliances, thereby lessening its importance and relevance in the present nuclear age. But the preservation of a country's interests is made possible by trying to balance the power of its rivals. Thus in some form the balance of power continues.

In the absence of the historic balance of power during the post Cold War period it has been argued that during Cold War, the system of bipolarity guaranteed peace. The superpowers could not use the weapons of total destruction and these weapons made an effective deterrent not only against each other but also against all other countries. The uncommitted states i.e. NAM countries acting as the 'multi polar buffer' also contributed towards preserving peace in the same period. Virtually it is the terror factor of total annihilation of mankind that was transforming the balance of power into the balance of deterrence and the balance of terror. In the present changed conditions it is not the question of obsolescence of the balance of power but the management of power. Unless some alternative device to manage power is found out, it would be difficult to declare the balance of power as outdated. In the case of the balance of power during the Cold War, there could not be equality of power among the members of a particular alliance. Hence the defection of a member could hardly affect either of the alliances i.e. NATO and WARSAW.

In principle, sovereign equality of states is recognized. But in terms of the possession of nuclear weapons the states cannot be equally powerful. Even lesser nuclear states like France, China and India cannot together be as powerful as the USA. The inequality of states is a fact in the contemporary International Politics. The traditional balance of power cannot be compared to the unlimited nuclear power of the super states. Diplomacy in the past was through balancing power by making, maintaining and breaking alliances. The alliance system functioned on the basis of equal sharing of burden. Now such alliance system does not exist. The Western allied powers were dependent upon the USA, but the USA was not. Same was the case with erstwhile Soviet Union as a super power. This dependence was because of the possession of the unlimited and effective nuclear power of the USA and Soviet Union.

In the 1960s and 70s, assured and mutually assured destruction and defensive efforts to limit damage were the dominant ways of thinking about deterrence between the super powers. Thus the parity of nuclear power between the two super powers guaranteed a balance between them. Mutually assured destruction (MAD) exists when both parties in a bilateral deterrence relation have a second strike assured destruction capability against the other. Even a presumed assured destruction is adequate to dissuade both parties from launching a first strike. This nuclear balance made maintenance of peace during the Cold War possible.

The present post Cold War period of U.S dominance, has evinced closer relation among Russia, China and France. Russia and China signed a Treaty of Friendship in 2001 and their relations have improved in areas like arms trade and demilitarization of the border. France on its part has strongly contested U.S positions in global trade negotiations and in NATO command structure. Europe and Japan have opposed U.S positions on many significant treaties like missile defense, biological weapons, small arms and global warming. In the 21st century, USA, China, Japan, France, UK Germany and Russia have emerged as great powers with their credible military force and each having more than \$ 1 trillion GDP. They possess half of the worlds

total GDP. India and Brazil have emerged as middle powers. Now there are no alliances specifically to balance one another's power. A kind of loose multipolar system is prevailing. Peace, economic development, suppression of world terrorism has assumed more and more importance among the great powers instead of augmenting more military capabilities. The appearance of a common enemy viz. the international terrorists brought the great powers together after the 2001 Sept 11 attacks on the USA.

SAQ:

If most of the states in the world had nuclear weapons rather than just a few of them, would it be more peaceful or more war-prone? Why?

(80 words)

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

1.7 Idea of Collective Security

The collective security was to be a permanent preponderance of power of the law abiding member states of the League of Nations. The principle of collective security means that an attack on any one state will be regarded as an attack on all states. The word security represents 'goal' while 'collective' indicates the nature of the means employed to achieve the goal. In the collective security system the preponderance of power is mostly in the hands of the protectors of peace and order. Hence a potential aggressor does not dare disrupt the peace. According to Hans Morgenthau, collective security is based on the principle of '*one for all and all for one*'. Collective security is a devise for the management of power as explained by Inis Claude and not that of the elimination of power. Collective security is regarded as more feasible than both balance of power and world government.

The success of the collective security depends on two points, first members must keep their alliance commitments to the group i.e. UN at present. The second requisite for collective security is that enough members must agree on what constitutes aggression. The UN Security Council is so structured that aggression is defined by what all five permanent members in addition to at least four of the other ten non-permanent members can agree on. This collective security system does not work against aggression by a great power. Also collective security differs from collective defence, so far as identifying the oppressor is concerned. In collective security, the aggressor is not identified in advance but once identified, the other states are expected to stand together and fight aggression. While in collective defence, the aggressor is identified in advance and all are committed to fight only against the one enemy who has been singled out. The United Nations has supplemented the concept of collective security with preventive diplomacy (which seeks to prevent fighting from occurring in the first place) and collective defense.

Recent years have seen the broadening of the concept of collective security and the welcoming of a new idea called *common security or mutual security*. The notion behind such security is that the security of all states' enemies as well as friends is interdependent; the insecurity of one state makes all states less secure. According to the Palme report 1992 - *"Acceptance of common security as the organizing principle for efforts to reduce the risk of war, limit arms and move towards disarmament means in principle that cooperation will replace confrontation in resolving conflicts of interest. This is not to say that differences among nations should be expected to disappear.... The task is only to ensure that these conflicts do not come to be expressed in acts of war, or in preparations of war. It means that nations must come to understand that the maintenance of world peace must be given a higher priority than the assertion of their own ideological or political positions."*

Thus collective security emphasizes on international law enforcement against aggressive or other illegal acts committed by other states. It is an alternative to alliance-against-alliance or balance of power mechanisms. Instead of

one power coalition against another, collective security groups the capabilities of law abiding states against aggressors.

Check your Progress:

1. How will you interpret the idea of balance of power? Is balance of power relevant in present times?
2. Explain the rationale behind the strategy of collective security.
3. Differentiate between balance of power and balance of terror

1.8 Summing up

After going through this unit you are now in a position to explain how and in what ways power (influence) is a capacity of one actor to change the will and action of other actors. Those who possess and use power are known as actors in domestic as well as International Politics. You have also learnt that there are several kinds of power or influence viz. rational persuasion, deceptive persuasion, inducement, coercion, particular power, authority and physical force. Each kind of power has its resource. True information is the resource for rational persuasion power, while money is the resource for inducement power. This unit also helps you to distinguish between Power and resource. Resource is the source of power. Power is a variable. Every actor possesses more or less amount of power. A government is the most powerful and resourceful actor in domestic politics compared to a voter or a party or a pressure group. The states having predominant economic and military forces armed with nuclear weapons are the powerful actors in International Politics.

After reading this unit, you have also learnt that actors use their power to promote their interests. It is the existence and use of the various elements or resources of power that enables a state to be powerful. These elements are population, territory, economy, natural resources, growth, science and technology, political consciousness, ideology and military strength. Moreover,

it also helps you to understand that in the present nuclear age war cannot be used as an ultimate method to promote the interest of an alliance. During the Cold war period, there was a balance of terror and nuclear deterrence. There shall be no victor or vanquished after a nuclear war is fought. It shall bring suicidal and total destruction. With the realization of the mutually assured destruction (MAD) the state actors are now more concerned with peace, economic development, environmental protection and fight against global terrorism.

1.9 References and Suggested Readings:

Morgenthau Hans, J. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York, 1960

Goldstein, Joshua. *International Relations*. Pearson Education, 2003

Dahl, Robert. A. *Modern Political Analysis*. Prentice Hall, 1989

Inis, Claude. *Swords into Plowshares*. New York, 1963

Inis, Claude. *Power and International Relations*. New York, 1962

Palmer and Perkins. *International Relations*. Boston, 1957

Wright, Quincy. *A Study of War*. Chicago, 1942

Held, David. *Political Theory and Modern State*. Maya Publishers, 1998

Paul R. Viotti & Mark V. Kauppi. *International Relations and World Politics*.

John, Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens. *The Globalization of World Politics*.

Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall. *Power in International Politics*. International Organization, 59, pp 39-75

Link:

<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/>

* * *

Unit 2

Ideology in International Politics

Contents:

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Objectives
- 2.3 Concepts and Types of Ideology
 - 2.3.1 Morgenthau's Division of Ideology
 - 2.3.2 Modern Ideologies
- 2.4 Ideological Element in International Politics
- 2.5 Relationship between Ideology and National Interest
- 2.6 Summing up
- 2.7 References and Suggested Readings

2.1 Introduction

Ideology has a very significant role to play in International Politics since it provides justification and rationalization to any policy or society. It also sets goals for political actions in international relations. There is no agreement as to how ideology influences International Politics. It has been experienced that the ideology of a country helps in shaping and formulating its foreign policy which in turn determines its behaviour in international arena. It is often said that ideology changed the international relations in the 20th century.

This unit makes an attempt to introduce you to the meaning of ideology and also to examine its role in International Politics. This unit will also discuss in detail the dominant ideologies in the International Politics. Moreover, an attempt is also made to trace the relationship between ideology and national interest.

2.2 Objectives

In International Politics, it is observed that wars are fought, alliances are made and treaties are signed on ideological considerations. After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- *discuss* the concept of ideology
- *explain* different dominant ideologies in the international field
- *trace* the relationship between ideology and national interest

2.3 Ideology as a Concept

The term 'ideology' has got different connotations. It is defined as a cluster of ideas about life, society or government which originates in most cases as consciously advocated or dogmatically asserted social, political or religious slogans or battle cries and which through continuous usage and preaching gradually become the characteristic beliefs or dogmas of a particular group, party or nationality.

The term ideology was coined by French scholar Antonie Louis Claude Destutt de Tracy in 1796 to refer to the 'science of ideas'. Thus, it is believed that the term ideology was born in the highly controversial, philosophical and political debates of French Revolution. Later, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels contradicted De Tracy on the subject. This contradiction is visible in *The German Ideology*. According to them, rather than the 'science of ideas'; ideology is nothing more than a fabrication used by a particular group of people to justify themselves. They further state that the dominant political ideas, or ideology, of any society would always reflect the interests of the ruling class.

German scholar Karl Mannheim also discussed ideology and basically agreed with Marx's conclusions. He made an attempt to analyze ideology from a historical perspective. A political ideology largely concerns itself with how to allocate power and to what ends it should be used.

Padelford and Lincoln defines ideology as “a body of ideas concerning economic, social and political values and goals with positive action programmes for attaining those goals”.

Again Synder and Wilson defines ideology as “a cluster of ideas about life, society or government which originate in most cases as consciously advocated or dogmatically asserted social, political or religious slogans or battle cries and which through continuous usages and preachment gradually become the characteristics beliefs or dogmas of particular group, party or nationality”.

Ideology is also defined as a system of abstract ideas held by the individuals which purports to explain reality, expresses value goals and contains programmes of action for retention or attainment of the kind of social order in which its proponents believe the goals can be realized. Thus, ideology is also linked up with power. Morgenthau also believes that politics compels the actor on the political scene to use ideologies in order to disguise the immediate goal of his action. He further states that in politics ideology is a means to control the behaviour and actions of others. It needs to be remembered here that a particular individual may follow different ideologies at the same point of time like nationalism, socialism, Gandhism etc. Thus, it is clear to you that different ideologies may not contradict each other allowing one person more than one ideologies at the same point of time. Ideologies in the modern world have become universalistic cutting across linguistic, regional and cultural boundaries.

Hence, it can be said here that ideologies may be political, social, economic and moral. Political ideologies can be defined as those ideas which are arranged into a logical system with a set of values and goals, a programme of action with requisite appeal to the minds of men and the power of beliefs.

Stop to Consider:**Ideology in the Developing Countries:**

The developing countries have their unique characteristics. Most of these countries are divided along tribal, cultural, religious and ethnic lines; many of the newly independent nations have adopted the ideology of nationalism. It was believed that such an ideology can unite a heterogeneous society. Again, many of these countries suffer from problems like over-population, poverty, neo-colonial exploitation. Hence, they consider socialism as to be the panacea to all these problems. Most of the developing countries were under colonial rule and they tend to develop a unique political and economic system. After living under the domination of colonial powers for a long time, most of these countries refused to compromise with their freedom and totalitarian dictatorships. Many of these countries tried to adopt liberal democracy after independence. However, they have refused to adopt either capitalism or communism and found a middle path for themselves.

2.3.1 Morgenthau's Division of Ideology

Already you have learnt that ideology is a set of ideas which are followed by a country to adjust its relationship or to preserve its identity in the international arena. However there are different kinds of ideology in International Politics on the basis of their general and particular sense. Ideology depends on states which is best suitable for them. Prof. Morgenthau has divided the various ideologies into three categories. They are ———

- Ideology of Status Quo
- Ideology of Imperialism
- Ambiguous Ideologies

- **Ideology of Status Quo**

Nations seeking the preservation of the existing power positions pursue the policy of status-quo. Various states like Switzerland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden follow the policy of status-quo. These nations pursue the policies

which tend to justify the power which these nations already have. Staus-quo ideology is against the ideology of imperialism since imperialism believes in overthrowing status-quo. It can be said that the state which pursues this ideology holds great faith in International Law and peace and are opposed to all types of imperialism. Again it needs mention here that states adhering to this ideology have faith in the system of ‘collective security’ and ‘mutual assistance’ and also seek to protect the interests of the smaller states. It wants to ensure that the world peace is not disturbed and thus goes against the use of force.

- **Ideology of Imperialism**

A policy that seeks to alter the status quo or a given power distribution is regarded as the Imperialist Policy. The policy of imperialism is always in need of some justification for altering the existing territorial arrangement. This policy must prove that the status quo which it desires to overthrow is not necessary. It bases its case on moral grounds and on natural law. Imperialist ideology is used by a nation for justifying its policy of expanding its national power beyond its borders for economic, strategic and political gains. Ideology of imperialism seeks to overthrow status quo. Ideology of imperialism is implemented by certain slogans like ‘the White Man’s Burden’, ‘A Christian Duty’, ‘Struggle for Survival of the Fittest’ etc. Thus every nation’s international behaviour is determined and justified by the ideology it follows. Napoleon ruled over England under the slogan of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Fascism and Nazism emphasized on the superiority of race. The Imperial countries try to justify the extension of their empires over backward countries through certain ‘moral ideologies’.

- **Ambiguous Ideologies**

Ambiguous ideologies are also known as ideologies of anti-imperialism. Three ambiguous ideologies are————

a) The Ideology of National Self-determination

- b) The Ideology of the United Nations
- c) The Ideology of Peace
- a) The Ideology of National Self-determination: Woodrow Wilson used this ideology for justifying the liberation of Central and East European nations from foreign domination. Hitler used this ideology to justify his policy of territorial expansionism. On the other hand National self-determination in the form of ethnic self-determination has recently witnessed the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
- b) The Ideology of the United Nations: The Charter of the United Nations contains the principles and objectives of the United Nations which deal with international relations. These principles are used almost by all nations for justifying their policies and actions in the international level.
- c) The Ideology of Peace: This ideology is against war. War is feared by the people in general because of its destructive character.

Hence it can be said that ideology may be pinpointed behind the foreign policy of a nation. It moulds the external behaviour of a nation. However, in the contemporary period ideology is not an important factor like the cold war period in the formulation of one nation's foreign policy. Nevertheless, above mentioned ideologies play an important role in the formulation of a nation's foreign policy.

Check Your Progress

1. Define Ideology.
2. The book *The German Ideology* is written by_____?
(Fill in the blanks)
3. Examine different types of ideologies on the basis of Morgenthau's classification.
4. Critically examine the Ideology of Imperialism.
5. Do the ideological differences generate contradiction among nations?
Give arguments in favour of your answer.

1.3.2 Modern Ideologies:

Apart from the above mentioned ideologies as has been mentioned earlier, in international relations ideology can be broadly categorized into two categories:

A) General ideologies

B) Particular ideologies.

Liberalism and Communism are the two main general ideologies that play an important role in influencing the behaviour of the states in international relations. Let us now discuss different ideological elements of international politics.

- **Ideology of Liberalism:**

In the field of International Politics, liberalism desires peace, friendship, freedom, co-operation and justice available to the people of the world. In this way, liberalism becomes identifiable with internationalism that stands for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, non-aggression, non-intervention of one state into the domestic affairs of another. Vernon Van Dyke has said that, 'faced with a choice between guns and butter, the liberal is inclined to choose butter, perhaps to the peril of his nation. Faced with a choice between appeasement and resistance to a foreign threat at the risk of war, the liberal may be inclined towards appeasement, for war threatens most of the values he holds dear. In recent decades, particularly, the liberal democracies have been very reluctant to engage in military preparations and to participate in war.' (Veron Van Dyke: International Politics, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957), p-64)

Ideology of liberalism stands for the values for freedom, democracy and humanism. It has three fundamental assumptions—limited government, pluralistic society and unlimited scope for human actions. Liberalism becomes a dominant ideology in the western social, political and economic systems

since 17th century. In the 20th century it came to be developed as a doctrine of 'Liberal Democracy', 'Democratic Capitalism' and also 'Modern Liberalism'. All the liberal ideologies advocate policies and actions designed to safeguard and promote the values of rights, liberty and individuality. Liberalism expects states to have as less control over the individual as possible. It regards free competition, free trade and freedom of choice as the three cardinal principles of a free and happy society and the key to progress.

It strongly opposes the ideologies of Totalitarianism, Fascism, Nazism and Communism as dangerous and totally destructive ideologies which kill individual initiative, enterprise and freedom. Liberalism rejects the idea of total state control or even excessive state control over the individual. The USA and their alliances used this ideology in the Cold War era.

The liberal theory believes that the state comes into existence as a result of a contract for the sole purpose of preserving and protecting the natural rights of an individual to life, liberty and property. It regards state as a necessary evil. It is the responsibility of the state to give undivided attention to the protection of the individual. Thus the guiding principle of liberalism is 'the maximum possible individual freedom and minimum possible state action.'

The ideology was very much popular in modern democratic countries for which writers like Daniel Bell had spoken of the 'end of ideology' in liberal democratic societies. Therefore, it can be said that the ideology of liberalism desires a system of democracy in the national as well as the international field. President Wilson followed this ideology in 1917 when he gave the call 'to make the world safe for democracy'. The statesmen who supported liberalism also supported international organizations like the League of Nations and the United Nations for establishing peace and order in the international arena.

- **Ideology of Communism:**

Communism is a branch of socialism. This ideology believes in the abolition of classes where property is controlled commonly. According to Karl Marx, communism is the final stage in the society which is established after a successful proletarian revolution. Thus, from Marxist point of view communism refers to a classless, stateless and oppression free society where every member of the society gets the opportunity to take part in the decision-making process in both political and economic life. In the international field, communism refers to the policies of the various communists states. The Communist states are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism that emphasizes on centrally planned economy and ownership of all the means of productions.

As the ideology of Communism is based upon the philosophy of Marxism and Leninism, it opposes liberal ideas and emphasizes more on equality rather than liberty. It gives primacy to the economic factors of social relations and regards them as the determinants of all behaviour *i.e.* social, political, cultural etc. It classifies states as rich or capitalist states and the poor and non-capitalist states. It seeks to end the class division between the rich and the poor. The Communist ideology identifies itself with the working class and advocates an economic and political system controlled by the proletariat *i.e.* the working class. It considers state as an instrument of exploitation in the hands of the rich to exploit the poor. Hence, it stands for a classless and stateless society. The ideology of communism strongly opposes capitalism along with its system of capitalist democracy.

Hence it can be said that the ideology of communism regards free trade and open competition as opposed to the interests of the individuals and terms them the instruments of inequality and exploitation of social relations. In the field of international relations this ideology criticizes the capitalist states.

