



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT
SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

M.A
POLITICAL SCIENCE
(II SEMESTER)

***THEORIES AND
CONCEPTS OF
INTERNATIONAL
POLITICS***

CORE COURSE: POL2C08

190458

2019 ADMISSION

THEORIES AND CONCEPTS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

STUDY MATERIAL

THIRD SEMESTER

CORE COURSE : POL2C08

For

M.A.POLITICAL SCIENCE

(2019 ADMISSION)



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Calicut University P.O, Malappuram, Kerala, India 673 635

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

THIRD SEMESTER

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

(2019 ADMISSION)

CORE COURSE :

POL2C08: THEORIES AND CONCEPTS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Prepared by :

Module I to III : Dr. Sreejesh. N.P
*Assistant Professor,
Head of the Department of Political Science,
P.M.Syed Calicut University Centre,
Androth, Lakshadweep.*

Module IV to VI : Sri. Sreejith.Y
*Assistant Professor,
Department of Political Science,
Government College, Madappally.*

Layout: 'H' Section, SDE

©

Reserved

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
Module I <i>Perspectives on the study of International Politics: Concept of Power in International Politics.</i>	05 - 11
Module II <i>Approaches to the Study of International Politics: Realism Vs. Idealism, System Theory, Game Theory, Communication Theory, Decision making Theory, Integration Theory and Dependency Theory.</i>	12 - 21
Module – III <i>Restructuring Theory, Practice and Agency: New Social Movements Green Politics, Orientalism and Global Civil Society.</i>	22 - 28
Module IV Conflict, Peace and Insecurity dilemma <i>Political, military, economic, environmental, terrorism and national security- theories of conflict resolution and peace research</i>	29 - 43
Module V Foreign policy: changing concept of national interest: developments in cold war -post cold war period, neo liberalism.	44 - 64
Module VI Future order and Global Governance <i>Globalisation and post-cold war trends, questions on imperialism and harmony—impact of globalisation on state system</i>	65 - 69

MODULE I

PERSPECTIVES ON THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: CONCEPT OF POWER IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

This module tries to address some key questions that;

1. Understanding International Politics and International Relations
2. Definitions International Politics
3. Scope of International Politics
4. Major features of International Politics
5. Define the concept of Power in International Politics
6. Discuss the importance of power in International Politics

Introduction

Today, International Politics is becoming a significant field of study. It addresses some of the most pressing problems of the world such as war and peace, the organisation of global economy, the causes and consequences of global inequality as well as power, violence, sovereignty, states, empire, intervention, inequality, justice, and democracy. The field is also highly interdisciplinary, drawing on theoretical and methodological traditions from history, law, political science, geography, sociology, gender studies. However, political science has made a great influence on the discipline of International Politics. The birth of International Politics as a distinctive branch of study can be traced in the outcome of World War I (1914–18).

The War has been created a global concern to rebuild peace and security in the world for the future years. Subsequently, the establishment of the chair for International Politics at the university college of Wales in 1919 is a land mark in the development of the study as an academic discipline. The following years, the London School of Economics in 1923, the University of Southern California, and the University of Oxford in 1930 has started the Department for the study of International Relations. At the same time, the political context of the world created a feasible situation to grow International Politics as a significant field of study. Thus International Politics became a popular subject across the world. It has been achieved a separate identity like other social science subject.

Understanding International Politics and International Relations

The term International Politics and International Relations is quite often used as synonyms to understand the politics among nations. Some writers do not like to draw a line of demarcation between International Relations and International Politics. They used these terms interchangeable manner. For example, the outstanding figures in this field like Hans J. Morgenthau and Kenneth Thompson use these terms inter-changeably and opinioned that International Politics as an inalienable part of International Relations. However, many scholars tries to bring a clear demarcation between International Politics and International

Relations in recent years. These diverse opinions of scholars have been created a reasonable intellectual debates on IP and IR.

A set of scholars including Schwarzenberger, Schleicher, Theodore A. Coulombis, Palmer, Perkins, Burton etc. prefer to use the name International Relations rather than International Politics. They argued that the term IR highlights the wider scope of the subject. It provide an extensive platform to study about all types of relationships and interactions between countries, the activities and policies of national governments, the intervention of international organizations (IGOs), nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), multinational corporations (MNCs) and so on. It also include social, economic, cultural, legal, official and non-official relations between countries as well as expose the issues regarding under-development, poverty, political repression, racism, and other human rights violations, environmental degradation and climate changes. Thus, IR is considered as an umbrella to discuss the entire social, economic, political, cultural and security issues around the globe.