However, after the collapse of the communist regimes in the USSR and all other socialist states, even the communists now look with favour the ideological principles of democratization, decentralization, liberalization, market economy, free trade and competition.

SAQ

Make a comparative analysis of the Liberal and Communist ideology. As per your view which one is best suitable ideology for India? (50+50 words)

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

- **Fascism:**

Fascism was originally founded by Italian National Syndicalists in World War I. Fascism rejects the autonomy of cultural or ethnic groups who are not considered part of the fascist's nation. Fascists believe that a nation is an organic community that requires strong leadership, singular collective identity, and the will and ability to commit violence and wage war in order to keep the nation strong. A Fascist state suppresses opposition to the Fascist state and the Fascist movement. Fascism as an ideology was very much popular in Italy by which the Prime Minister Benito Mussolini ruled Italy from 1922-1943.

The origin of fascism can be traced to the writings of George Sorel and Friedrich Nietzsche. Hitler implemented his ideology of Fascism through his Nazism (National Socialist German Worker's Party). Nazism also supported superiority of the race, calling for the unification of all the German-speaking peoples into one single empire. It regards Parliamentary institutions as meaningless.

Fascism is opposed to the ideology of Liberalism. It believes in the omnipresence of the state. It supports one-party government and the absence of any political controversy not only as a means but as an end. Its main slogan is 'nothing above the state, nothing against it, nothing outside it'. Therefore, it is regarded as a radical, authoritarian and nationalist political ideology.

The Fascist accepts life and loves it, knowing nothing of and despising suicide; he rather conceives of life as duty and struggle and conquest, life, which should be high and full, lived for oneself, but not above all, for others— those who are at hand, and those who are at far distant, contemporaries, and those who will come after.

(Benito Mussolini, doctrine of Fascism, 1933)

Norman Hill stated that Fascism also regards the growth of Empire, that is to say the expansion of a nation, is an essential manifestation of vitality, and its opposite is a sign of decadence. (Norman Hill: Contemporary World Politics, New York: Harper and Brothers 1954, pp 414-15.)

Fascist party under Mussolini showed the following important principles:

- a) The state is assigned certain mystical quality. When there is a conflict of interest between the state and its citizens, the interest of the state prevails. State welfare includes the individual welfare.
- b) It opposes democratic ideology since it opposes majority rule and favours the rule of one leader.
- c) The government is empowered to intrude into every field of human interest.
- d) It appreciates and welcomes war. Therefore, it repudiates the doctrine of Pacifism.
- e) In the name of Nationalism, Fascism supports total sub-ordination of individuals at the alter of the state.
- f) It regards Expansionism as one of the important objectives of the state and thereby supports Imperialism.

Fascism is also considered as a counter-revolutionary politics that arose in the early part of the twentieth century in Europe. It was a response to the rapid social upheaval, devastations of the World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution.

Hence, fascism can be described as the exercise of dictatorship, with an ideology of aggressive Nationalism. Along with Mussolini, German ruler Adolf Hitler's name is also associated with the ideology of Fascism.

Thus it can be said that ideology is a group of beliefs and disbeliefs. It depends on an ideology that is best suitable for their better survival in the international arena. But it can be said that no one ideology is self-sufficient for better development. There needs combination of both ideologies depending on the external as well as the internal environment of the nation.

Stop to Consider:

Ideology in early political philosophy (in the writings of Niccolò Machiavelli and Laski)

Ideology as a concept of political science or International Politics is not new. We find ideological elements in the writings of the Italian political philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli. In fact he is known as the precursor of Modern Ideology. Historians admired him for his republican ideas. Rousseau recognized this when he spoke of *The Prince* as a "handbook for republicans." Machiavelli's dream was to see a modern Italy a republic as glorious as that of ancient Rome, and he suggested that it could be achieved only by means of a revolution that had the strength of will to liquidate its enemies. Machiavelli was the first to link ideology with terror, but he was too much of a political scientist to enact the role of the ideologue.

Seventeenth-century England occupies an important place in the history of ideology, with the publication of Locke's *Two Treatises of Government*. It is an outstanding example of literature written to justify the rights of man against absolutism. His writings increase the tendency to construct systems and discuss politics in terms of principles. It marks the emergence of the ideological style. In political conversation generally it was accompanied by a growing use of concepts such as right and liberty - ideals in terms of which actual policies were judged.

2.4 Ideological Elements in International Politics

No one can deny the fact that in the international arena, ideology is probably the most important factor that affects the activities of the nations. Again it is believed that ideology is both a means to an end and end in itself. In other

words we can say that ideology determines the external behaviour of the nations. In terms of ideological elements or impact of ideology in International Politics there is a difference of opinion among scholars. In this context we can put forward the arguments of Prof. Norman Hill, who said that ideology is the readymade package of ideas on the basis of which we can simplify the relationship among the nations. In other words, we can say that International Politics revolves around the concept of ideology for its proper explanations of incidents.

As it has been mentioned earlier ideology is regarded as a body of ideas reflecting the social needs and aspirations of an individual, group, class, or culture. The major international incidents are the reflections of ideological differences. For example, the course of World War I, a new element has been introduced. By 1916 the Allies were being urged to think of their endeavour as a war “to make the world safe for democracy,” and the Germans, on their side, were correspondingly encouraged to visualize the war as a struggle of “culture” against “barbarism.” Hence it is clear that ideological elements are the basic factors behind the War. However it is not true to accept this, because there are also some other causes which are responsible for the war.

However, Ideology has tremendously influenced the relationships between the countries in the international arena. During the period between the first and second World Wars, Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany had considerably influenced the foreign policies of these countries. Policy makers of various countries try to mould the public opinion in support of their policies. Particularly in the totalitarian states, the rulers justify their actions through ideologies.

It can be said that ideology is a set of doctrines or beliefs that form the basis of a political, economic, or other system. And we all know that one country’s foreign policy is the reflection of its international and external behaviour and composite desire and beliefs of its people. Through foreign policy one country tries to adjust its relationship with other nations. From this stand point ideology enables us to discover the lines of difference. For example, during

the Cold war period we may easily point out that due to the ideological differences the two super powers moved against each other.

Again the rise of Communism marked a corresponding increase in the role of ideology in International Relations. Fascism helped to speed the process. The Spanish Civil War of the 1930s was an almost clear-cut confrontation between the ideologies of left and right. Ideology comes to play a very important role in International Politics. The balance of power in today's world is a balance weighted by ideological commitment. Earlier, the role of ideology was insignificant in the International Politics when states were ruled by the kings. The common people were not concerned about ideologies. Little as the world was divided into two blocks on ideological ground. The two major dominant ideologies in the world are——Liberalism and Communism. The countries of the West have mainly favoured Liberalism as an ideology.

In the contemporary International Politics it is believed that ideology has transformed international relationships from traditional to a modern one. In earlier centuries world experienced dynastic wars, national, civil, and imperial wars, and diplomacy designed to further national security or national expansion or to promote mutual advantages and general peace. Such factors, indeed, appeared to govern International Relations until recent times. International Relations today are seemingly dominated more often than not by the exigencies of “isms”: Wars are fought, alliances are made, and treaties are signed because of ideological considerations. The balance of power in the contemporary world is a balance weighted by ideological commitment. “The Communist bloc” confronts “the free peoples,” and in the “Third World” emergent nations cultivate a nationalist, anti-colonialist ideology in their search for identity and their efforts to achieve modernity.

Hence it can be said that, almost any incident in politics constitutes a belief system of one kind or another. However, some of the belief systems are more structured, more ordered, and generally systematic than others, so they are still prevalent in International Politics. Here we can cite the example of the ideology of Democracy or the ideology of Liberalism which are becoming popular among different nations of the world today.

SAQ

In the present International Politics, can the Fascist Ideology help the world community to establish a stable world? Give arguments in favour of your answer.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Stop to Consider

Decline of Ideology

There is an important debate going on in the decline of ideology. Among the scholars who are involved in this debate, Prof. Daniel Bell's name needs special mention. According to Bell, the ideological fires in the Western world have cooled down and 'ideology' which was once the road to action, has become a dead end. Most of the disputes between countries at the international level are no longer ideological in character though sometimes they may be projected as ideological. For example, disputes between India and Pakistan, Arab states and Israel cannot be described as ideological dispute. Hence, Bell is of the view that ideologies have hardly any role to play in the world politics. However, many scholars have rejected this view. They argue that in many countries it may be true that political ideas and ideologies have lost their old appeal, but this does not minimize the role of ideology in International Politics.

Though it is difficult to say that ideology is a dead end now, the growing co-operation between states with ideological differences makes it evident that ideology has lost its relevance. In the Cold war period, ideological differences have resulted in the bi-polarisation of the world. However, in the post-cold war era bipolarism has also come to an end. With the collapse of former USSR there is a decline in Communist ideology. Most of the East European countries which earlier held faith in Communist ideology have moved towards Democracy and Liberalization which symbolizes the end of ideological confrontations. Unification of the East and the West Germany which were divided on ideological ground is also a proof of decline of ideology in the international field.

2.5 Relationship between Ideology and National Interest

If we analyze the definitions of ideology, it will be clear to us that ideology is closely associated with interest. An ideology may be shaped by interest and then it may be used to fulfill the interest. In the field of International Politics, it is observed that national interests shape the foreign policies of the countries on the basis of their ideologies and in turn, ideologies help in fulfilling their national interests. For example, the colonial power their policy of establishment of their colonies as ‘white man’s burden’ and describe it as an educating, civilizing and humanitarian mission. However, their real aim was the economic exploitation of the colonies. Thus, ideology helps to rationalize one’s action.

Although, national interest differs from country to country, all states have core interests, and these generally revolve around security and prosperity. There are often trade-offs between these imperatives as a particular country might assign greater importance to one over another. Hence, it can be said that national interest has three basic dimensions—— security, economic development, and a stable world order. Every state wants territorial integrity, national security and a stable world order, and success depends on its national power. In this context ideology plays a vital role, because it is linked with national power. So, we can refer as the “Ideologisation of International Politics”.

Again, ideology is not only regarded a set of action oriented ideas; it is also used as a tool or an instrument which is used to fulfill the national interest. The leaders of a nation always follow a handy ideology with which one can justify what needs to be done. For example, USA always opposed Communism, but during the Second World War it took side with USSR, which is known for its Communism. Such policy of USA is justified on the ground of fulfilling their national interest.

Again, to illustrate the role of ideology in moulding national interest we can forward the example of India. India’s ever closer ties with the US can be explained by the Indian elite’s realist paradigm, where “national interest” is

accepted as a given reality. In fact, it is an ideological construction created to justify the pursuit of neo-liberal policies at the expense of the working class and poor masses.

Again, some scholars argue that despite the ideological influence in the making of foreign policy goal and moulding the behaviour of a nation, it is subordinate to the national interest. In this context we can point out that intervention in a foreign territory is opposed by the ideology of democracy or liberalism. But US's intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan, is not rational to its ideological view point, again, despite having a founder member of Non Alignment Movement, India signed a treaty of peace and friendship and defense with the USSR in 1971 and refuted the charge of doing anything contrary to the basic principles of her foreign policy of non-alignment. However, some scholars are of the view that national interest and ideology are not different things. According to their view, ideology is of no avail if it is not subservient to the national interest.

Hence, it is evident from the above discussion that the ideology is connected with national interest. Each state has its own national interest and is above everything and tries to mould and re-mould its ideology. For example, national security is the most important among all interests and for achieving this objective a state enters into alliances, counter alliances, despite its ideology barred it to do so. However, no one can deny the fact that ideology has an important impact in moulding one's national interest. For, example India still believes its Panchasheel policies when it formulates its foreign policy goals.

Check Your Progress

1. Why Facism is called the ideology of Dictatorship?
2. Examine the causes which are responsible for the decline of ideology.
3. Critically examine the role of ideology in International politics.
4. Explain the role of ideology in the formulation of one nation's foreign policy.
5. Examine the relationship between national interest and ideology.

2.6 Summing up

After going through this unit you are now in a position to understand ideology as a concept of International Politics and its role in the formulation of one country's foreign policy. In this unit we have learnt that ideology establishes the intellectual framework through which policy makers observe reality. Again ideology prescribes for policy makers both national roles and an image of the future state of the world. Ideology also establishes the long-range goals of a state's external behaviour, to be promoted through diplomacy, propaganda, revolution or force. In short we can say that ideology is a system of ideas that aspires both to explain the world and to change it.

However, a critical analysis of all that we have learnt in the preceding sections shows that the role of ideology in International Politics has its strong as well as weak sides. In the context of its strong side we can point out that ideology is a simplifying mechanism and offers to the state actors ready packaged ideas. On the basis of these ideas one nation can obtain its desired goals in the international arena. However on the other hand ideology often plays up the emotional element by playing down the intellectual. Due to this ideological conformation brings conflicts among the nations. To conclude, we can say that the role of ideology in International Politics has now emerged as a fertile source of international conflict and tension. It has greatly complicated the task of peaceful resolution of international disputes. Nevertheless, ideology still plays an important role in the formulation of a nation's foreign policy.

2.7 References and Suggested Readings

Johari, J.C. *International Relations and Politics*. New Delhi: Starling Publications, 1999

Ghai, K. K. *International Relations: Theory and Practice of International Politics*. New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers, 2007

Kumar, Mahendra. *Theoretical Aspects of International Politics*. New Delhi: Shiva Lal Agarwal & Co, 2000

Prakash, Chandra. *Theories of International Relations*, Third Edition, 2005

* * *

**Institute of Distance and Open Learning
Gauhati University**

MA in Political Science

Paper II

International Politics: Theoretical Aspects

Block 3

Foreign Policy and Diplomacy



Contents:

Block Introduction–

Unit 1 : Foreign Policy

Unit 2 : Diplomacy

Contributors:

Dipankar Saikia : Counsellor in Political Science
(Unit 1) IDOL, GU

Chayanika Sarma : Counsellor in Political Science
(Unit 2) IDOL, GU

Course Co-ordination

Dr. Kandarpa Das : Director
IDOL, GU

Barnalee Choudhury : Lecturer in Political Science
IDOL, GU

Editorial Team

Content Editing : Barnalee Choudhury
Lecturer in Political Science
IDOL, GU

Format Editing : Prasenjit Das
Editor in Charge
IDOL, GU

Language Editing : Binita Sarmah
Counsellor in English
IDOL, GU

Cover Page Designing:

Kaushik Sarma : Graphic Designer
CET, IITG

June, 2010

© Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. Further information about the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University courses may be obtained from the University's office at BKB Auditorium (1st floor), Gauhati University, Guwahati-14. Published on behalf of the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University by Dr. Kandarpa Das, Director and printed at Maliyata Offset Press, Mirza. Copies printed 1000.

Acknowledgement

The Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University duly acknowledges the financial assistance from the Distance Education Council, IGNOU, New Delhi for preparation of this material.

Block Introduction:

This block is an attempt to introduce you with two most important devices applied by the states to promote and protect their national interest in the international arena. It is foreign policy and diplomacy through which a nation survives in the international arena. Both foreign policy and diplomacy is a system of activities evolved by the communities for changing the behavior of other states for adjusting own activities to the international environment. In international politics, foreign policy can be considered as the goal, while diplomacy is the means through which nations begin to develop their relations. Again an effective foreign policy is also helpful to secure international peace and establish a stable world order. As well as in the internal affairs like developmental activities of a state, a well executed foreign policy helps them to gain aids form other countries. And the diplomacy is the means through which one nation put forward their view in front of other states. Hence this block is very important in terms of examining how one country formulates foreign policy and how diplomacy plays a vital role in executing theses policies. These issues are discussed in two units.

Unit 1 discusses with foreign policy. In this unit we will try to give you a brief and clear cut idea of foreign policy and also discuss and examine some definitions of foreign policy forwarded by some prominent scholars. The unit also deals with different kinds of factors which are responsible for formulating a nation's foreign policy. Here we shall also discuss the objectives of foreign policy. We also deal with the aims and goals of foreign policy.

Unit 2 discusses with the concept of diplomacy. Diplomacy acts as a device of power management in the struggle for power among nations. In this unit we shall discuss the concept of diplomacy on the basis of different definitions put forwarded by some prominent scholars of international politics. The unit also discusses with different kinds of diplomacy and examines how diplomacy changed its nature accordingly with the changing of time and situation. Here we shall also discuss why diplomacy is regarded an important instrument for promoting national interest in the light of its objectives and values.

Contents:

Unit 1: Foreign policy

Unit 2: Diplomacy

Unit 1

Foreign Policy

Contents:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Meaning and Definition of Foreign Policy
- 1.4 Objectives of Foreign Policy
- 1.5 Determinants of Foreign Policy
 - 1.5.1 Internal Factors
 - 1.5.2 External Factors
- 1.6 Summing up
- 1.7 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction

The study of the foreign policy is one of the most important aspects of the study of International Politics. As human beings we can not live without our society. Likewise, in international relation no state can avoid its involvement in it. However, this involvement must be systematic and based on certain well-defined principles. Foreign policy and diplomacy are the two instruments with which the process of international politics operates. All states have to adopt some strategy to execute policies in the international level. Here, foreign policy involves strategies which are executed through diplomacy. Foreign policy is an important key to the rational explanation of international behaviour. Thus, we can say that it consists of external behaviour of a state. To Norman Hill "It is the content or substance of a nation's effort to promote its interests vis- a-vis other Nations".

As have been mentioned earlier, we are discussing foreign policy and diplomacy in this block. In this unit we shall make an attempt to discuss different aspects of foreign policy. The unit also deals with the different determinants of foreign policy. As you know foreign policy of a country refers to some well defined principles which help the nation to achieve their desired goals in the international arena. But in the selection of the principles some factors affect the decisions of the nation. These are called determinants of foreign policy. Therefore it is important for us to know the different determinates of foreign policy. Here we shall also make an attempt to discuss the objectives or goals of foreign policy.

1.2 Objectives

The success and failure of a nation in international arena depends on the effective implementation of its foreign policy. It is an instrument, used by the states to promote and secure its national interest. After reading this unit you will be able to:

- *analyze* the meaning and definitions of foreign policy
- *explain* the goals and objectives of foreign policy
- *discuss* the determinants of foreign policy

1.3 Meaning and Definition of Foreign Policy

We know that no state can avoid its involvement in International Relations for their overall development. In the contemporary period, no state is self-sufficient in terms of technology, economy and for its overall development. Moreover, no state can exist in complete isolation from others. Therefore, the nations are continuously in interaction with each other. But these involvement and interactions must be systematic and well organized based on certain well-defined principles. These principles constitute the foreign policy of a nation. However, while determining these principles the nations should work within some limitations keeping in mind the realities of its external

environment. The Foreign policy of a nation works as a driving wheel in the international arena. We can say that a state without foreign policy is like a ship without a rudder. It strengthens the country in the international affairs.

We have already pointed out that the foreign policy of a state consists of its external behaviour. The foreign policy of a state takes form in the course of an action undertaken by the authority of the state and is intended to affect situations beyond the span of its jurisdiction. It is the key through which one state maintains a healthy relation with other states in the international arena. Apart from it, it is one of the most important instruments of a nation to promote their national interests. The Brookings Institutions, in its book *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy, 1952- 53* used the term foreign policy to refer to the complex and dynamic political course that a nation follows in relation to other state. Hence, it is clear that the foreign policy is concerned with the behaviour of a state towards other states. Foreign policy involves a series of inputs and actions that a nation makes use of in influencing the behaviour of other nations in the pursuit of its prescribed goals.

However, scholars differ in their views while forwarding their ideas on foreign policy. It is difficult to find out one universally adaptable definition of foreign policy. Following are some definitions forwarded by some prominent scholars.

Ruthnaswamy defines Foreign Policy “as the bundle of principles and practices that regulate the intercourse of a state with other states”.

According to **George Modelski** “foreign policy is the systematic activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and adjusting their own activities to the environment”.

C.C.Rodee states that “foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its own interest”.

According to **Padelford and Lincoln**, “Foreign policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete course of action to attain these objectives and preserve its interests”.

Prof. Joseph Frankle is of the view that foreign policy is the set of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extent relations between one state and others.

According to **Gibson**, foreign policy is “a well rounded comprehensive plan based on knowledge and experience for conducting the business of government with the rest of world”.

From these definitions it can be said that foreign policy implies the use of political influence in order to induce other states to exercise their law making power and a manner desired by the concerned state. Foreign policy is also an interaction between forces originating outside the country’s borders and those working within them. Thus we can say that basically foreign policy lays emphasis on either on the plan of action or policy executed. It is also concerned with the behaviour of a state towards other states to maintain a sound relation. Thus, foreign policy gives the state the character of an international person.

Stop To Consider

Approaches to the study of foreign policy:

There are many approaches through which we can analyze foreign policy properly.

Some of them are:

1. *Traditional approach*: the traditional approach made an effort to reconstruct the diplomacy of a particular period with accuracy and precision and focused on the major events. Again it sought to enlighten the present with reference to the past.
2. *Descriptive approach*: the approach focused on the foreign policy of some selected powers in the background of current events.
3. *Ideological approach*: it is the most important approach which tries to analyse foreign policy as an expression of prevailing political, social and religious beliefs.

4. *The Analytical Approach*: It is based on proposition that foreign policy rests on multiple determinants and holds that each state has certain permanent interest.

5. *Comparative Approach*: It is a recent phenomenon which draws inspiration from comparative government. It studied the foreign policy under different political system with a view to make an intensive and extensive comparative analysis.

1.4 Objectives of Foreign Policy

Already you have learnt that through foreign policy one nation tries to fulfill its desired goals in the international arena. Most of the objectives of foreign policy represent the composite desires and wishes of the articulate groups within a state that are interested in some phase of international relations. The common one for all policy goals is the obligation of any nation to maintain the nation as an unimpaired entity. Some important objectives of foreign policy are: maintaining the integrity of the state, promoting the interests for the economy, protecting its national security, protecting the national prestige and developing a power potential to prosecute an offensive war if necessary. In one word the goals or objective of foreign policy can be described as 'national interest'. Let us discuss briefly some basic objectives of foreign policy.

Every country tries to make its territory stable. Through foreign policy they seek to protect the territorial integrity. Foreign policy also protects the interest of its citizens, both within and outside the country. Another objective of foreign policy is the maintenance of communication and co-operation with other members of the international community. This is done through the adoption of policy of conflict and cooperation with a view to promote its own interests.

As you have learnt that the foreign policy of a country seeks to promote its national interests and aims at promotion of economic interests of the country. The status of a country is largely determined by its economic condition, hence, it always tries to seek greater benefit. For example, India deliberately avoided diplomatic relations with Iraq, so that it can make close trade relations with USA. The foreign policy also aims at the enhancement of the

influence of the state either by expanding its area of influence or reducing the other state to the position of dependence. In this context we can refer the policy of US and USSR in the post World War II period which has been largely motivated by these considerations.

Apart from these goals, the objectives or goals of foreign policy according to Arnold Wolfers have two categories: 'possessions goals' and 'milieu goals'. By the 'possessions goals' he means those goals which a foreign policy seeks to achieve in order to preserve its possessions, on the other hand by the 'milieu goals' he means those goals which nations pursue in order to shape favourable conditions beyond their national territory or jurisdictions. Apart from it, 'milieu goals' aim at bringing peace, promoting international laws and the establishment of International Organizations.

The objectives of foreign policy can be classified into three categories, viz.

- Core value (interest) objectives
- Middle range objectives, and
- Universal long run objectives

The core value or interests are related to the existence of the state. For this kind of goal people can make their ultimate sacrifice. Some of them are: self-preservation, defense of strategically vital areas, such as Nuclear Plants, beliefs and values; economic development and prosperity etc. They are vital for the existence of a state and therefore, no state can ignore such interests.

On the other hand middle range objectives basically deal with trade and commerce and are in relation with other countries. Ideological self-extension is also an important component that can promote a state's socio economic and political values abroad. Access to communication facilities and foreign aids are some other goals of such objectives.

Last but not least a Universal long range objective deals with the strategy that a state takes for survival in the international arena through International Organizations. It also aims at concerning with the restructuring of world

order. Here we can cite the example of Hitler's concepts of 'Thousand-Year Reich' plan.

Hence it is clear that through foreign policy one nation tries to survive in the International arena. Regarding the objectives, we can say that it mainly revolves round the national interest of that particular country. Every objective that we stated earlier pointed towards the fulfillment of one's national goals. But it should be remembered that the first and the second kind of objective requires immediate pursuit but the third kind is meant for distant future.

Stop To Consider

Goals of Foreign Policy in brief :

Foreign policy is the reflection of a country's external behaviour. Through foreign policy one country tries to maintain a stable relation with other countries.

Apart from that foreign policy aims at :

1. *Protection of territorial integrity*: foreign policy seeks to protect the territorial integrity of a country and the interest of its citizens.
2. *Maintaining international relation*: another aim of foreign policy is to maintain a sound relation with other countries.
3. *Promotion of national interest*: national interest is the key objective of every country's foreign policy. A country formulates its foreign policy on the basis of its tradition, culture aimed at to fulfill its national interest.
4. *Promotion of economic interest*: it is another important objective of foreign policy. Every country gives their first priority to the infrastructure development.

Check Your Progress

1. Define foreign policy.
2. Examine the objectives of foreign policy.
3. Would you agree with the statement that foreign policy is the key instrument to promote one's national interest? Give arguments in favour of your answer.

1.5 Determinants of Foreign Policy

Already we have learnt that foreign policy is directed towards the achievement of national interests and it is composite body of plans and programmes executed for preserving national integrity. The formulation of foreign policy is the task of the executive. However, the executive cannot use his discretion in formulating the foreign policy. In fact, it is influenced by a large number of factors. These factors affect the formulation procedures of foreign policy in different ways in different conditions. In this context, we can put the definition of Rosenau who rightly argues that history, geography, culture, technological and economical development, social structure, situational factors are kept in mind when foreign policy is formulated. Again he stated that these factors are fall in two categories- Internal and External. According to Pdelford and Lincoln “fundamentally, foreign policy has its roots in the unique historical background, political institutions, traditions, economic needs, power factors, aspirations of people, peculiar geographical circumstances and basic set of values held by a nation”.

Hence from these two definitions we can categorise the determinants of foreign policy into three categories, as

- Internal factors
- External factors, and
- Policy making factors

Let us discuss these factors briefly in the following sub-sections:

<p>SAQ</p> <p>Do you think that national interest is the core objective of foreign policy? Give arguments in favour of your answer. (50 words)</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>
--

1.5.1 Internal Factors

Internal factors of foreign policy are those factors which are vital for one country. It is the composite of aspirations of its people and territorial security or national security. The first task of the government is to maintain its national security and fulfill the aspiration of its people for their existence. So foreign policy of a country is directed towards the fulfillment of these goals. It can be sub-divided into the following categories

- **Geography:** It is one of the potent factors that influence the formulation of foreign policy. Geography includes location, size, topography, state boundaries, population, climate, hydrography, soil etc. If we carefully analyze the foreign policy of a country, we find that all these geographical factors have an important role in formulating and shaping the foreign policy. Here we can cite the example of Nepal which is known as 'Land Locked' (or buffer state) country surrounded by India and China. It is difficult for any Nepalese government to take any decision which harms either country. In case of America, being separated from the continents of Europe and Asia by wide expanse of water had followed an isolationist policy for a long time in the name of Monroe Doctrine. However the development of science and technology decreases the importance of geography.
- **History:** The historical traditions of a country also influence the formulation of a foreign policy. A nation's unified historical experiences where the people share the common values and memories are reflected in the foreign policy of the country. For example, the isolationist policy adopted by America was the legacy which took a long time to outlive its utility.
- **Culture:** Culture also plays an important role in the formulation of foreign policy. In the words of Prof. Rosenau, "the influence of cultural factors is not limited to the impact of societal unity upon the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. Equally important is the process through which the contents of shared norms and practices of society, as

distinguished from the degree of unity that supports them, shape the plans that are made and the activities that are undertaken with respect to the external world”. Hence, from this definition it is clear that culture of a country influences foreign policy very much.

- **National Capacity:** It implies military strength of a country. It is also related to the advancement of technology and economic development. While formulating the foreign policy a nation must take into account its national capacity. To illustrate, the British foreign policy had to reconcile with its lost of ‘Great Power’ status after the Second World War. On the other-hand due to the advancement of technology and economic growth USA become Super-Power after the World War II.
- **Public Opinion:** Public Opinion plays an important role in the formulation as well as in the implementation of foreign policy of a nation. No country can ignore or go against its public opinion. For Example, America had to withdraw its Military from Vietnam after 1968 due to the pressure of its public. India went for nuclearisation after getting pressure of public. However, for playing an effective role public opinion should be well organized. However, it needs mention here that its role is limited to the democratic states only. The policy makers in authoritarian or totalitarian states are immune to public feelings.
- **Ideology:** Ideology means a composite desire of people, their beliefs, attitudes, customs etc. towards their political system. The foreign policy of a country is expressed in terms of people’s beliefs and behaviour and therefore ideology has a very important role to play in shaping the foreign policy of a country.
- **Political Organizations:** In a parliamentary democratic system political organization greatly influences in the making of foreign policy. We know that in this system the majority party formed the government and the responsibility of making foreign policy rests on the government. In this context, government does not ignore the beliefs and norms of its party or organizations.

The above discussions on the internal determinants of foreign policy provide us a clear picture of foreign policy. We find that in the making of foreign policy the policy makers are always influenced by its internal environment. For the smooth running of the government and for national integration and security, policy makers must keep these determinants in their mind. However, only one factor can not determine the norms of ones foreign policy. For an effective foreign policy all the factors must work in a balanced manner with the external factors. Let us discuss the external factors of foreign policy.

Stop To Consider

Foreign Policy and National Interest:

Simply speaking national interest is that interest which the state seeks to protect or achieve in relation to other states. It is a composite desire of people towards their self-preservation and development. National interest is one of the key concepts of International Politics, and also a key concept of foreign policy. According to Norman Hill, “the starting point in foreign policy making is national interest”. Morgenthau also opined that “as long as the world is politically organized into nations the national interest is indeed the final word in world politics”. We know that national interest has three basic dimensions- Security, Economic Development and a stable world order. Every nation, big or small desires or continuously tries to maintain their national integrity and national security, survival and promotion of their economic interest. In this process foreign policy helps them to achieve their desired goals since foreign policy basically deals with the rational explanation of international behaviour. It is one of the most important instruments that nations employ to promote their national interests.

Hence it can be said that in the international arena foreign policy helps one country to promote and preserve their national interest. It helps you to understand the relationship between foreign policy and national interest.

1.5.2 External Factors:

Already we have learnt about the internal factors, which are affecting in the determination of foreign policy of a country. Now in these sections we shall

discuss the external factors of foreign policy. Basically three elements together form the external milieu. They are: 1. world organizations, which include international law, the United Nations Organization and other international organizations which are aimed at maintaining the existing world order, 2. world public opinion and 3. Reaction of other states specially the friendly states. Let us discuss briefly these factors.

SAQ

Do you think that unorganized public opinion can influence the formulation of foreign policy? Give arguments in favour of your answer. (100 words)

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

- **International organizations:** Contemporary International Organizations greatly influence the formulation of foreign policy of a country. A country has to obey the rules and procedures of International Law. In formulation of foreign policy no country can ignore these factors without jeopardizing its own interest. For example, no country can ignore the decisions of UNO in the formulation of foreign policy. To illustrate, when India tested its nuclear weapons ignoring the decisions of UNO, it faced criticisms from the world community. Besides, the regional organizations such as SAARC, ASEAN also influence the formulation of foreign policy of their member countries.

- **Reaction of Other States:** The nations have to take in to consideration the reaction of other states to their various actions while formulating their foreign policy. No country can afford to pursue interests which are against the interests of other states. Any policy based on narrow national interests is likely to evoke strong reaction from the concerned state and produce disastrous consequences. To illustrate we can point out the incident of 1939 when unmindful of the British reaction with disastrous consequences, Hitler embarked upon the invasion of Poland. Similarly, unmindful of the strong American sentiments on Japan's attacks on Pearl Harbor produced disastrous affect to her. (U. Sharma, P. 74)
- **Alliances:** Alliances that took place in between the countries also effect the formulation of foreign policy. The states of the alliances have to respond to the request and demands of their allies. They have to refrain from formulating policies or taking actions which are offensive to the other members of the allies.
- **World Public Opinion:** The world public opinion also exercises profound influence on the foreign policy of a country. But it is occasional. It can influence on foreign policy when public opinion of the concerned state also ratified it. For example, US had to change their policy regarding Vietnam due to the hostile world public opinion as well as their own public opinion.

Besides, the multinational impact of technological advance on international relations, and the political evolution of nation state system are some of the major factors which are influencing the formulation of foreign policy of a country. In the post-Second World War era, some major developments such as the bipolarity of the world and then hegemony of USA greatly influenced the formulation of foreign policy of almost all the countries of the globe. For example, during the cold war period (bipolar system) most of the Asian, African and Latin American countries took the Non Alignment Policy as their foreign policy goals. Hence it is clear that in formulation of

foreign policy not only internal conditions of country have an impact but also external environments are also having vital importance.

Check Your Progress:

1. What do you mean by land locked country? Is India a land locked country?
2. “As long as the world is politically organized into nations the national interest is indeed the final word in world politics”. Who said this?
3. Examine the internal factors that are effecting the formulation of foreign policy.
4. Why SAARC is not regarded as an international organization?
5. On what ground world public opinion is different from national public opinion?

Apart from the internal and external factors of foreign policy another variable in the formulation of foreign policy are the attitude of the policy maker's. A policy making process is a composite of decision-makers role or attitudes and their internal as well as external environment. In the word of Michael Breacher, ‘policy choice flows inexorably from the composite images of the decision making elite, modified only by the counter images of competing elite within the political system’. Obviously, in the formulation of foreign policy the ruling elite play a major role. They act in accordance with their perception of reality. Seeing the internal as well as external environments the decision makers take their decisions. One good and well versed leader can take effective decisions. For example we can point out the policies of Nehru, the first prime Minister of India, who took a bold decision of not joining in any block during the cold war period. This gave India support from both the block, which was very much important for the development.

Stop To Consider

Role of the Press in the formulation of foreign policy:

The press and the mass media play a vital role in the formulation of foreign policy. It contributes to this policy formulation process by supplying factual information on the basis of which the people take decisions. Again it supplies information to the people on the governmental policy. By publishing contemporary articles on international developments, (needs of the state) it can motivate people. They also analyze the policy of the government in the matters of foreign affairs. It also plays an important role in publishing foreign policy of different countries. So it is known as the fourth pillar of the government. However, the role of press depends on the prevailing governmental system, the rate of literacy as well as the attitude of the government.

1.6 Summing up

A careful analysis of the foreign policy provides us a clear cut picture of a country's position in the international arena. Foreign policy is the key to understand the developments of international relations and also provide us attitudes of the states towards other. In the word of Modelski we can say that foreign policy aimed at the change of behaviour of other states to suit the interests of one's own state. The aim of foreign policy should be to regulate and not merely to change, the behaviour of other states and directed towards the fulfillment of one's national interests. Indeed we can say that national interest is the core factor in foreign policy goals. However, the formulation of foreign policy is a very difficult task in front of the decision makers. While formulating the foreign policy for their country they must keep their mind in the internal as well external behaviour. Their attitudes and personality also plays an important role in the formulation of foreign policy. Hence we can say that foreign policy of a country is the key factor for survival in the international arena.

1.7 References and Suggested Readings

Kumar, M. *Theoretical Aspects of International Relations*. Delhi: S L Agarwal & Company, 2005

Johari, J. C. *International Politics and Relations*. Delhi: Sterling Publishers Privet Ltd, 2003

Chandra, P. *International Relations*. Delhi: Bookhivers, 2008

Modelski, George. *The Theory Of Foreign Policy*. London, 1962

Padelford & Lincoln. *International Politics*. New York: MacMillan,1954

* * * * *

Unit 2

Diplomacy

Contents:

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Objectives
- 2.3 Meaning of Diplomacy
- 2.4 History and Nature of Diplomacy
 - 2.4.1 History
 - 2.4.2 Nature of Diplomacy
- 2.5 Types of Diplomacy
- 2.6 Relationship between Foreign Policy and Diplomacy
- 2.7 Summing up
- 2.8. References and Suggested Readings

2.1 Introduction

Diplomacy is an integral part of foreign policy. It provides an insight into the various events that have shaped international relations. In the previous unit of this block we have already learnt that no state in the present time can survive in isolation from others. Through establishing diplomatic relations, a state becomes a member of the family of the nations in the international sphere. Diplomacy acts as an instrument for securing international peace through accommodation.

In this unit we shall deal with the concept and meaning of diplomacy. Diplomatic relations are maintained in the international field since earlier times. Therefore, we shall also make an attempt to describe the history and nature of diplomacy. The present unit will also highlight up a various types of diplomacy such as old and new diplomacy. We have already learnt that foreign policy and diplomacy are two major instruments through which nations maintain their relations. Here we will also try to analyze the relationship between foreign policy and diplomacy.

2.2 Objectives

Diplomacy attempts to cloak the real goals of national interests with several ideational principles or morality or rules of international behavior. After reading this unit you will be able to:

- *understand* the meaning of diplomacy
- *trace* the history of diplomacy
- *explain* the nature of diplomacy
- *describe* the various kinds of diplomacy
- *analyse* the relation between foreign policy and diplomacy

2.3 Meaning of Diplomacy

The term diplomacy is used in a variety of ways. Sometimes it is described as “the art of telling lies on behalf of the nation”, or “as instrument for employing deceit and duplicity in international relation”. No doubt, diplomacy at times attempts to cloak the real goals of national interests with several ideational principles or morality or rules of international behavior, yet it cannot be described as the art of deceit and concealment. Diplomacy is in fact the art of negotiations and conduction of foreign relations. It is the key instrument for implementing the foreign policy of a nation.

The term diplomacy has been drawn from the Latin term ‘diploma’ which means a double document. During the Roman period all passports, imperial letters etc. were stamped in a double metal plate, folded and sewed together. These metal passes were described as ‘diplomas’. Subsequently the term ‘diploma’ began to be applied to all the official documents that conferred privileges or rights under some treaty.

The term diplomacy in the modern sense was for the first time used by Burke in the letters on Regicide Peace. He used it for the skill in the conduction of the international relations and negotiations. After him different scholars have defined diplomacy in different senses and offered various definitions of the term.