At the same time, some scholars prefer to use the term International Politics. They argue that the term International Relations is very general and broad. It is not a suitable term to understand the specific nature and complex relations between nations. In fact, the interactions between the nations characterized by conflict, struggle for power, wars and disputes along with cooperation and friendship. As such, the use of the term International Relations for designating the study of politics among nations is held to be inappropriate and misleading. Thus, Legg and Morrison argue that International Politics to be the correct name of the subject which studies power interactions among nations or politics among nations, "Since the core area of the study is the political aspect of relations among nations, we must stick to the use of the name International Politics." This name truly reflects the true nature of relations among nations.

As a discipline, International Politics is concerned primarily with the study of power-relations among nations. Furthermore, the use of the term International Politics is most appropriate for identifying the study of conflict of purpose and struggle for power among nations. Thus we can say that International Politics is more specific name to study the interactions between the nations. Therefore, we need to use the term International Relations in a broader and general sense to understand all type of interactions between nations. In fact, scholars propose different opinions about the use of both names. It ultimately highlights the importance of the subject and however, we can use both the names International Relations and International Politics by considering the context.

Define International Politics

The central focus of International Politics is the study of the interactions between nations and these relations are generally determined by the political, diplomatic, military and strategic terms. In fact, there are different range of definitions about International Politics. Scholars proposed the definitions in according to their theoretical positions. According to

H.J. Morgenthau, *International Politics* “is struggle for and use of power among nations. This definition very clearly articulated that international politics is determined by the power. There each nations tires to accumulate and expand the power for gaining their national interest. Likewise, Padelford and Lincoln define that *international politics is the interaction of state policies within the changing pattern of power relationship*. Moreover, Palmer and Perkins express similar views that international politics is essentially concerned with the state system. At the same time, Charles Schleicher forward a broad definitions that *all inter-state relations are included in international politics, even though all the inter-state relations are not political*.

The above definitions express different range of ideas about International Politics. There is no a single definition on IP. Through these definitions, we can understand that International Politics is primarily a process of interactions among nations. In fact, the state come into the central positions in the study of IP. It deals with conflicts and cooperation among nations essentially at political level. Hence, the complex process of globalization bring a new dimension to the study of IP.

Scope of the study of International Politics

The populations of the world is divided into separate political communities, independent states, which profoundly affect the way of people life. At the present time, there are almost 200 independent states and they interact with each other’s in different ways. The states are usually embedded in international markets that reflect in the formation of their government policies and the wealth and welfare of its citizens. It demands to the states to enter into relations with each other. Thus, IP is the study of the nature and consequences of these relations.

In order to understand the scope of IP, we need to analyse the role of states in the everyday life of human being. It is undoubtable fact that the state is a responsible institution to uphold some basic social values like security, freedom, law, justice, and welfare of the citizens. For example, people generally think that the state has a responsibility to ensure the security of the citizens from internal and external threat. Thus, security is one of the fundamental concern of IP. Likewise, the state need to ensure the freedom in terms of personal and national freedom of citizens. In the same way, state need to establish and maintain international order as well as the justice of very citizens. Another important responsibility of the state is uphold socio-economic wealth and welfare of the people.

The World War II resulted to rise a wider anti-war sentiments across the world. This sentiments lead to the practical and theoretical solutions to ensure the peace and security of the world populations. In a practical sense, the League of Nations established in 1920 at Geneva. The fundamental objective of this institution to promote international co-operation and achieve peace and security in the world. Subsequently, the Permanent Court of International Justice set up in 1922 at The Hague as well as established many other

international organizations to strengthen economic and security co-operations among the nations.

At the same time, the establishment of the Department of International Politics at the University of Wales in 1919 was a great step to activate a theoretical enquiry about IP through lens of academics. Since then, the IP has been traveled through different level of academic enquiry and theoretical debates. In the initial years, IP was mainly studied by Western scholars especially the scholars from US. It was caused to rise a criticisms that the study of IP is a euro centric subject. Over the years, globalization brought an unpredicted twist and turn in the disciple of IP. Thus the scope of this subject growing in recent years. Almost all universities have been started a particular Department to study IP. Many universities introduced area studies on Middle East, Europe, Africa, Latin America, and East Asia as a part of International Politics.