The term diplomacy has been used to denote a variety of meanings. According to Harold Nicholson, in current time diplomacy is carelessly taken to denote several things. At one moment it is employed as synonym for foreign policy, and another moment it signifies negotiations. Now let us examine various definitions of diplomacy given by different thinkers.

According to the oxford dictionary, diplomacy “is 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 diplomatists.”

According to the Chamber’s Twentieth Century Dictionary, diplomacy is the art of negotiation, especially of treaties between states.”

In the words of Panikkar, an Indian diplomat, “Diplomacy used in relation to international politics is the art of forwarding one’s interest in relation to other countries.”

According to Padelford and Lincoln, “Diplomacy is the process of representation and negotiation by which states customarily deal with one another in times of peace.”

Sir Ernest Satow observes, “Diplomacy is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between governments of independent states.”

Hans J Morgenthau writes, “Diplomacy is the promotion of the national interest by peaceful means.”

Childs defined diplomacy as “the process by which foreign policy is carried out.”

Lester Pearson considers diplomacy as an act of negotiation. He says, “Diplomacy does not make policy, it transmits and explains it and tries to negotiate arrangements which embody and secure it.”

Thus, it can be said that diplomacy refers to the management of international relations by negotiation. Through diplomacy nations try to promote national interest in the international field. This objective is usually fulfilled by foreign policy of a country.

2.4 History and Nature of Diplomacy

We have already learnt that diplomacy was present since earlier times. The monarchs used diplomacy to maintain and enhance their power. However, the nature of diplomacy undergoes various changes with the passage of time. In this section, let us discuss the history and changing nature of diplomacy which will comprehend your knowledge on diplomacy.

2.4.1 History

Before discussing diplomacy in a detailed way, let us have a look at the history and development of diplomacy through the ages. In ancient times, diplomacy depended on the sweet will of the ruler as the states were mostly ruled by the kings. The kings were despotic and supporters of divine rights. People were indifferent to the political affairs as they had no voice or power. International affairs were conducted with a view to enrich the monarchs. The foreign kings were offered valuable gifts and they showed outward respect only to win their favour.

With the end of the monarchical age, the situation has changed. Economic and political spheres of the states became distinctly divided. The bourgeoisie class was selected for conducting diplomatic relations. After the bourgeoisie age, the political problems became extremely intricate in the modern age. This age is famous for its democratic spirit. The state's responsibility includes all social, political, moral, cultural and economic interests of the people. In modern age, the success of diplomacy rests upon the progress of the entire society. Now diplomacy solves political problems benefiting all the interest of the existing society.

The origin of diplomacy can be traced back to the times of city states of ancient Greece. By the 5th century B.C. special missions between the city states became very frequent. The Greek city states used to send envoys to each other in order to negotiate specific issues such as war, peace or commercial relations and they would return immediately after their mission concluded. They did not have representatives posted on other states on a regular basis. In India also the Arthashastra of Kautilya included a chapter on theory of diplomacy.

While looking back at the history of diplomacy it is found that the Romans did little to develop the art of diplomacy. However, in Eastern Roman Empire, the diplomatic methods were employed with great zeal. The Eastern Empire diplomats became skilled diplomats. They included accurate observation, reporting and representation.

From 6th century A.D. to late 18th century, diplomacy included study and the preservation of archives. Modern diplomacy arose in Italy in the late Middle ages. The first known mission was established at Genoa in 1445 by the Duke of Milan. By the next century Italy established permanent embassies in London, Paris and at the Court of Holy Roman Empire. The main object of diplomacy during that time was to promote the interests of the foreigners abroad by various means. By the 17th century diplomacy became an established profession and a generally accepted method of mutual relations. After the nation state system was established in 1648 (Westphalia Treaty) diplomacy became essential. The Court of Louis XIV consisted of diplomats from all countries. In the 18th century the diplomacy of Court entered its Golden Age.

By late 18th century, the Industrial, American and French revolution ushered in a new era of diplomacy. The voice of the people began to be recognized. The growing democratic control called for a new kind of diplomat. During that time, the diplomats were mostly the aristocrats as the remuneration was very low and only those who had other sources of income accepted these assignments. The Congress of Vienna contributed towards the making of diplomacy less formal and restricted. With this its rules became more standardized and more acceptable.

It needs mention here that diplomacy till 18th century was branded as old diplomacy. The 19th century diplomacy is known as modern diplomacy. Modern diplomacy demanded new methods as well as new personnel. The developments of 19th century like the growing sense of community of nations, increasing appreciation of the importance of public opinion, rapid increase in communication etc. have greatly affected the theory and practice of diplomacy.

The present diplomacy which is known as new diplomacy is the result of many new developments. The status of the ambassador has been reduced to that of a glorified clerk. The diplomats in present day do not enjoy any freedom or personal discretion. In fact, conference diplomacy is becoming more and more popular.

Stop To Consider:

The Main Characteristics of Diplomacy:

The main characteristics of old diplomacy were-

- Old diplomacy was mainly concerned with Europe and non- European countries were outside its purview.
- It was a big power affair of the European countries. Small countries had no role in old diplomacy.
- The diplomats were selected by the monarchs. They were the aristocrats and answerable to the king.
- In old diplomacy negotiations were kept confidential. Strict secrecy was maintained while dealing with the issue and conducting the negotiation.
- The diplomats in old diplomacy enjoyed greater freedom in matters of negotiations as the means of communications were very slow and the monarchs could keep in touch with the diplomats all the time.

2.4.2 Nature of Diplomacy

In the above section we have learnt about the history of diplomacy. We have also learnt that the nature of diplomacy undergoes changes in different periods of history. Now let us discuss the nature of diplomacy in detail here.

Diplomacy is not immoral. Diplomacy is neither the art of deceit nor mere lies or propaganda. It is a normal means of conducting relations. It consists of techniques and procedures for conducting relations among nations. Diplomacy can also be regarded as the machinery for action.

Again, Diplomacy acts through settled procedures. Diplomacy functions through a network of foreign offices, embassies, legations, consulates and

special missions all over the world. It always works according to definite and settled procedures and protocol. It can be found in the bilateral as well as multilateral form. Diplomacy is commonly bilateral in character. However, as a result of the growing importance of international conferences, international organizations, regional negotiations, it has now also developed a plural character. It is concerned with all the issues and problems among nations and embraces a multitude of interests from the simplest issues to vital issues to that of war and peace.

In the modern world, diplomacy plays a vital role and breakdown of diplomacy always leads to crisis. When diplomacy breaks down, the danger of war, or at least of a major crisis develops. One should remember here that diplomacy operates both in times of peace as well as war. Some writers hold that diplomacy operates only in times of peace and when war breaks out diplomacy comes to an end. However, this is not a correct view. Diplomacy continues to operate even when war breaks out. Of course, during war its nature undergoes a change; from peace diplomacy it takes the form of war diplomacy.

Diplomacy works in an environment characterized both by conflict and cooperation. A certain degree of cooperation among nations is essential for the working of diplomacy because in its absence, diplomatic relations cannot be maintained. Similarly, when there is no conflict, diplomacy becomes superfluous because there is no need for negotiations. Thus existence of cooperation as well as conflict is essential for the working of diplomacy. Again, diplomacy always works for securing national interests of the nation it represents. The purpose of diplomacy is to secure the goals of national interest as defined and specified by the foreign policy of the nation.

That is why it can be said that diplomacy is backed by national power. A strong diplomacy means a diplomacy backed by a strong national power. Diplomacy uses persuasion and influence as the means for exercising power in international relations. It cannot use force and violence. However, it can use warnings, give ultimatums, promise rewards and threaten punishment, but beyond this it cannot directly exercise force. Diplomacy is the promotion

of national interest by peaceful means. The success of diplomacy is measured in terms of the amount of success achieved towards the fulfillment of the goals of national interest in international relations.

Therefore, diplomacy is regarded as a technique of implementing foreign policy. It is a channel or business of communication between governments. It is also described as the method of adjusting and managing inter- state relations. For successful and effective working, diplomacy requires trained and professional diplomats.

Stop To Consider:

The Nature of New Diplomacy

- The new diplomacy is an international affair. It is not confined to European countries alone. The new diplomacy is equally concerned with the non-European countries.
- New diplomacy tends to involve different persons in different types of diplomatic negotiations. The ambassadors are usually generalists who may not do justice to a subject of technical nature. Therefore to deal with special issues the new diplomacy engages the experts on that subject.
- In new diplomacy, some important issues are handled by the top political leaders themselves. They can take immediate decision and they can also use their discretionary power.
- New diplomacy is open in nature. All the negotiations are carried out in the public view.
- The new diplomacy is under the democratic control.

Check Your Progress

1. What is open diplomacy?
2. Discuss the nature of diplomacy in the bourgeoisie age.
3. Define secret diplomacy? Make a comparative analysis of open and secret diplomacy.

2.5 Types of Diplomacy

As we have already learnt diplomacy can be divided into two broad types- old diplomacy and new diplomacy. Old diplomacy was originated at the close of the 16th century and continued upto 1918-19. This diplomacy was mainly concerned with the building up of allies. It was a closed affair and did not involve hatred or violent animosities. It was a friendly, humane and polite art carried on with mutual tolerance. The era of new diplomacy ushered in the 20th century and especially after the First World War. During this period, international conditions changed considerably and democratic governments replaced monarchies. The new diplomacy was more professional and non-political.

Apart from these two broad categories, in general, diplomacy has various other categories. These are as follows-

- *Appeasement diplomacy*-:Appeasement is the policy of settling international quarrels by admitting and satisfying grievances through rational negotiation and compromise, thereby avoiding the resort to an armed conflict which would be expensive, bloody and possibly dangerous. The British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain used this policy towards Nazi Germany between 1919 ad 1937 to signify the pursuit of peace.
- *Big stick diplomacy*-: This diplomacy is associated with the US President Theodore Roosevelt. This term has been originated from the phrase “speak softly and carry a big stick.” It denotes the idea of negotiating peacefully and simultaneously threatening with the big stick or the military. Roosevelt used this diplomacy in Antarctic Coal Strike in 1902. The miners went on strike wanting higher pay, shorter work hours and better housing. The mining companies refused to accept their demands and sought the help of federal government. Roosevelt, the President was aware of the effect a coal shortage would have on the economy. He decided to host a meeting in the White House and invited the representatives of the miners and the leaders of the mining companies.

But the miners did not submit to the political pressure and continued on with the strike. Roosevelt then brought in the military to run the mines in public interest. The mining companies had to accept the demands of the United Mines Workers (UMW) as the companies were no longer directly making a profit.

- *Citizen diplomacy*:- In this diplomacy, citizens emerge as representatives of a country or cause either inadvertently or by design. It takes place when official channels are not reliable or desirable. For example, if two countries do not formally recognize their governments, citizen diplomacy may be an ideal tool of statecraft. Citizen diplomacy can take the form of scientific exchange, cultural exchange and international athletic events. Citizen diplomats can be students, teachers, athletes, artists, business people, humanitarians, adventurers or tourists. This diplomacy is based on the concept that the individual has the right, even the responsibility to help shape the foreign relation of the country.
- *Cultural diplomacy*:- Cultural diplomacy refers to the exchange of ideas, information, art, lifestyle, value system, traditions, beliefs and other aspects of cultures. At first, each party recognizes the distinct cultural dynamics of the other. Then the parties study the foreign cultural dynamics in order to understand the tradition, history, language and general way of life of the other party. After that the parties generally conduct dialogue through an interpreter or by using a common language. The roots of cultural diplomacy can be traced back to the very beginning of human exchanges in dialogue. William Wilberforce displayed the most remarkable practice of cultural diplomacy in his association with a campaign for the abolition of slavery. His understanding of the miserable nature of the slave trade and cultural dynamics of the African slaves was used to sow the seeds for a groundbreaking consensus in the Parliament of the United Kingdom which led to the Slavery Abolition Act of 1833. Cultural diplomacy refers to the use and transfer of cultural ideas between different groups to achieve rapport and understanding. According to Joseph Nye it is a prime example of soft power or the ability to persuade through culture, value and ideas opposed to 'hard power' which conquers or coerces through military might.

Stop To Consider

Origin of diplomacy in Asia

In Asia, the ancient India, with its kingdom and dynasties had a long tradition of diplomacy. Kautilya's *Arthashastra* is regarded as one of the oldest treatise on statecraft and diplomacy. *Arthashastra* is a complete work on the art of kingship, with long chapters on taxation and on the raising and maintenance of armies. It incorporates a theory of diplomacy, of how in a situation of mutually contesting kingdoms, the wise king builds alliances and tries to checkmate his adversaries. The Chinese had also practiced diplomatic relations. They had sent envoys into central Asia, India and Persia starting with Zhang Qian in the 2nd century B.C. Another notable event in Chinese diplomacy was the Chinese embassy mission of Zhou Daguan to the Khmer Empire of Cambodia in the 13th century. Since the Tang Dynasty (618–907 AD), the Chinese started sending diplomatic envoys abroad on maritime missions into the Indian Ocean, to India, Persia, Arabia, East Africa, and Egypt. Chinese maritime activity was increased dramatically during the commercialized period of the Song Dynasty, with new nautical technologies, many more private ship owners, and an increasing amount of economic investors in overseas ventures. Since the 17th century, there was a series of treaties upheld by Qing Dynasty China and Czarist Russia, beginning with the Treaty of Nerchinsk in the year 1689. This was followed up by the Aigun Treaty and the Convention of Peking in the mid 19th century.

Diplomatic relations within the Early Modern era of Asia were depicted as an environment of prestige and status. It was maintained that one must be of noble ancestry in order to represent an autonomous state within the international arena. Therefore the diplomats were regarded as the elitist class within Asia. Diplomats in Asia were originally sent only for the purpose of negotiation. They would be required to immediately return after their task was completed. The majority of diplomats initially constituted the relatives of the ruling family. A high rank was bestowed upon them in order to present a sense of legitimacy with regard to their presence. Italy, the Ottoman Empire, and China were the first real states that perpetuated environments of diplomacy. During the early modern era diplomacy evolved to become a crucial element of international relations within the Mediterranean and Asia. As European power spread around the world in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries so too did its diplomatic model and system become adopted by Asian countries.

SAQ

Discuss the importance of cultural diplomacy in improving India-Pakistan diplomatic relations. (80 words)

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

- *Gunboat diplomacy*- Gunboat diplomacy refers to the pursuit of foreign policy objectives by displaying a direct threat of warfare. The term comes from the age of colonialism where gunboats were a prominent type of warship. Gunboat diplomacy refers to the display of naval might. For example, the Don Pacifico Incident in 1850. The simple demonstration of force simply meant that the nations with naval power could easily establish military bases and arrange economically advantageous relationships around the world. Gunboat diplomacy was also a dominant way to establish new trade partners. In the modern context, gunboat diplomacy is considered a form of hegemony. US administration frequently uses this diplomacy to influence opinion in foreign capitals. In 1990 the Clinton administration used sea-launched Tomahawk missiles in the Yugoslav War.
- *Conference diplomacy*- Conference diplomacy refers to international conferences and the periodic meetings of regional and international organizations. In conference diplomacy leaders or representatives of more than two countries participate and is characterized by complicated rules of procedure. The Hague Conference of 1899 ad 1907 can be cited as early examples of conference diplomacy. A number of conferences followed in succession e.g. Paris Peace Conference (1918), Disarmament Conference at Washington (1922), Economic Conference

at Genoa (1922), Disarmament Conference at Geneva (1927), London Conference(1930) etc. the Casablanca Conference (1943), the Moscow Conference (1943), the Tehrn Conference (1943), the Bretton Woods Conference (1944), the Yalta Conference (1945), the San Francisco Conference (1945), etc are fine examples of conference diplomacy during wand after the Second World War. NPT Review Conference (1995), Conference on Disarmament that discussed the CTBT in 1996 are the latest examples of conference diplomacy.

Stop To Consider

Kautilya on Diplomacy

Kautilya believed that diplomacy will be practiced as long as the self interest of the state is served because every state acts in a way to maximize the power and self interest. According to him, diplomacy is a series of actions to conquer the nations with whom the diplomatic ties were created. He had a firm belief that a king who understands the rue implication of diplomacy conquers the whole world. Kautilya talked about six types of diplomacy-

- *Sandhi*- in this type the kings seek to accommodate each other and do not resort to hostile means. It could be temporary and permanent.
- *Vigraha*- this means hostility shown to neighbor or a state. As states are always at war and seek power, it is necessary to have this kind of diplomacy.
- *Asana*- this means indifference. It is applicable for those states which are neutral. It is also applicable in case of equal power.
- *Dvaidhibhava*- this means double policy. Kautilya advocates this for militarily superior states.
- *Samsarya*- this means protection. It is followed when a stronger state intervenes and shelters a weak state.
- *Yana*- this policy is to attack. Kautilya mentions that peace and stability make state powerful but never shies away from attacking the weak and unjust king.

- *Institutional diplomacy*-institutional diplomacy has come into existence with the rise of international and regional institutions like UN and its specialized agencies. Institutional diplomacy is a new kind of organized and permanent diplomacy. In this kind of diplomacy, international institutions conduct negotiations with a view to solving international conflicts and problems. The diplomatic efforts undertaken by UN from time to time with regard to various international crisis and conflicts are the foremost examples of institutional diplomacy. UN played an important role in ending Korean conflict in 1953. It also took steps to bring to an end the Congolese crisis of 1960 and the Middle East War in 1967.

UN is a kind of permanent international conference. The representatives of its member states are always posted at the headquarters of the organizations and it provides atmosphere for constant diplomatic negotiations. The UN provides a set framework which enables it to summon an international conference to discuss urgent issues at a short notice.

- *Parliamentary diplomacy*- Parliamentary diplomacy is a child of institutional diplomacy. The term was coined by a former US Secretary of State , Dean Rusk. He used it to describe what goes on in the UN General Assembly and its other organs. This type of diplomacy follows the procedures usually used by legislative bodies of democratic nations such as public debate, voting, decisions by majority vote, reporting out of committees etc. According to Rusk, parliamentary diplomacy is composed of a continuing organization, regular public debate exposed to mass media, a set of rules governing the procedures and formal conclusions expressed in resolutions passed by majority.

SAQ

Discuss the relevance of conference diplomacy in the modern world.
(40 words).

.....

- *Bilateral diplomacy*: Bilateral diplomacy tackles the bilateral issues and matters between two countries and neighbors. India and Pakistan, India and China, India and USA, US and Russia etc. meet at a number of times to sort out their differences.
- *Economic diplomacy*: The increasing liberalization, trends of globalization and the growth of regional trading blocks such as NAFTA, SAFTA, APEC, LAFTA, EU, WTO etc. have heightened interest in economic diplomacy. Economic diplomacy tries to tackle the economic issues like the use of sea-bed, establishment of a New International Economic Order, the international allocation of resources- energy, raw material technology, protection of intellectual property rights, foreign investment, joint ventures, economic aid, debt etc. which are of political importance as well. Economic methods are used both in times of war and peace. Economic diplomacy uses international trade, economic aid and assistance as tools in times of peace. But during the war time, economic measures are often used as a means of coercing the adversaries. During the war time a country tries to inflict economic hardship to its adversary through blockade. For example, Great Britain used naval blockades during the Napoleon War and the two World Wars. It gave rise to the idea of economic sanctions. The US, Japan and some other countries imposed economic sanctions on India and Pakistan when they exploded nuclear weapons in May 1998.