Some of the major scope of IP is;

- Study of state systems and relations among states
- Study of National Interests and National Power
- Study of International Law and International Organizations
- Study of Foreign Policy and geopolitics
- Study of Conflict Management and Conflict Resolution
- Study of War, Peace, and Disarmament
- Study of Ideologies, Nationalism, Colonialism and Imperialism
- Study of issues related to Environmental protection
- Study of issues related to Human Rights
- Study of role of Economic factors
- Study of demographic factors
- Study of problem of fundamentalism and terrorism

Major features of International Politics

- The features of International Politics involves the study of contemporary issues and problems around the world.
- International Politics basically involves the art of preserving or securing goals of national interests.
- It is a study of conflict and conflict-resolution among nations.
- Every Nations try to achieve more power and resources. Thus they continuously engaged in the process of interactions. This makes international politics a continuing phenomenon of interactions.
- The behaviour of each state in international relations is always directed and controlled by its foreign policy
- Every nations actively engage in economic and trade relations with other nations.

- An outstanding feature of the contemporary era has been the rapid growth of international institutions and organizations. Some of these are truly international/universal in nature like the United Nations, while several others are regional organizations like NATO, OAS, OAU, OPEC, ASEAN, ECO, EU, SAARC and so on.
- Rise of several active non-state international or supra-national or trans-national actors, NGOs, Human Rights Organizations, Peace Movements and other such actors in the international environment has necessitated the inclusion of the study of the role of these actors in the international system.
- The relations among nations mostly take the form of interactions among the foreign policies of the nations.
- Since national interest is the objective that each nation tries to secure during the course of relations with other nations, it becomes imperative for International Politics to study national interests of various nations.
- The concept of national power is the core concept in the study of International Politics. Nations are actors but these always act on the basis of their national powers.

Concept of Power in International Politics

The concept of Power is a significant theme in every field of study. In IP, Power is one of the most important concepts. For example, Lasswell and Kaplan explain *politics is the study of the shaping and sharing of power*. Hans J Morgenthau explains that *politics is the struggle for power*. Thus, power has a significant role in the study of political science. There are several definitions about power. *Robert Dahl (a famous political scientist)* defines power as a capability and control of a person over another person. For example, there are two persons, A and B. If A has the capability to control B, it means that A exercises power over B. Similarly, Bertrand Russell defines power as the ability of a person to fulfil his desire. MacIver says, power is an ability to command service from others. D. D. Raphael describes that power is a specific kind of ability. Through all definitions, we simply define that power is the ability of a person to exercise over others. This form of power may be used by force. For example, if a husband slaps his wife, he uses physical power over the wife. But, more recently Michael Foucault (French Philosopher) has tried to bring a connection between *Power and Knowledge*. He defines that *knowledge is power* which means knowledge is more powerful than any type of power. For example, a doctor has power to give any medicine when a patient comes to consult the doctor. Similarly, a teacher has power to control his class room while teaching.

In International Politics, the state is a central actor and each nation engaged in the process of acquiring, maintaining, increasing and using power. In fact, power is both the means as well as an end in IP. Nations always use power for securing the goals of their national interests. Traditionally, the power of the state is determined by geography, natural

resources, industrial capacity, military, and population. Some scholar like Morgenthau says that these are elements as well as determinants of national powers. In this, the military power is the most important form of power in international politics, as it serves as both a means and an end in itself. Every nation tries to increase the strength of military power in IP.

By considering the changing features of IP, Joseph Nye, a neo-liberal thinker proposed different concept about the power. He classified power into two forms: hard and soft. In this, hard power is measured by

- a) Population size
- b) Geography
- c) Natural resources
- d) Military force
- e) Economic stability

a) Population size

Population is an essential factor in deciding national power of the nation. Manpower continues to be a key factor which determines the industrial and military capacities of a nation and its status as a power in international relations. In this age of science, machines have come to perform a large number of functions which were previously being performed by men. Yet machines have failed to completely replace men. Even today men behind the machines continue to be more important than the machines. Population is a source of power. The major powers of our times are states with fairly large populations. Large concentration of man-power in Asia, particularly China and India, has been an important factor of the power structure in international politics. Human Power resulting from the presence of a large class of skilled workforce has been a source for the emerging power of India in the world.

b) Geography

Amongst the elements of National Power, geography is the most stable, tangible, permanent and natural element. In this, size is very important geographical element of national power. The large size of a country can accommodate a large population, offer better natural resources and raw materials, and can be more helpful in the defense of the country. A large size can help the country to defend by retreat in the event of an attack. Similarly, location of a nation can be as helping as well as a hindering factor for its national power. It determines whether a nation can be a sea-power or not. England could become a big naval power and thereby an imperial power because of its location. The location of Japan has helped it to be a major ship- building nation. Location of Germany in the heart of Europe has been a source of strength for it. Boundary is also a geographic factor of national power. Settled and natural boundaries are always a source of friendly and cooperative relations among the nations of a region.