The capitalist countries became more powerful with the industrialization and liberalization. They began to exert pressure on their governments to find new markets. The diplomats started taking keen interest in furthering the commercial interests of their countries in other states.

A number of new posts such as commercial attaches, trade commissioners etc. have created diplomatic missions by countries as a result of growing importance of economic diplomacy.

- *Hi-tech diplomacy*: Information technology has revolutionized the every aspect of society including politics, commerce, defense and diplomacy. Mainstream culture of this century revolves round satellite television,

internet, cyberspace, and email, multimedia etc. Telecommuting creates virtual office at any place. Teleconferencing is the new buzzword. Email has overshadowed the earlier technologies of telex and fax. Technological changes have improved the security and the speed of communication between missions abroad and their government. Now the governments react much more quickly to the world events. They maintain a constant dialogue with their representatives abroad. The leaders now can speak to each other on hot lines to diffuse the crises.

- *Engagement diplomacy*: The engagement diplomacy denotes the specific practices of a contact between an international actor and a foreign public. Since January 2009, it has been widely used by the administration of President Barack Obama in the United States. In May 2009, the Obama administration announced the creation of a unit within the National Security Council responsible for coordinating diplomacy, aid and international communication called the Global Engagement Directive.
- *Freelance diplomacy*: Freelance diplomacy is a form of self-financing diplomatic representation used by countries who as a general rule, could not afford to hire expert diplomatic consultants full time. A 'Freelance Diplomat' is hired for a specific task or may sometimes be contracted on a permanent basis to run a Delegation, Mission or Embassy. They may also be used to promote investment into the country they work for. It is understood to be a performance based relationship, where the diplomat is paid on results only.
- *Facebook diplomacy*: The term Facebook diplomacy is coined in October 2008. It was used casually in connection with US President Barack Obama's electoral political campaigns' keen use of facebook and other social network websites. It describes the potential 'soft power' that can be created with social networking tools like Facebook. Facebook diplomacy and online activism can cause global awareness regarding any issue through the use of Facebook groups.

- *Multi-track diplomacy*: Joseph Montville in 1981 distinguished between the governmental and the non-governmental efforts of conflict resolution by naming them as track one and track two diplomacy. The multi track diplomacy is based on this original distinction between two tracks. The phrase ‘multi track diplomacy’ has been coined by Louise Diamond. Ambassador John W. McDonald expanded these two tracks into four separate tracks- a. Conflict resolution professionals, b. Business, c. Private citizen, d. Media. In 1991 Diamond and McDonald had added five new tracks and expanded the number of tracks to nine – a. Religion, b. Activism, c. Research, d. Training and education, e. Philanthropy. They recognized the relationship between various tracks and that is why they connected the tracks in a circle. No one track is more important than the other and no one track is independent of the others. They operate together as a system. There are 12 principles of multi track diplomacy-
 - Relationship- building strong interpersonal and inter-group relations throughout the fabric of society.
 - Long-term commitment- making an on-going commitment to people and to processes that may take years to come to fruition.
 - Cultural synergy- respecting the cultural wisdom of all the parties and welcoming the creative interaction of different cultural ways.
 - Partnership- modeling collaborative process by partnering with local parties and with other institutions and coalitions.
 - Multiple technologies- utilizing a variety of technologies as appropriate and creating new methods as needed to meet the unique needs of each situation.
 - Facilitation- assisting parties in taking responsibility for their own dreams and destiny.
 - Empowerment- helping people become empowered agents of exchange and transformation within their societies.

- Action research- learning from all that we do and sharing that learning with others.
- Invitation- entering the system where there is an invitation and an open door.
- Trust- building relationships of mutual trust and caring within the system.
- Engagement- acknowledging that once we enter a system we become a unique part of it- an engaged, caring and accountable partner.
- Transformation- catalyzing changes at the deepest level of beliefs, assumptions and values as well as behaviours and structures.

Stop To Consider

Some other types of diplomacy

Panda diplomacy: Panda diplomacy refers to China's use of Giant Pandas as diplomatic gifts to their countries. For example, Empress Wu Zetian of Tang Dynasty sent a pair of Pandas to the Japanese Emperor. From 1958 to 1982, China gave 23 Pandas to nine different countries. In 1972, Mao TSE Dong, gifted two Pandas, Ling- Ling and Hsing Hsing to American President Richard Nixon. This was seen as an enormous diplomatic success. Other rare animals are also appear as political or diplomatic gifts. For example, in 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, China's Central Government has given five Chinese Sturgeons to Hong Kong.

Public diplomacy: The term public diplomacy has been coined in 1960s. It describes the conduct of foreign policy by engagement with foreign publics. Public diplomacy focuses on the ways in which a country communicates with citizens in other societies.

Regional diplomacy: It describes the conduct of relations between states within an identifiable geographic region. For eg. EU, ASEAN etc. This diplomacy is practised within a closed circle of neighboring states.

Shuttle diplomacy: Shuttle diplomacy refers to the existence of an intermediary between parties in a dispute. It involves successive travel or shuttling by the intermediary. The term was first used by USA's Secretary of States Henry Kissinger in 1973. In 2008, shuttle diplomacy was performed by Mathew Nimtez between Greece and the Republic of Macedonia to resolve Macedonia Naming Dispute.

Check Your Progress

1. Mention two differences between Bilateral and multilateral diplomacy.
2. Define multi- track diplomacy?
3. On what grounds parliamentary diplomacy differs from institutional diplomacy?
4. What is the full form of APEC?
5. How does Facebook diplomacy help in improving diplomatic relations?

2.6 Relationship between Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

Though the terms foreign policy and diplomacy are often used identically yet they carry different meanings. It cannot be denied that there is a close relationship between foreign policy and diplomacy. But it would be certainly wrong to assume that the two are identical. Diplomacy is not the policy but the agency that gives effect to it. Foreign policy and diplomacy cannot act without the cooperation of the other. Foreign policy is the aggregate of decisions made by a government regarding a state's position vis-à-vis other states and its posture in international institutions and conferences. Diplomacy is the instrument through which the foreign policy is implemented. Foreign policy represents the substance of foreign relations while diplomacy provides the personnel and the machinery for the implementation of foreign policy. Diplomats are solely concerned with the implementation of the foreign policy and are not connected with its formulation.

Foreign policy is based on a general conception of national requirements. Diplomacy on the other hand, is the means to prevent major conflicts arising between sovereign states. Diplomacy is the agency through which the foreign policy seeks to attain its purpose by agreement rather than by war. Though the terms foreign policy and diplomacy are used interchangeably yet they are technically different. Foreign policy is the business of governments whereas diplomacy is the job of trained officials. Foreign policy is the substance whereas diplomacy is the method. Diplomacy is the process by which foreign policy is carried out.

Though foreign policy and diplomacy differ from each other yet it cannot be denied that they exercise profound influence on each other. A sound foreign policy may be ruined by a weak diplomacy as a bad foreign policy may be worked out effectively by a strong and effective diplomacy. Instead of all these differences, both are interdependent and complementary to each other. There is a close relation between foreign policy and reporting and negotiation function of diplomacy. The reports and feedback of the ambassadors and negotiations carried on different world capitals greatly influence the foreign policy decisions.

Improved methods and communication have narrowed down the gap between foreign policy and diplomacy because constant contact between the home government and the diplomat ensures much greater conformity to the instructions given by the home government. Now-a-days a situation has been created in which policymakers have become implementers of their own policies and thus a perfect distinction between policy making and policy management has become rather difficult to be defined.

Diplomacy is the instrument by which foreign policy of a nation travels beyond its borders and establishes contacts with other nations. Diplomacy tries to secure the goals of foreign policy. Diplomacy is also an input of foreign policy. The diplomats sketch world view to prepare reports which are valuable sources of foreign policy making. The modes of operation and quality of diplomacy always effect the operational quality and efficiency of a foreign policy. In late 1960's the contacts between Indian and Chinese diplomats helped the emergence of a definite trend towards normalisation of Sino-Indian relations. Diplomacy is one of the major instruments or techniques of executing foreign policy. Diplomats are the officials who practice methods or techniques of diplomacy in achieving foreign policy goals.

Stop To Consider

The Rules of Diplomacy:

There are certain rules which the diplomats are expected to follow while maintaining diplomatic relations. These are as follows-

- **Be realistic.** It is important to have goals and solutions that are reachable. The diplomats should keep in mind that other countries have their own needs to worry about.
- **Be careful about what you say.** The diplomats need to plan the communiqués carefully. The words they choose could make all the difference to another country. The diplomats should use diplomatic language!
- **Seek common ground.** Disputes begin negotiations; finding the common ground is the pathway to a solution. Diplomats should think about what compromises they are willing to make that may be attractive to the other countries. Be flexible (but stay in character)!
- **Understand the other side.** The diplomats need to look at the issue through the other country's eyes. Part of this is understanding the viewpoint of other countries and their economic, demographic and cultural differences.
- **Be patient.** Being overly anxious to come to an agreement can make the other country think that they are weak, can pressure them into saying no, and can lead to bad decisions.
- **Leave avenues of retreat open.** Countries do not like to be in a position where they are being ordered to do something without any options.

SAQ

How does diplomacy influence the foreign policy of a country? (40 word)

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2.7 Summing up

This unit has helped you to understand that diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of groups or states. It usually refers to the conduct of international relations through the intercession of professional diplomats with regard to issues of peace-making, trade, war, economics, culture, environment and human rights. We have also learned about old and new diplomacy and their characteristics. After reading this unit you have also learnt that there are various kinds of diplomacy like appeasement diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, economic diplomacy, facebook diplomacy etc. This unit has helped you understanding the relation between foreign policy and diplomacy which are interdependent. Diplomacy is the instrument of executing foreign policy. It is worth mentioning that despite a change in its role and functions, diplomacy still continues to be a valuable instrument of international relations. It continues to be an important element of both national power and foreign policy. A change or decline in its role does not mean that diplomacy stands rejected as an instrument of international relations. Diplomacy in its new form, the new diplomacy, continues to be regarded as one of the most important means of securing national interest as well as for preserving peace against war. So long as the need to eliminate, or at least to reduce the chances of war remains, the dependence on diplomacy as a means for the conduct of relations is bound to be accepted by all the nations. With its new dress, diplomacy can be successfully used as a valuable instrument for the resolution of conflict among nations. Diplomacy can be further developed and used as an instrument for preserving peace through accommodation as well as device for crisis management among different nations.

2.8. References and Suggested Readings

Kumar, M. *Theoretical Aspects of International Relations*. Delhi: S L Agarwal & Company, 2005.

Johari, J. C. *International Politics and Relations*. Delhi: Sterling Publishers Privet Ltd, 2003.

Chandra, P. *International Relations*. Delhi: Bookhivers, 2008.

Links

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diplomacy>

http://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/9962/1/MPRA_paper_9962.pdf

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diplomacy>

<http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/history.htm>

<http://kids.britannica.com/comptons/article-234286/diplomacy>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Types_of_diplomacy

* * * * *

**Institute of Distance and Open Learning
Gauhati University**

MA in Political Science

Paper II

International Politics: Theoretical Aspects

Block 4

Disarmament and Arms Control



Contents:

Block Introduction–

Unit 1 : Disarmament and Arms Control

Unit 2 : Regimes of Arms Control

Contributors:

Dipankar Saikia (Units 1)	:	Counsellor in Political Science IDOL, GU
Rumi Roy (Units 2)	:	Research Scholar Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

Course Co-ordination

Dr. Kandarpa Das	:	Director IDOL, GU
Barnalee Choudhury	:	Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU

Editorial Team

Content Editing	:	Barnalee Choudhury Lecturer in Political Science IDOL, GU
Format Editing	:	Prasenjit Das Editor in Charge IDOL, GU
Language Editing	:	Sanghamitra De Lecturer in English IDOL, GU

Cover Page Designing:

Kaushik Sarma	:	Graphic Designer CET, IITG
---------------	---	-------------------------------

May, 2010

© Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University. Further information about the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University courses may be obtained from the University's office at BKB Auditorium (1st floor), Gauhati University, Guwahati-14. Published on behalf of the Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University by Dr. Kandarpa Das, Director and printed at Maliyata Offset Press, Mirza. Copies printed 1000.

Acknowledgement

The Institute of Distance and Open Learning, Gauhati University duly acknowledges the financial assistance from the Distance Education Council, IGNOU, New Delhi for preparation of this material.

Block Introduction:

In the contemporary period, armament and war are regarded as the biggest threats to mankind because of the total destructive power which may endanger human existence. Hence, the immediate need is to strengthen international peace, security and development by eliminating and reducing armament and the chance of war. Arms race aggravates the struggle for power through the fear it generates and the burden it imposes. Through disarmament and arms control, attempts have been made to establish peace and security in the world. Therefore, the preservation of international peace and security through disarmament and arms control constitutes a very popular approach of international relations

In this block we shall deal with the concepts of 'disarmament' and 'arms control' as well as the attempts made from time to time in this regard. It needs to be mentioned here that though arms control and disarmament are used interchangeably, the meaning of the terms are different. The former seeks to limit weapons in certain agreed ways (e.g., quantity, range, lethality, transparency etc.), while the latter aims at the physical elimination of agreed types of weapons, or the mutual commitments to prohibit the production of weapons. Race for armaments has increased in the cold war period. Various steps have been taken for disarming the countries of the world. But at the same time many countries of the world opted for nuclearisation. Therefore, disarmament and arms control have become the need of hour. However, complete disarmament is not possible to achieve. Therefore, emphasis has been laid on arms control. Through the different regimes of arms control, attempt has been made to transform the fundamental character of international relations into a global system based on co-operation.

In unit I of this block, we shall discuss the concepts of disarmament and arms control. Here our attempt is to study the meaning of disarmament, arms control and the relation between disarmament and arms control. Here we shall make an attempt to deal with the necessity for disarmament. In this unit, we also plan to discuss the efforts necessary for disarmament and arms control and the obstacles that stand in the way of disarmament and arms control as well as nuclear non-proliferation.

In unit II, we will discuss the perceptions and interests associated with the steps in arms control and examine the opportunities and obstacles for their implementation. In this unit, we will also examine the origins of nuclear proliferation and its impact on international security and the major pillars of modern nuclear non-proliferation and arms control. Here our attempt is to focus on how the regulation of nuclear weapons under the multilateral treaties offers a case in point which will be seen in the discussion around the various treaties.

In this block we have two units.

Unit 1: Disarmament and Arms Control

Unit 2: Regimes of Arms Control

Unit 1

Disarmament and Arms Control

Contents :

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Meaning of Disarmament and Arms Control
- 1.4 Relation between Arms Control and Disarmament
- 1.5 Necessity for Disarmament
- 1.6 Steps towards Disarmament and Arms Control
 - 1.6.1 First Phase (1960-70)
 - 1.6.2 Second Phase (1970-80)
 - 1.6.3 Third Phase (1980-2000)
- 1.7 Hindrances in the Way of Disarmament
- 1.8 Nuclear Non-proliferation
- 1.9 Summing up
- 1.10 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction

In the previous blocks of this paper, we have read the scope and nature of international relation as well as the importance of power as a theme of international politics. We have also learnt that the modern states try to enhance their power through foreign policies and diplomatic relation. In the contemporary scenario, much emphasis has been laid on the efforts to establish peace as the world has witnessed the devastations caused by the world wars. Therefore, we can say that now peace, security and development are the cardinal objectives of mankind and the cherished goals of all nations. Today armament and war are regarded as the biggest threats to mankind because of the total destructive power which may endanger human existence. Thus the immediate task for us is to strengthen international peace, security and development by eliminating and reducing armament and the chance of war. The preservation of international peace and security through disarmament and arms control constitutes a very popular approach of international relations.

In this unit we shall discuss at length Disarmament and Arms Control. We shall study the meaning of disarmament, arms control and the relation between disarmament and arms control. Here, we shall make an attempt to deal with the necessity for disarmament. Besides, we shall discuss about the efforts for Disarmament and Arms control and the obstacle that stands in the way of it. Moreover, in this unit, we will also discuss the Nuclear - Non Proliferation.

1.2 Objectives

As armament and war are the greatest threats to mankind in the contemporary scenario, the need of the hour is the attempts to strengthen international peace, security and development by eliminating and reducing armament and the chance of war. Disarmament and arms control, therefore, appears to be the panacea to ensure international peace and security.

After reading this unit you will be able to

- *explain* the meaning of disarmament and arms control
- *discuss* the necessity of disarmament and arms control
- *examine* the major obstacles of disarmament and arms control
- *discuss* the efforts for disarmament and arms control
- *describe* the meaning of Nuclear -Non Proliferation

1.3 Meaning of Disarmament and Arms Control

In contemporary scenario, the production of armaments having the capacity of total destruction of every idea of life on this earth has assumed a highly dangerous proportion. Disarmament and arms control stands for the elimination, reduction and control of armaments. Disarmament connotes the idea of the limitation or reduction or control of armament. It refers to the reduction of war material and personnel to international agreements. Hence, it can be said that in the field of international relations, disarmament stands for the reduction of military force, military manpower, military budgets and other purely military factors.

According to Morgenthau, "Disarmament is the reduction or elimination of certain or all armaments for the purpose of ending the armament race". According to V.V Dyke, "Any regulation or limitation having to do with armed power is treated as a measure of disarmament".

The concept of disarmament has come to develop several dimensions and interpretations-

General Disarmament - It is the kind of disarmament in which all nations participate.

Local Disarmament - It means disarmament by a limited number of nations.

Quantitative Disarmament - It stands for an overall reduction of armaments of most or all types of weapons.

Qualitative Disarmament - It envisages the reduction of or abolition of only special types of armaments.

Conventional Disarmament - It refers to the elimination and reduction of conventional weapons.

Nuclear Disarmament - It advocates the liquidation of nuclear weapons.

Comprehensive and General Disarmament - It means the reduction of armaments of all types by all nations.

Total Disarmament - It implies the ultimate achievement of a world order free from all human and material instrumentalities of warfare.

We can, therefore, say that disarmament means elimination or reduction of armaments for preventing war in international level. Disarmament includes everything from the total elimination of all weapons to the regulation or control of only some kind of (offensive and totally destructive) weapons.

Now let us deal with the concept of arms control. The term disarmament and arms control often seem confusing and are regarded as identical. However, there exists a subtle difference between the two. Arms Control is a generic term and it includes any kind of cooperation with respect to armaments which will curtail the arms race, reduce the possibility of war or limit its scope and violence. It includes unilateral decisions of states, informal understanding among them and formally negotiated and institutionalized

agreements. The stress is on reducing the incentives rather than the capacity for war. Thus, we can see that 'Arms Control' entails the limitation of certain types of weapons or reduction of armaments. It covers all international accords and measures to regulate the use of arms which may be permitted and to enforce the observance of prohibited action such as the possession of certain weapons.

Check Your Progress

1. What do you mean by Disarmament?
2. How will you distinguish between Quantitative and Qualitative disarmament?
3. Define Comprehensive and General Disarmament.
4. Define Arms Control.

1.4 Relation between Disarmament and Arms Control

After reading the above section, we have got an idea about the meaning of 'Disarmament and Arms Control'. We have also learnt that both the concepts have different meanings. However, disarmament and arms control are complementary and supplementary to each other. In this section, we will discuss the relationship between disarmament and arms control.

- Without arms control, disarmament can serve no enduring and useful purpose.
- Any scheme for reducing or abolishing the existing armaments is bound to remain incomplete without the provision for a scheme for future control and regulation of armament race or production of weapons.
- Arms control in itself can serve no meaningful purpose without first providing for reducing or eliminating the existing stockpiles of weapons. Arms Control is a condition of disarmament just as disarmament is a necessity for arms control.
- Moreover, the basic objective of disarmament and arms control is identical i.e. to prevent, limit or reduce the probability of the illegitimate use of force and violence in international society.

Thus, both disarmament and arms control can go a long way in securing the freedom of mankind from war, aggression and weapons. Let us now discuss the differences between disarmament and arms control-

- Disarmament refers to the reduction of war material and personnel in accordance with international agreements. Arms control refers to all the international agreements and measures for regulating the use of arms which may be permitted.
- Disarmament seeks to liquidate or destroy the existing weapons. Arms control refers to an agreed and desired regulation of the future production and use of armaments.
- Disarmament means a plan or a system for limitation, reduction or abolition of armed forces including their arms, equipments, bases and budgets. On the other hand, arms control refers to a multilateral cooperative approach to armament policy for the reduction and limitation all or some kind of weapons, forces, development and utilisation in periods of relaxation or tension.

Thus both disarmament and arms control are different but intimately related concepts. World public opinion now fully accepts the urgent necessity of ensuring an end to the current threat to international peace and security and thus regards disarmament and arms control as the possible and effective means.

SAQ
 Is Disarmament necessary in the present world? Give arguments in favour of your answer. (20+80 words)

.....

.....

.....

1.5 Necessity for Disarmament

After discussing the relation between disarmament and arms control, now in this section we will discuss the need for disarmament. The necessity for disarmament and arms control can be supported on the following grounds-

- **Military Argument for Disarmament -**
 According to military argument, armament is the cause of war. History bears witness to the fact that high level of armaments leads to war as it aggravates

tensions and fears among nations ultimately resulting in war. It is also known that armaments lead to armament race and armament race leads to war. Hence armaments constitute the cause of war and by eliminating the cause through disarmament, war can be eliminated.

In the words of Coheen, "Armaments aggravate tension and fear among nations. By releasing tension and fear, disarmament should facilitate and strength the process of peaceful settlement"

- Economic Arguments for Disarmament -

The economic argument holds that the burden of armament must be reduced so that economic resources may be diverted to the economic development of the world and international cooperation. It believes that progress in disarmament is essential for peace and development. The basic argument here is that through disarmament, the large amount of funds currently being wasted on the fruitless and dangerous production of armaments can be saved and used for better cause. These funds can be used for general welfare and developmental purposes. With nearly trillion dollars spent on arms, we can dramatically reduce hunger, disease, poverty and illiteracy in the world.

This argument further says that the increasing amount spent on arms boosts inflation, drains scarce resources, inhibits advance in civilian technology and lowers the standard of living. It does not promote development or generate employment or contribute to social growth.

- Moral Argument for Disarmament-

Another strong and philosophically the most effective argument in favour of disarmament is the moral argument. It holds that war as well as the preparation of war corrupts human morally. We all know that war is evil and immoral because it involves killings. Since armaments are the means of war, these can also be regarded as evil. The production of armament is the beginning of the immoral process of war. Hence, elimination of war demands elimination of arms and armament race first.

- Disarmament, a Universal Need-

A practical argument and indeed a strong argument in favour of disarmament is that the present craze for armaments is aggravating and making mankind

more and more dependent on machines or more specifically on war machines. It has increased the risk of an all destructive accidental war. The growing dangers of modern electronic warfare pose the biggest threat to human race in the form of an accidental war leading to total destruction. The need of the hour is to take a timely action in favour of disarmament and arms control.

Therefore, we can say that on military, economic and moral grounds, the nations in the world should opt for disarmament. It is a universal need which will lead to proper development of the world.

Check Your Progress

1. Fill in the gaps

- a) War is aneed.
- b).....is the cause of war.
- c) Elimination of war demands elimination of
.....and.....

2. Write two differences between disarmament and arms control.

3. Write three arguments in favour of disarmament.

Stop To Consider

History of Disarmament

Of all the attempts to achieve peace through limitation, the more persistent has been that of disarmament. Historically, disarmament has been a subject of special pleading by reformers. Immanuel Kant's "Perpetual Peace" (1795) is a pioneering work in this respect. Later on, in 1816, the Czar of Russia proposed to the British Government for the simultaneous reduction of the armed forces of every kind. In 1831, France made similar proposals to all nations. Napoleon III made similar proposals repeatedly in 1863, 1867 and 1869. Other attempts of this nature were made in 1870 by Britain and in 1877 by Italy. All these attempts, however, failed and remained on paper only.

The only successful attempt in this regard was the Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817 between USA and Canada. It limited the naval forces in the Great lakes to three vessels of equal tonnage and armament for each. The next

serious efforts were made at the two Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. But the resolutions passed were of no effect.

Disarmament Efforts after the First World War-

More consistent and serious efforts were made only after the First World War. An outstanding example of a venture in disarmament was the Washington Treaty of 1922 for limitation of naval armaments. The next step was the General Naval Conference of 1927 but it failed. The London Naval Conference of 1930 and 1935-36 limited maximum size of naval vessels.

Disarmament Efforts under The League of Nations-

Article 8 of the League Covenant declares that "the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety.....". The establishment of the Preparatory Commission for Disarmament Conference by the council in 1925 put the League on the long road that led its supreme attempt at limiting national armaments - the Geneva Disarmament Conference. The World Disarmament conference met from 1932 to 1934 at Geneva which was attended by 61 nations but it failed miserably.

The knowledge of the history of disarmament is going to help you comprehend the efforts made for disarmament. Moreover, it will also give you an idea about the importance of disarmament in the history of world.

1.6 Steps towards Disarmament and Arms Control

As we have seen, various steps have already been taken towards disarmament and arms control. Thus, realising the urgent need for securing international peace and security and accepting disarmament and arms control as the important means, the decision to incorporate provisions for disarmament and arms control in the UN charter was taken.

The first resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 24th January 1946 was devoted to disarmament. The first General Assembly also created the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) comprising of the permanent members of the Security Council and Canada. At the first meeting

of the Commission, US put forth the Baruch Plan (1946) for creating an International Atomic Development authority. In 1947, the Security Council set up a Commission for Conventional Armament (CCA). However no success could be achieved between 1948 and 1952. After the failure of AEC and CCA the UN General Assembly appointed a committee of twelve members for suggesting ways and means for combining these two commissions and created a Disarmament Commission (DC). In 1959, Khrushchev gave a proposal for a general and complete disarmament within four years and a non-aggression pact between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO countries.

By the late sixties the UN had run into a "stable stalemate" on the question of armament. The great powers discarded the goal of general disarmament and started arms control negotiations without the United Nations, because by that time the United Nations had become a battle ground of the Cold War where rival powers presented ambitious schemes for "general and complete disarmament."

In the following sections we will deal with some of the notable agreements regarding arms control and disarmament.

1.6.1 First Phase (1960-70)

- Antarctic Treaty (1959) - This treaty has freezed all territorial claims in the Antarctica region and for the first time put in practice the concept of a nuclear free-zone
- Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963) - This treaty is the first global agreement to protect the environment and is partly intended to erode the growing opposition to nuclear weapon tests. It has reduced the dangers of radioactive fallout by restricting the test to underground.
- Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT) (1963) - A Partial Test Ban treaty was signed at Moscow in August, 1963. The main features of the treaty were - a). no signatory state should carry out any nuclear test in atmosphere, outer space and underwater, b). no signatory state should undertake any nuclear test in territorial waters and high seas and c). each signatory state should refrain from encouraging either directly or indirectly the non - signatory states from carrying out nuclear test.

- **Outer Space Treaty (1967)** - This treaty prohibits the stationing of nuclear arms in outer space and their landing on the moon and other celestial bodies for military bases. This treaty made outer space a common property of mankind and also called for a peaceful exploration and sharing of outer space.
- **Non - Proliferation Treaty (NPT) (1968)** - By the end of 1960's a new era began which may be described as a period of 'Détente'. The process of detente continued in the 1970's, resulting in various arms control agreements and the Non - Proliferation Treaty is the major among them. The NPT aims at prevention of multiplication of nuclear powers. It came into force in 1970 when forty four non - nuclear and three nuclear powers completed the process of ratification. In the following unit we shall discuss NPT further.

Stop to Consider:

The Major Features of the NPT:

- a. NPT obliged all nuclear powers not to disseminate nuclear knowledge and transfer nuclear weapons to the non - nuclear states.
- b. Nuclear powers agreed to give all information and material to all the non-nuclear nations agreed to sign NPT and thereby committed them to the peaceful use of nuclear energy.
- c. Nuclear Countries agreed to give protection to non - nuclear states in case the latter were subjected to any nuclear attack, actual or threatened.
- d. Non - nuclear nations had to accept inspection and supervision of their nuclear establishments.

Despite having all these provisions, NPT failed to check the armament race among nuclear powers and lead to a full and general Nuclear Disarmament in the world.

1.6.2 Second Phase (1970-80)

- **Sea - Bed Treaty (1972)** - This treaty bans the use of nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction from the sea bed. It was first signed by US, Britain and USSR and later signed by more than ninety countries.

It was the first step towards complete demilitarisation of the sea. The ban applies to the entire sea - bed beyond the 19kms limit which every coastal state claims as territorial waters.

- Biological Weapons Convention (1972) - A "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin or weapons and on their destruction was signed on 10th April, 1972 at London, Moscow and Washington. By the convention, the signatory states agreed to refrain from developing, producing, stockpiling or otherwise acquiring or retaining microbial or other biological agents or toxin weapons, equipment or means of delivery designed to use such agents or toxins for hostile purposes or in an armed conflict. They agreed to destroy or divert to peaceful purpose all agents, toxins, weapons, equipment and means of delivery within nine months of the enforcement of the convention. Moreover, they were not supposed to encourage or assist any state or organisation of states to manufacture or acquire such weapons.
- Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty - I (SALT-I) (1972) - In the era of detente, which had its beginning in early 1970's, the two superpowers initiated attempts for the promotion of bilateral cooperation and entered into Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. It conveyed issue of regulation of those weapons of mass destruction with which each super power could directly destroy the other. After hard bargaining, the two super powers were successful in reaching SALT I agreement.

The agreement broadly consisted of two treaties - i) Treaty on the limitations of ABM system and ii) The Interim Agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms.

The ABM system Treaty permitted each super power to have only two sites for ballistic missile defence - one for the protection of their national capital and area and the other for the protection of the field of ICMs . It also fixed the dimensions of the ABM systems of two countries. The Interim Agreement on Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms covered both land based ICMs and Submarines Launched ballistic Missiles.

- US - Soviet Arms Pact (1974) - By this pact signed in July 1974, both the superpowers agree that for a period of ten years, the two countries shall limit the production of offensive nuclear weapons and shall not conduct underground nuclear test of more than 150 megaton. New limits of missile defense are also agreed upon.
- By another agreement of 1974, both the US and USSR agreed that the nuclear arsenals of the two countries shall be equal to all number of delivery vehicles.
- Convention on Prohibition of Military or other Hostile use of Environment Modification Techniques (1977) - The signatory states of this Convention signed at Geneva in May 1977, agreed not to engage in military or other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. They agreed upon to work for and cooperate with each other for the preservation, improvement and peaceful utilisation of the environment.
- Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) (1979) - SALT II agreement was signed by the two super powers at the Carter - Brezhnev meeting of 1979 at Vienna.

Stop to Consider:

The Major Features of SALT II are :

1. The treaty was to remain in force for five years.
2. The strategic arms of each side were to be limited for five years to a combined total of 2,250.
3. Under the overall ceiling of 2,250 a sub - ceiling of 1,320 was to be placed on Multiple Overheads (MIRVs) and for slowing down the introduction of new strategic weapons, each super power was to be permitted to test and deploy only one ICBM.

SALT II was designed as a measure to check nuclear weapons of mass destruction. In actual practice however SALT II failed to become operational.

1.6.3 Third Phase (1980-2000)

- Intermediate Nuclear Force Treaty (1987) - In 1987, the US president Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev signed the INF

treaty at Washington. This treaty became the first international agreement for reducing the development and deployment of existing nuclear weapons and hence marked the first step towards de-nuclearisation of the world.

- Conventional Arms Cut Treaty (1990) - European countries like the US and USSR signed a Conventional Arms Cut agreement at the Paris Summit and agreed to eliminate several thousand tanks, guns and APCs.
- Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I (1991) - The march towards arms control which got initiated by SALT I but got derailed after the failure of SALT II received a great leap forward when in 1991 the US and the USSR signed the historic START - I and agreed to reduce their nuclear arsenals by about 30 percent. By this treaty the US and the USSR agreed that each would have 1600 Strategic Nuclear Vehicles. While signing the START I, it was declared that in future no cold war shall take place between the East and the West. START I only limited the nuclear arms race. Moreover this treaty did not cover several types of weapons of mass destruction.
- START II (1993) - On 3 January 1993, The US and Russia signed the START II treaty. It sought to bring down the American nuclear stockpile to 1960's level and the Russian stockpile to mid -1970's level. It reduced 10,000 nuclear warheads of Russia and America to about 3,000 over a period of ten years. The agreement required the destruction of all land based multiple warhead missiles. It is the most far-reaching disarmament agreement ever concluded. START - I also contained provisions for the regulation of the order of re -equipment of reduced or limited components of strategic offensive armaments.
- Chemical Weapons Treaty (1993) - This treaty was meant to prevent the proliferation of chemical weapons. It was treated as the model disarmament treaty and was the most complete, universal and non - discriminatory disarmament treaty. It committed the countries to destroy their stockpiles of chemical weapons and refrain from producing and acquiring them. It banned the production, use, transfer and stockpiling of such weapons.
- ASEAN NFZ Treaty (1995) - In December 1995, the seven ASEAN nations have declared the South - East Asian region as a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone.

- African Nuclear Free Zone Declaration (1996) - On April 1996, forty nine nations signed a treaty pledging not to build, test or stockpile nuclear weapons and not to bury imported nuclear waste. This NWFZ Treaty is also termed as Pelindaba Treaty.
- Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)(1996) - In 1996, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was signed. It sought to ban all nuclear tests in future. However, it permitted the states having nuclear weapon to maintain their nuclear stockpiles as well as to undertake further research and improvement through laboratory testing and computer simulations. It further called upon the non - nuclear weapon states and the nuclear-threshold states to open their nuclear power reactors and other installations for international inspection. Countries like India described this treaty as unequal, discriminatory and inadequate because it did not provide for a nuclear disarmament programme. India refused to sign it and currently CTBT is virtually in a cold storage.
- Nuclear Waste Treaty (1997) - A new international Convention requiring countries with nuclear facilities to comply with high standards of radioactive waste management was signed in 1997. This was entitled Joint Convention on Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on safety of Radioactive Management. The Convention held that in principle, the nuclear waste generated in a country should be disposed of in the same country.
- Landmines Ban Treaty (1997) - In September 1997, delegates of about ninety countries formally adopted a draft treaty banning anti - personnel landmines. The treaty was aimed at banning the use, sale, stockpiling, transport and production of landmines. It defined such mines as those "designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact to a person and that will incapacitate, injure or kill one or more persons".
- Expansion of Nuclear Club (1998) - In 1998, a horizontal expansion of nuclear club took place when India, after conducting five underground nuclear tests on 11th and 13th May, 1998 declared herself to be a nuclear weapon state.

Check Your Progress

1. Fill in the gaps
 - a) The Partial Test Ban Treaty was signed in.....
 - b) The full form of NPT is.....
3. What are the two treaties included in Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty I?
4. What are the main features of SALT II?
5. Why did India refuse to sign CTBT?

1.7 Hindrances in the Way of Disarmament

After going through the above section, we come to know that various agreements and conventions have been passed for disarmament in different periods. However, the success achieved in the field of disarmament and arms control is minimal. In the light of above mentioned agreements, conventions and declarations, we can share Morgenthau's observation that "the history of attempt at disarmament is a story of many failures and few successes."

There are several factors that have been hindering the process of desirable success in securing disarmament and arms control in international relations. In the following section, we will discuss the factors leading to the failure of disarmament.

- **Faith In Armament** - The first hindrance is the view that supports armaments as an essential means for the exercise of power of the state. States continue to depend on armaments and are not likely to give them up or accept serious restrictions on these until alternative means of serving their interest and purposes have been established.
- **The Problem of Ratios Of Strength** - Another big hindrance in the way of disarmament is the fact that agreement on disarmament presupposes agreement on ratios of strength of weapons and armed establishment of various nations. There exists no scientific basis for fixing the ratios of strength among weapons. Armaments and armed establishments which the different states possess makes it very difficult to make a decision regarding the allocation of different quantities and types of armament to different nations within the agreed ratio.

- The Problem of Implementation of Agreements on Ratio - Even if there are agreements on the ratios of power prevailing among states seeking disarmament, there will still be great obstacles to disarmament. Different states are bound to have more or less power in international relations. This is bound to be there because military factor itself is always dependent upon several factors. Nations with allocated ratios of armaments and military power are bound to be motivated differently in favour or against war. Hence even the fixation of ratio of strength of armaments cannot fully solve the problem of disarmament.
- Sense of Insecurity Among Nations - Another big hindrance in the way of disarmament is the sense of insecurity among nations. Armament is considered to be the source and symbol of security and disarmament is regarded as a condition which can lead to insecurity.
- Continued Distrust Among Nations - The existence of strong distrust among several nations makes it difficult for the international community to opt for disarmament and arms control. The disarmament plans offered by various nations from time to time are mostly based on fear and distrust and thus these agreements contain several reservations.

In the words of Schleicher, "If there were perfect trust among nations, arms would be unnecessary and disarmament would not be a problem."
- Political Rivalry And Disputes - The existence of strong political rivalry and disputes among nations has been a potent hindrance in the way of disarmament. Political rivalry among the states has been a source of armament race in international relations and in this way it has acted as a stumbling block in the way of disarmament and arms control.

Besides these six key hindrances, the following factors stand as hindrances in the path of disarmament and arms control -

- (a) The highly dynamic nature of military technology also stands as a hindrance in the path of disarmament and arms control.
- (b) The importance of armament industry in the existing international economic system constitutes another hindrance in the path of disarmament.
- (c) The continued love for narrowly conceived national sovereignties has been acting as a general hindrance in the way of disarmament.

- (d) Another major hindrance in the way of disarmament and arms control in the contemporary era of international relations happens to be the difference of approach of several nations towards the objective of disarmament and arms control.
- (e) Another hurdle in the way of disarmament is that sophisticated weapons are treated as status symbols or international currency of power.

SAQ

1. Discuss in details the ways to remove the obstacles in the way of disarmament and arms control. (80 words)

.....

.....

.....

1.8 Nuclear Non-proliferation

After discussing the major hindrances in the above section, now we attempt to discuss the most vital issue in contemporary scenario i.e. Nuclear Non - Proliferation.

We all know that the Second World War came to an end in August 1945, when the dropping of the atom bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki compelled Japan to surrender. However, the final end of the Second World War came with the opening of a potentially dangerous and destructive nuclear age. The highly destructive event also marked the beginning of an age with both immensely dangerous and totally destructive potentiality as well as a possibility for peaceful and developmental purposes.

The coming of the nuclear weapons acted as a source of formidable changes in international relations of the post - war period. Mankind found itself living with dangerous nuclear arms race and the presence of huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Originally only USA and USSR had nuclear weapons but later on three more nuclear states came to be identified as P - 5 nations i.e. nations in possession of N - Weapons with overkill capacity of Nuclear Weapon States (NWS). Between 1945 -1990, nuclear proliferation by the Nuclear Weapon States increased the destructive potentiality of the modern weapons by more than hundred times as compared to the two

atomic bombs dropped at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Nuclear Proliferation by five N - power acted as a source of massive and adverse impact on the nature of international relations. The non - nuclear states thus started demanding a comprehensive time bound nuclear disarmament programme followed by systematically organised and enforced nuclear arms control. The nuclear weapon states however believed and advocated that the immediate need was to check the attempt towards nuclear proliferation on the part of the non - nuclear nations in general and the threshold states in particular.

The adoption of the Moscow Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT) and the Nuclear Non - Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was designed to impose a non - proliferation regime on the non - nuclear nations. P - 5 always justified their own N - Weapon and N - Proliferation as necessary for their security. The non - nuclear states always opposed such moves as attempts at practising nuclear hegemony and nuclear imperialism by nuclear weapon states. The issue of Proliferation vs Non - Proliferation came to characterize international relations. As we all know nuclear weapons still continues to be a key issue in the 21st century.

Check Your Progress

1. Fill in the gaps
 - a) The second world war ended in
 - b) Originally only and had nuclear weapons.
2. What is the meaning of P- 5 Nations?
3. The full form of NWS is.....
4. Write three important obstacles in the way of disarmament.

1.9 Summing up

After reading this unit on disarmament and arms control, we are now in a position to discuss the concepts like disarmament and arms control. As peace, security and development are the cardinal objectives to achieve in contemporary scenario, disarmament and arms control seem to be the only

remedial measure to ensure world peace. Arms race aggravates the struggle to power through the fear it generates and the burdens it imposes. So, disarmament contributes to the improvement of the political situation by reducing political tensions. However since total disarmament could not be achieved, international society now strive for arms control and it is believed that arms control shall to some extent solve the problem of international peace and security. In this unit, we have witnessed the contribution disarmament makes to the establishment of international order and the preservation of international peace. Moreover, we have also been familiarized with the differences and relationships between these two concepts. The unit helps us to learn the steps taken for disarmament by the nations in different periods. Here, we have also addressed the various obstacles in the way of achieving complete disarmament as the idea of complete disarmament, though eminently desirable is not possible at present. After familiarizing you with the concepts of disarmament and arms control, on the next unit we will discuss in detail the various regimes of arms control for a comprehensive understanding of the role of disarmament and arms control in international politics.

1.10 References and Suggested Readings

1. Chandra, Prakash, Theories of International Relations Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi 2004
2. K.k, Ghai International Relations - A simple study of international Relations, Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi, 2007
3. Kumar, Mahendra Theoretical Aspects of international politics Shiva Lal Agarwala and Company, 1967
4. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations revised by Kenneth W Thompson Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi, 2000
5. Schuman, Fredrick L International Politics Vth edition, 1953

* * *

Unit 2

Regimes of Arms Control

Contents:

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Objectives
- 2.3 Regimes of Arms Control
 - 2.3.1 The Mutual Deterrence Programme
 - 2.3.2 The System of Strategic Stability
- 2.4 Different Talks and Treaties for Arms Control
 - 2.4.1 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START)
 - 2.4.2 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)
 - 2.4.3 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)
 - 2.4.4 Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT)
- 2.5 Proliferation and Nuclear Weapons, WMD.
 - 2.5.1 Anti-proliferation Measures
 - 2.5.2 Non-proliferation Measures Aftermath September, 11, 2001
- 2.6 Summing up
- 2.7 References and Suggested Readings

2.1 Introduction

In the previous unit of this block on disarmament and arms control, we have read that the existing arms control regimes were inherited from the period of cold war. It seems that now we are at the crossroads with options worth considering. Either we form a new concept of arms control to replace the one created during the cold war era of bipolar conflict, or the entire set of existing arms control agreements may become irrelevant and ineffective.

We also know that in recent years, arms control measures aiming to serve a broader goal of creating a multilateral anti-nuclear regime have become distanced from the original purposes. Its scope has come to include other types of arms as attempts are made to turn arms control into a universal

regime alongside trade, human rights, the environment etc. Taken together, these separate regimes aim to transform the fundamental character of international relations into a global system that institutionalizes cooperation. Commendable as this goal is, arms control has not lived up to its promise. It has failed to prevent the emergence of a second nuclear age. Proliferation of atomic weapons along with their spread has created a new nuclear age that is structurally different from the first. Thus, the present crisis of the arms control regime inherited from the cold war era presents not only a challenge but also an opportunity to maintain and strengthen the positive achievements of the previous period, to get rid of the institutionalized rules of rivalry and to build new mechanisms for the maintenance of peace and stability based on strong positive cooperation.

In this unit, we will discuss perceptions and interests associated with the steps for disarmament and arms control and explore opportunities and obstacles for their implementation. Here, our attempt unit is to examine the origins of nuclear proliferation and its impact on international security and the major pillars of modern nuclear non-proliferation and arms control. We will also focus on the multilateral treaties and their role under the regime of arms control

2.2 Objectives

Arms control occupies a significant position in the study of international politics in the present time. Realizing the ill-effects of war, the international community has emphasized on controlling arms race through various policies and regimes. After reading this unit you will be able to

- *discuss* the concepts of arms control
- *evaluate* the various policy measures under arms control.
- *analyse* the causes and consequences of nuclear proliferation.
- *examine* the multilateral treaties and their role under the regime of arms control

2.3 Regimes of Arms Control

We have already learnt in the first unit of this block that modern arms control regime took shape in the early 1960s when a loose collection of strategic concepts was linked together to manage the dangers arising from new technologies. It rested on three pillars.

- First, as disarmament was not the appropriate term, "arms control" was coined in the first place, to distinguish it from disarmament. Since the chance of war was believed to be directly related to the number of weapons, disarmament aimed to either cut the number of weapons or eliminate the whole reservoir of weapons. Reductions were seen as contributing to general welfare that needed little additional justification seen in the context of the menace of the new technologies. Arms control, in contrast, analyzed the relationship between the strategy and the goals of reducing the chance and damage of war.
- The second pillar of arms control was making a sharp distinction between ends and means. As Hedley Bull wrote in 1961:

It is commonly assumed that the only important questions that arise in connection with disarmament or arms control concern how it may be brought about. But the question must first be asked, what is it for? Unless there can be some clear conception of what it is that disarmament or arms control is intended to promote, and to what extent and in what ways it is able to do so, no disciplined discussion of this subject can begin.

To elaborate, nuclear weapons were known to be highly destructive but beneficial at the same time. From the perspective of disarmament, the tactical nuclear defence strategy was a disaster as it increased the number of nuclear weapons. Arms control (the means) called attention to the safe operation of the nuclear deterrent (the ends), and thereby lowered the chance of war.

The third pillar of arms control was creating a middle position between the extremes. In the early 1960s, a debate over U.S strategy was raging between those who believed that the U.S. arms race was more dangerous than the Soviet Union and those who believed that the Soviet regime was so malevolent that military power was the only way to deal with it. One of the most striking features of early arms control is the way it brought people

together. It was respectable to take a middle position and seek additional alternatives. The discussion highlighted the interests shared by the superpowers and the fact that disarmament might even increase the chances of war.

In recent years the pillars of arms control have been eroded, and in some cases broken down altogether. Under the auspices of arms control, now international community proposes for the reduction or elimination of nuclear weapons, land mines, cruise missiles, defensive missiles, chemical and biological weapons, small arms, and even military satellites. Attempts are also made to eliminate biological weapons.

It must be remembered here that identifying arms control with multilateral treaties overlooked that achievement of peace was possible without treaties and even without any mutual agreements. By going away from the original purposes of arms control, proponents of arms control also made it difficult to sustain a middle position on complicated questions of military strategy and national security. One was either an arms controller or an arms supporter. The gradual disappearance of a middle ground conversation was one of the most harmful consequences of the shift in the meaning of arms control.

Stop to Consider

Role of U.S and Soviet Union in Arms Control:

During the cold war arms control was understood as a set of rules accepted by the two superpowers engaged in a global confrontation, to ensure that their competition would be less risky, more predictable and less costly and at the same time to fix their special status in the international system. However, arms control was never meant to end the Soviet-US global rivalry; it had a much more limited purpose, namely, to regulate the competition between the Soviet Union and the USA by technical arrangements, establishing equal ceilings for certain weapon systems. Sometimes this ceiling could be as low as 'zero', but for the most part the limits were rather high, although still limiting the build-up of these weapons. Other agreements regulated certain types of military activity, for instance, non-deployment of nuclear weapons in space and non-

deployment of territorial anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems, a ban on nuclear tests in three environments or the limitations on military exercises. By agreeing on 'what is not to be done', Moscow and Washington created the negative rules of the game, because they felt free to engage in anything which was not specifically prohibited or restricted by these arrangements. We have also learnt that the process of arms control negotiations after the late 1960s dominated the Soviet-US diplomatic agenda. Nothing else was left for the two superpowers to talk about during the cold war era.

2.3.1 The Mutual Deterrence Programme

During the cold war, nuclear weapons acquired the function of deterrence i.e. preventing the use of the nuclear weapons and military force in general against each other. Instead of a war-fighting function, deterrence became the cornerstone rationale for nuclear weapons. It is not always recognized that the model of mutual nuclear deterrence and a 'pure' nuclear deterrence posture are not exactly similar. We must remember here that the nuclear deterrence posture may not be directed against a particular country, even if this country possesses nuclear weapons. For instance, while France and the UK rely on nuclear deterrence, they are not engaged in mutual nuclear deterrence vis-a-vis each other, even if they may sometimes strongly disagree on some issues. Nor is there mutual nuclear deterrence between the USA and each of these two countries. The nuclear deterrence model based on Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) is unique in that it exists only in Russian-US relations, not at the other layers. Both the superpowers subscribed to the mutual deterrence model developed after the Cuban missile crisis and was accepted by the USA and the USSR at the beginning of the 1990s. Both the sides codified the rules for managing the nuclear arms race between them.

Stop to Consider:

The main elements of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) system

- (a) A reliance on counter-force weapons
- (b) The theoretical possibility of a pre-emptive strike
- (c) Dependence on early warning;
- (d) Launch on warning

- (e) The possibility of horizontal and vertical escalation
- (f) The assumption that a strategic offensive capability is stabilizing and a defensive capability destabilizing
- (g) A decoupling of conventional from nuclear weapons and
- (h) 'Uncertainty' or a lack of transparency.

We have learnt that the cold war period required well-calculated strategic measures to permanently maintain the threat to the other side. Mutual nuclear deterrence is based on the philosophical premise that we posture nuclear weapons in a way that demonstrates our ability to act irrationally as by threatening to act irrationally we force the other side to behave rationally and not cross a certain threshold. This is 'a dialectical contradiction': we demonstrate that we can cross this threshold as a means to prevent the other side from doing so. The MAD concept was accepted and adopted as the highest wisdom. It was formalized and fixed by the 1991 and 1993 Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties (START I and START II, respectively) and the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM Treaty).

Check Your Progress

1. What do you mean by arms control regime?
2. What is nuclear deterrence?
3. Do you think arms control treaties have succeeded in controlling arms race in the present century?

2.3.2 The System of Strategic Stability

At the end of the cold war we had a regime imposed by the USA and the USSR and supported by arms control agreements. The discipline of the bipolar world rigidly maintained the inequality of the participants in international relations as the great majority of them were forbidden to do what was allowed for the nuclear superpowers. Any effort to openly violate these rules was (who could compete in an arms race with the Soviet Union and the USA) dangerous (the superpowers could launch a preventive attack). Furthermore, regional conflicts were immediately transformed into areas of confrontation of the superpowers supporting opposing parties but guaranteeing that conventional conflicts would not escalate into nuclear war.

The system of strategic stability during the cold war established different rules of the game for different countries i.e. a hierarchy of strategic stability with three levels.

- At the top level of the cold war nuclear strategic stability were the USA and the USSR whose posture was based on the MAD concept or mutual nuclear deterrence. The two superpowers developed the notion of their special privilege as the owners of 98 per cent of the nuclear weapons of the world.
- The middle level consisted of three other nuclear weapon states (China, France and the UK), which were restricted in their holding of nuclear weapons. A completely different set of rules applied to them, ensuring that they could not challenge the two superpowers.
- The third group was comprised of the rest of the world which by the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was prohibited from acquiring nuclear weapons. Although a dozen medium-size and small states had begun their own nuclear programmes, none of them decided to openly cross the nuclear threshold as the door to the nuclear club for them was tightly closed for them. The NPT regime legally consolidated the double standards of the superpowers and made it impossible to upgrade the status of all other countries, not only the nuclear states, but also Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany which had restored their economic power but were deprived of the opportunity to build up corresponding military muscle.

However, the management of arms control in a unipolar world will be a difficult task than the maintenance of strategic stability during the cold war. Therefore, the arms control regime of the 21st century will require new principles and methods. There is a need to create a new international security system by bringing together the former cold war rivals and the new contenders for power. Recent developments have demonstrated that, without the creation of a reliable international security system, events in the world arena could lead in an extremely dangerous direction. Although the present situation is dangerous, it is not hopeless.

For the reduction of arms and to establish a better world, various treaties negotiated in the second half of the 20th century seek to control nuclear weapons. These treaties, taken together, form a tenuous non-proliferation

and arms control fabric. Central to the creation and implementation of this framework of treaty is a commitment to nuclear disarmament by the official nuclear weapon states -- the US, Russia, China, France, and the UK, who together possess over 30,000 nuclear weapons. In addition, India, Israel, and Pakistan are known to have nuclear weapons, and others have pursued nuclear weapons. Whether the current non-proliferation and arms control regime can restrain nuclearisation will depend on how fully states abide by their obligations today and work to strengthen this regime in the future.

In the following section, we will discuss the major pillars of modern nuclear non-proliferation and arms control at current arsenals.

2.4 Different Talks and Treaties for Arms Control

After the havoc caused by the two World Wars, the world-community began to think about the reduction of arms race which became very important consideration after 1990s. The two contemporary super powers namely USA and USSR took the leading role and with the help of UNO, certain treaties were formulated to abolish World War III. The Third World countries including India, on the other hand, criticized those treaties as it was believed that they were meant to serve the purpose of the First World countries only. The reduction of arms race to some extent was possible through such treaties. But still we can see that the mass production and consequent proliferation of nuclear as well as other destructive weapons in the name of maintaining internal sovereignty and balance of power are becoming the most chosen option for countries like India and Pakistan. Such tendency has refuted many of the positive aspects of the various treaties. In the following section, we attempt to offer an analysis of some of the important and major treaties that have taken place amongst the world-community for arms control.

2.4.1 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty

START I

After almost 10 years of difficult negotiations, the United States and the Soviet Union signed the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) on 31

July 1991. Five months later, the Soviet Union dissolved and four independent states (Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia and Ukraine) with strategic nuclear weapons on their territory came into existence. In anticipation of the entry into force within a few months of signing the treaty, technical characteristic exhibitions of strategic ballistic missiles and distinguishability exhibitions of heavy bombers began in September 1991 and were completed in March 1992. Both sides also began eliminating their Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) and launchers, Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs) and launchers, and heavy bombers well in advance of START's anticipated entry of force date. Through the Lisbon Protocol to the START I Treaty signed on May 23, 1992, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia and Ukraine became Parties to the START I Treaty as legal successors to the Soviet Union. The breakup of the Soviet Union delayed START's entry into force nearly three-and-a-half years until Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine, which had inherited strategic nuclear weapons from the Soviet Union, ratified START and joined the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as non-nuclear states. On 5 December 1994, the parties exchanged instruments of ratification at the Budapest Summit.

START includes an intrusive verification regime consisting of a detailed data exchange, extensive notifications, 12 types of on-site inspection, and continuous monitoring activities designed to help verify that signatories are complying with their treaty obligations. Baseline inspections to confirm the accuracy of the numbers and types of items were conducted at 72 former Soviet and 35 U.S. facilities from March through June 1995. In January 1995, the United States began continuous portal monitoring activities at missile assembly plants. START contains provisions that permit up to 30 inspectors to conduct continuous portal monitoring at one U.S. and two former Soviet sites.

START II

Next effort at arms control was made on January 3, 1993, when President George Bush and President Boris Yeltsin signed the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms.

The Treaty, often called START II, codifies the Joint Understanding signed by the two Presidents at the Washington Summit on June 17, 1992. Its main objective was to eliminate the most destabilizing strategic weapons – heavy Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMS) and all other Multiple-Warhead (MIRVed) ICBMS. The Treaty included a Protocol on Elimination or Conversion concerning heavy ICBMs and heavy ICBM silos, a Protocol on Exhibition and Inspection concerning heavy bombers and a Memorandum on Attribution.

START III

Thus we can see that arms control through START continues till the later part of the twentieth century. START III aimed at establishing by December 31, 2007 a ceiling of 2,000-2,500 strategic nuclear weapons for each of the parties, representing 30-45 percent reduction in the number of total deployed strategic warheads permitted under START II. The new treaty will include measures relating to the transparency of strategic nuclear warhead inventories and the destruction of strategic nuclear warheads. The Russian Federation has proposed a reduction of the overall threshold of up to 1,500 warheads, a more substantial reduction of nuclear arms than had been foreseen at Helsinki in March 1997. As of early 2000, Russia remained committed to the goal of reducing the number of strategic nuclear warheads held by each side to 1,500, while the American position remains that 2,000 to 2,500 warheads are needed for effective nuclear deterrence.

START IV

After three START treaties, it is now believed that a future START IV agreement would involve all declared nuclear nations. The goal of such a multilateral effort would be to substantially reduce global warhead inventories to the point where the declared powers would have some level of parity. Negotiation of the details of START IV is pending on negotiation and ratification of START III.

2.4.2 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaties (NPT) forms an important element of nuclear arms control. The Treaty was opened for signature on 01 July 1968, and signed on that date by the United States, the United Kingdom, the

Soviet Union, and 59 other countries. It entered into force with the deposit of US ratification on 05 March 1970. China acceded to the NPT on 09 March 1992, and France acceded on 03 August 1992. In 1996, Belarus joined Ukraine and Kazakhstan in removing and transferring to the Russian Federation the last of the remaining former Soviet nuclear weapons located within their territories, and each of these nations has become a State Party to the NPT, as a non-nuclear-weapon state. In June 1997 Brazil became a State Party to the NPT.

Although NPT is the most widely accepted arms control agreement, Israel, India, and Pakistan have never been signatories of the Treaty, and North Korea withdrew from the Treaty in 2003.

Under the NPT, 181 non-nuclear weapon states have pledged never to develop or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons and to submit to international safeguards. In exchange, these states were promised unfettered access to peaceful nuclear technologies. Besides, the five nuclear-weapon states—the United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China pledged to engage in disarmament negotiations aimed at the ultimate elimination of their nuclear arsenals. Thus you can see that the basic foundation of the NPT regime rests on non-proliferation in exchange for nuclear arms reductions and eventual nuclear disarmament.

NPT aims at achieving eight primary objectives which includes universalization of NPT membership, a reaffirmation of the Article VI commitments of the nuclear weapon states to pursue in good faith measures related to eventual nuclear disarmament and the completion of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) by the end of 1996. Besides, the treaty also called for the commencement of negotiations for a fissile material cut-off treaty, efforts by the nuclear weapon states to reduce global nuclear arsenals, and the encouragement of the creation of new nuclear-weapon free zones. An enhanced verification system and further steps to assure the non-nuclear weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons (otherwise known as "negative security assurances") were also called for.

Stop to Consider

New Dimension of NPT

The 1995 Review and Extension Conference also negotiated a strengthened review process that included the conduct of NPT Review Conferences every five years and Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meetings in each of the three years prior to the Review Conferences.

Together, these provisions require the states parties to the NPT to meet almost annually to discuss substantive issues relevant to the treaty, including progress toward meeting the goals in the Statement of Principles and Objectives. This is a significant change from the previous, quintennial structure in place prior to the 1995 Review Conference. In effect, as part of the agreement to make the NPT permanent, the non nuclear weapon states were given greater ability and opportunity to address concerns about progress by the nuclear weapon states toward fulfilling their half of the NPT's basic bargain. Thus, the enhanced NPT review process has contributed to the multilateralization of arms control by adding nearly annual oversight of treaty related issues by a conference of 186 nations, 181 of which are non nuclear weapon states.

Criticisms leveled against NPT:

Despite having provisions for arms control, the NPT has been called discriminatory and many nations including India refused to sign it. The major criticism against NPT is that it recognizes only five nuclear weapon states, although it also requires them to disarm. Thus, the non-signatories argue that the viability of the NPT depends on the nuclear weapon states fulfilling their Article VI commitments. In 1995, the parties agreed to an indefinite extension of the NPT based on commitments by the nuclear powers to greater progress on key disarmament measures. The 2000 NPT Review Conference made some progress in this direction by identifying 13 "practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI," including an "unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This consensus agreement also called for unilateral reductions of strategic and nonstrategic

weapons, increased transparency, irreversibility, reducing operational status of weapons, a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies, and regular reports on progress in nuclear disarmament. The 2005 NPT Review was considered a failure, largely because of the refusal of the US and a small number of other states to agree upon an agenda or a final statement.

2.4.3 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)

After discussing NPT in the previous section, now we shall deal with Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in this section. The Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty was held in Vienna, Austria from 6 October 1999 to 8 October 1999. On 6 October 1999 the conference elected His Excellency Mr. Masahiko Koumura, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, as its President. The conference emphasizes the importance of the Treaty in nuclear disarmament as a means of achieving global security.

As we have already discussed, little progress was made in nuclear disarmament until 1991 because of cold war. With the support from the UN General Assembly, negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty began in 1993. Intensive efforts were made over the next three years to draft the Treaty text and its two annexes, culminating in the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) on 10 September 1996 by the United Nations General Assembly in New York.

The CTBT which prohibits all nuclear test explosions in all environments was opened for signature in New York on 24 September 1996, when it was signed by 71 States, including the five nuclear-weapon States. On October 13, 1999, the United States Senate refused to ratify the Test Ban. In contrast, Russia, the UK, and France have all signed and ratified the CTBT while the United States, China and Israel have signed but not ratified. India and Pakistan, however, did not sign the treaty. The non-ratification adds to pressures already at work to interpret the terms of the CTBT as permitting the development of new kinds of nuclear weapons.

In 1998, a CTBT was negotiated and opened for signature. It required the signature and ratification of 44 nuclear-capable states. US President Bill

Clinton signed it, but the treaty was rejected in 1999 by the US Senate which had the power to ratify treaties. The Bush administration was opposed to the CTBT and refused to resubmit it to the Senate. In early 2000, the Russian Duma ratified the CTBT.

Stop to Consider:

India's stand on CTBT:

To date, India and Pakistan, whose signature and ratification are required, have refused to sign the CTBT. Hence, the future of the CTBT is unclear. Thus, you have already learnt that India is not a signatory to CTBT. After an indefinite extension given to the NPT in 1995, Indian view was that the NPT had failed to tackle the question of global disarmament. Further, CTBT with its implicit limitations on its scope also did not proceed in the direction of global disarmament. India maintained that the five nuclear weapon powers agree on a time table for total removal of nuclear weapons as a precondition to this acceptance. Hence, India voted against the treaty considering it as discriminatory. Opposing the treaty, the then Chief Negotiator of India (Ms. Arundhati Ghose) said to the General Assembly that India would never sign 'this unequal treaty not now, not later until the major nuclear powers formulate a time table for eliminating their nuclear arsenal'.

Conference on Disarmament concluded without taking any decision and then the CTBT proposal was placed in the United Nations General Assembly as a resolution which was eventually passed in 1996 as a UN resolution. The acrimonious debate that took place on CTBT illustrates the dilemma about nuclear proliferation.

Hence, it is clear to you now that the CTBT makes a key contribution to both non-proliferation and disarmament. It serves as a practical step toward nuclear disarmament and as an effective non-proliferation measure by limiting the technological development of nuclear weapons.

2.4.4 Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT)

SALT I

Let us now discuss Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I), as a means of arms control. The first series of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I), signed by USA and USSR extended from November 1969 to May 1972. During that period the United States and the Soviet Union negotiated the first agreements to place limits and restraints on some of their central and most important armaments. In a Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, they moved to end an emerging competition in defensive systems that threatened to spur offensive competition to still greater heights. With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, the two nations took the first steps to check the rivalry in their most powerful land- and submarine-based offensive nuclear weapons.

Here you need to remember that the earliest efforts to halt the growth in strategic arms met with no success. Strategic weapons had been included in the U.S. and Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament. But the failure of these comprehensive schemes left strategic arms unrestrained. On July 1, 1968, President Johnson of USA announced, at the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, that agreement had been reached with the Soviet Union to begin discussions on limiting and reducing both strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and defence against ballistic missiles. After initial attempts to reach a comprehensive agreement failed, the Soviets sought to restrict negotiations to antiballistic missile systems, maintaining that limitations on offensive systems should be deferred. The U.S. position was that to limit ABM systems but allow the unrestricted growth of offensive weapons would be incompatible with the basic objectives of SALT and that it was essential to make at least a beginning at limiting offensive systems as well.

A long deadlock on the question was finally broken by exchanges at the highest levels of both governments. On May 20, 1971, Washington and Moscow announced that an understanding had been reached to concentrate on a permanent Treaty to limit ABM systems, but at the same time to work out certain limitations on offensive systems, and to continue negotiations for a more comprehensive and long-term agreement on the latter. In a summit

meeting in Moscow, after two and a half years of negotiation, the first round of SALT was brought to a conclusion on May 26, 1972, when President Nixon and General Secretary Brezhnev signed the ABM Treaty and the Interim Agreement on strategic offensive arms.

SALT II

In accordance with Article VII of the SALT I Interim Agreement, in which the sides committed themselves to continue active negotiations on strategic offensive arms, the SALT II negotiations began in November 1972. The primary goal of SALT II was to replace the Interim Agreement with a long-term comprehensive Treaty providing broad limit on strategic offensive weapons systems. The principal U.S. objectives as the SALT II negotiations began were to provide for equal numbers of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles for the sides, to begin the process of reduction of these delivery vehicles, and to impose restraints on qualitative developments which could threaten future stability. A major breakthrough occurred at the Vladivostok meeting in November 1974, between President Ford and General Secretary Brezhnev. In early 1975, the delegations in Geneva resumed negotiations, working toward an agreement based on this general framework. It was during this time that a Joint Draft Text was first prepared and many limitations were agreed. During the negotiations, however, it became clear that there was fundamental disagreement between the two sides on two major issues: how cruise missiles were to be addressed, and whether the new Soviet bomber known to the United States as Backfire would be considered a heavy bomber and therefore counted in the 2,400 aggregate. While there was disagreement on other issues such as MIRV verification provisions, restrictions on new systems, and missile throw-weight ceilings, progress was made in these areas. However, the issues of cruise missiles and Backfire remained unresolved.

In 1977, renewed emphasis was placed on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. Building on the work of the previous administration, particularly the Vladivostok accord and the subsequent agreement on many issues in Geneva, the United States made a comprehensive proposal which was presented to the Soviets by Secretary of State in March 1977. The completed SALT II agreement was signed by President Carter and General Secretary Brezhnev in Vienna on June 18, 1979.

On May 26, 1986, President Reagan stated that he had reviewed again the status of U.S. interim restraint policy and that, as he had documented in three detailed reports to the Congress, the Soviet Union had not complied with its political commitment to observe the SALT agreements, including the SALT II Treaty, nor had the Soviet Union indicated its readiness to join in a framework of truly mutual restraint. On May 26, 1986, President Reagan stated that "... the United States must base decisions regarding its strategic force structure on the nature and magnitude of the threat posed by Soviet strategic forces and not on standards contained in the SALT structure...."

Points to Remember

- In October, the White House and the Kremlin announced that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks would begin in Helsinki on November 17, 1969.
- During the SALT I years alone Soviet ICBMs rose from around 1,000 to around 1,500, and they were being deployed at the rate of some 200 annually.
- The United States had not increased its deployment of strategic missiles since 1967 (when its ICBMs numbered 1,054 and its SLBMs 656), but it was conducting a vigorous program of equipping missiles with "Multiple Independently-targeted Re-entry Vehicles" (MIRV).
- "MIRVs" permit an individual missile to carry a number of warheads directed at separate targets.
- SALT II began, in November 1972.

The duration of the Treaty was to have been through 1985.

Check Your Progress

1. Explain the main treaties in the conflict nuclear explosions
2. Examine the major issues of NPT
3. Discuss briefly India's stand on CTBT.

2.5 Proliferation and Nuclear Weapons, WMD

The issue of nuclear proliferation represents one of the marked illustrations of world politics. Concern about the proliferation of nuclear capabilities has undoubtedly increased in significance on the global agenda since the end of cold war. The responses to nuclear proliferation have embraced a wide range of unilateral, bilateral, regional and global measures that collectively have traditionally been termed the nuclear non proliferation regime.

Nuclear proliferation is greatly enhancing the possibility of nuclear war. Nuclear proliferation among nations or terrorists greatly increases the chance of nuclear violence on a scale that will be intolerable. Proliferation increases the chance that nuclear weapons will fall into the hands of irrational people, either suicidal or with no concern for the fate of the world. Irrational or outright psychotic leaders of military factions or terrorist groups might decide to use a few nuclear weapons under their control to stimulate a global nuclear war as an act of vengeance against humanity as a whole. Countless scenarios of this type can be constructed. As the aftermath of the Cold War and the Gulf War, the problem of nuclear proliferation has risen to new prominence. The end of the Cold War has reduced the risk of a large-scale nuclear war, but it has also reduced control by the superpower. The Gulf War has shown that Iraq, in violation of its obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), has a massive program to develop nuclear weapons. The successful Iraqi deception raises questions about the adequacy of national intelligence efforts as well as of the Inter-national Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspection system. Fears of rogue states, withdrawal of cold war-era security guarantees, technological threshold, and availability to terrorist organizations ensure that nuclear weapon proliferation remains a central security issue. The United Nations Commission for Conventional Armaments in 1948 introduced a new category of 'weapons of mass destruction' (WMD) to distinguish nuclear weapons from conventional forms. The WMD included 'atomic explosive weapons, radioactive material weapons, lethal chemical and biological, radioactive material weapons, and any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect to those of the atomic bomb or other weapons. In recent years, an alternative term has appeared, namely CBRN (referring to Chemical, Biological,

Radiological and Nuclear capabilities). The understanding of the dynamics of nuclear proliferation has become more complex.

Events in the mid-1990's such as the first bombing of the World Trade Centre in New York in 1993 and the attack against the U.S Government building in Oklahoma in April 1995, revealed the extent of damage and loss of life that could be caused by arms. While both these instances involved traditional methods of inflicting damage, the use of nerve agents (chemical weapons) in an underground train network in central Tokyo in March 1995 to cause both death and widespread panic has been viewed as representing a quantum change in methods. These concerns have intensified since the tragic events of 11 September 2001, when the Twin Towers of the World Trade Centre were completely destroyed by a coordinated attack using civilian aircraft loaded with aviation fuel leading to mass casualties and a changed assumption of terrorist use of CBRN capabilities.

In addition to these factors, attention has been focused on nuclear smuggling which has been heightened attention since the discovery that materials and technology suitable for making nuclear weapons are being trafficked by transnational networks.

2.5.1 Anti-proliferation Measures

One of the main concerns of international community is to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Since the end of the Cold War, international non-proliferation regimes have been enjoying continuous improvement and reinforcement, and promoted international security and regional stability in general. But some states strive to dominate the regimes and adopt double-standards, which leads to the intensification of various contradictions. At present time, the regimes are facing severe challenges because several countries are still outside the regimes and continue to develop WMD.

Nuclear non-proliferation policy has emerged through four main stages:

i) The post-war phase included a resolution passed by the United Nations General Assembly establishing the UN Atomic Energy Commission (UNAEC) in January 1946. The remit of the UNAEC was to make proposals for the elimination of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes under international

control. Due to disagreements between the United States and Soviet Union, these proposals were never implemented.

ii) The issue of international atomic energy control was revisited following President Eisenhower's 'Atoms for Peace' speech on 8 December 1953. Negotiations to implement 'Atoms for Peace' culminated in the establishment of the IAEA on 29 July 1957. The IAEA functions is to seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health, and prosperity throughout the world and to ensure that assistance provided is not used to further any military purpose.

iii) The policy of controls through safeguards came to be sponsored by the nuclear weapon powers to contain the spread of nuclear weapons across the world. This came to be enshrined in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968 and subsequent efforts like the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) of 1996. The Nuclear Proliferation Treaty considered as the first step to the construction of an effective international regime designed to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The NPT had provided for periodic review conferences. In 1995 the conference decided to extend the Treaty indefinitely. In the late 1950's attention has also focused on measures to prevent the nuclearization of specific environments and geographical areas. The first Nuclear Weapon Free Zone (NWFZ) applied to a populated geographic region is the treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (the Tlatelolco treaty) which was opened for signature in 1967. In 1961, the UN General Assembly adopted what became known as the 'Irish Resolution', which called for measures to limit the possibilities for additional states to acquire nuclear weapons and for all states to refrain from transfer or acquisition of such weapons.

iv) The reactive phase on part of the nuclear weapons in the post Indian nuclear test of 1974 and subsequent testing by India and Pakistan in 1998. This phase saw the creation of the Nuclear Suppliers Club and such other legislation like the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act (1978) of the United States. It also saw the debates shift from technical to political discourse on the utility of nuclear weapons and impositions of various sanctions against the new nuclear weapons states. In 1987 missile technology exporters agreed to establish identical export guidelines to cover the sale of nuclear capable ballistic missiles. This agreement is known as the Missile Technology Control

regime (MTCR). Also in 2002 a new initiative, known as "The Hague Code of Conduct" was launched which seeks to develop standards of appropriate behaviour in transfer of missiles and missile parts.

2.5.2 Non-proliferation Measures Aftermath September, 11, 2001

The terrorist attacks on 11 September underscore the new threats we face as we find that the institutions of the Cold War are not sufficient to provide security. The international community has made major strides since September 11 in combating WMD proliferation and nuclear terrorism. Long standing non-proliferation tools like the International Atomic Energy Agency and assistance programs to reduce and secure weapons of mass destruction, related materials and technologies are extensively used. Traditional international instruments, enlisting them for the first time in the fight against weapons of mass destruction proliferation and terrorism are also put into use. Various measures were taken like United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540, resolutions against Iran's and North Korea's nuclear programmes, and the General Assembly's International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. Finally and most notably, we have developed new instruments, such as the Proliferation Security Initiative, the G-8 Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction and the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. Under their auspices, the vast majority of the international community has united to counter proliferation and nuclear terrorism through innovative action that takes advantage of existing legal authorities and growing cooperative relationships.

The debate on nuclear proliferation is concerned not with the use of nuclear technology, but with the peaceful versus the military uses of this technology. The debate on the development of nuclear technology is complicated as it is not certain what ends the technology is going to be used for. Thus the intent of a country is important and it is this concern that has led to the nuclear non-proliferation policy.

Check Your Progress

1. What is the role of arms control and disarmament in the fast changing security environment of today?
2. How would you respond to the non-proliferation measures adopted after the September, 2001 attacks? Is it sufficient to deal with proliferation in the present scenario?
3. Do you justify India's stance under CTBT? Give reasons for your justification.
4. Comment on the increasing sophistication of nuclear weapons.

2.6 Summing Up

This unit has comprehensively dealt with the regimes of arms control. We have learnt that arms control is a necessity in the contemporary world. Under the regimes of arms control we have dealt with the mutual deterrence programme and the system of strategic stability. During the cold war, nuclear weapons acquired the function of deterrence i.e. preventing the use of the nuclear weapons and military force in general against each other. From this unit we have learnt that the nuclear deterrence model based on Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) is unique in that it exists only in Russian-US relations. This unit also gives us information on different talks and treaties for arms control. Two super powers USA and USSR and the UNO played the major role in this regard to avert the third world war. This unit has also discussed at length various treaties like Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties (START), Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties (SALT), Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaties (NPT) and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Though most of the countries of the world are favouring arms control for establishing a peaceful world, yet violence continues and after the attack on world trade centre on September 11, 2001, it was realized that the policies and measures for arms control are not sufficient to establish peace and security. Threatened by the attack, international community has united to counter proliferation and nuclear terrorism and regard nuclear non-proliferation as the need of the hour. Strengthening international non-proliferation regimes benefit world and regional security.

2.7 References and Suggested Readings

Perkovich, George and James M. Acton. *Abolishing Nuclear Weapons*. International Institute for Strategic Studies 2009

Weldon and Edwards *The Post-Hussein Era: America, Russia, Terrorism and WMD* 2003

http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2003_06/weldonedwards_june03.asp.

Nye, Joseph S.Jr. *New Approaches to Nuclear Proliferation Policy Science*, New Series, Vol. 256, No. 5061 (May 29), pp. 1293-1297. 1992

Singh, Jaswant. *Against Nuclear Apartheid*. *Foreign Affairs* 77 (5): 41-52. 1998

Perkovich, George. *Nuclear Proliferation*. *Foreign Policy*, No. 112, Autumn, pp. 12-23. 1998

Burroughs, John. *The Legal Framework for Non-Use and Elimination of Nuclear Weapons*. Online at <http://www.lcnp.org/disarmament/Gpeacebrfpaper.pdf>. 2006

Committee on Technical Issues Related to Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty National Academy of Sciences. *Technical Issues Related to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty*. Access online at <http://newton.nap.edu/catalog/10471.html>. 2002

Committee on International Security and Arms Control, National Academy of Sciences. *Monitoring Nuclear Weapons and Nuclear-Explosive Materials: An Assessment of Methods and Capabilities*. Online at <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11265.html> 2005

Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. *Final Document, Vol. I, NPT/CONF.2000/28, Part I: 14-15*. Access at

<http://disarmament.un.org/wmd/npt/finaldoc.html>, 2000

Abe Nobuyasu *Strengthening International Regimes for Arms*. Access online at

http://www.un.org/disarmament/HomePage/HR/docs/2004/2004Oct19_UN.pdf 2004

* * *