c) Natural Resources

Natural resources is another elements of national power. The industrial and military capabilities of a nation as well as its economic well-being are dependent upon the existence of natural resources. A self-sufficiency in certain key resources can be a big source of power

of a nation. The USA has been in a position to be a super power in the world mainly due to its near self-sufficiency in respect of several key natural resources. No nation can be powerful without becoming a developed industrialized nation and the chances of becoming an industrialized nation are basically linked with the possession of natural resources, particularly industrial raw materials and minerals. Natural resources, in the form of minerals, fertile soil, flora and fauna, through planned exploitation and use always make a nation powerful.

d) Military

Military power is a vitally important part of national power of a state. Military power is an important part of national power which contributes to its strength and effectiveness. Military preparedness is a background factor for the success of a foreign policy and it is a tangible factor capable of supporting the foreign policy and promoting national interest. It influences the level of success of foreign policy. The super powers and other major powers of our times have been big military powers. By virtue of being a major military power, India, besides other factors, is considered to be a major power having a potential to be a super power in the next 20 years or so.

e) Economic stability

Economic power is a vitally important part of national power of a nation because it is the means for military power and the basis for welfare, prosperity and development of its people. A nation with developed, healthy and growing economy alone can be a great power in world politics. Effective economic organisation and planning are essential qualities of a powerful nation. Only nations with developed economies can use the economic instruments—aid, loan, rewards, trade, grants and denial of rewards or punishment, for securing their desired goals in international relations. By using economic means a nation tries to exercise its national power in a productive and useful way. The level of economic well-being determines the power of a nation.

In a similar way, Joseph Nye classify the soft power into;

- a) Culture
- b) Political values
- c) Foreign policies

a) Culture: Culture is the set of practices that create meaning for a society, and it has many manifestations.

b) Political values: Government policies at home and abroad are another potential source of soft power.

c) Foreign policies: Similarly, foreign policies strongly affect soft power. Government policies can reinforce or diminish a country's soft power. Domestic or foreign policies that appear to be hypocritical and indifferent to the opinion of others or based on a narrow approach to national interests can undermine soft power.

MODULE II

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: REALISM VS. IDEALISM, SYSTEM THEORY, GAME THEORY, COMMUNICATION THEORY, DECISION MAKING THEORY, INTEGRATION THEORY AND DEPENDENCY THEORY

Approaches to the Study of International Politics

The study of international relations takes a wide range of theoretical approaches. Some theories emerge from within the discipline itself; others have been imported from disciplines such as economics or sociology. Many theories of international politics are internally and externally contested, and few scholars believe only in one or another. Although several major schools of thought are discernable, differentiated principally by the variables they emphasize, e.g. military power, material interests, or ideological beliefs. Some of the major approaches are Realism, Idealism, System Theory, Game Theory, Communication Theory, and Decision making Theory, Integration Theory and Dependency Theory. This chapter is intended to discuss about these approaches.

Realism

Realism was introduced in international politics as a counter movement against so-called utopian liberal school during the inter-war period in Europe. Gradually, realism became a dominant theory of IP. The intellectual origin of realism can be traced back to the historical and political thoughts of Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes. Their theories of realism known as classical realism. Later period, it strengthened by E.H Carr, Hans J Morgenthau. Very recently, Kenneth Waltz introduced more systematic theory in IP and it was called neo-realism or structural realism. All these theorists proposed different range of ideas about realism. Thus realism divided into two categories; classical realism and neorealism. In order to understand the theories of realism in IP, we need to analyse both classical and neo-realism.

A) Classical Realism

Classical realist tradition in western thought goes back thousands of years. Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Spinoza, and Rousseau all belong to the classical realist tradition. In this, Greek historian Thucydides (460 BC – 395 BC) and his book *The History of the Peloponnesian War* (431 BC) cemented a credible base to classical realism. He argues in the *History of the Peloponnesian War* that the war between Sparta and Athens was a result of the fear that the growth of Athenian power invoked in the minds of the Spartans. The Spartans thought it was important to maintain balance of power in the 'international system' in which they existed. On the other hand, we see seeds of offensive realist thinking in the Athenian argument that the strong dominate the weak in the international system.

Later, Machiavelli's treatise *The Prince* is considered to be one of the earliest texts of realist writings. His praise for ancient Rome's desire for universal imperialism, which he regards as a necessary ambition by the rulers. In other words, he suggests that states aspire to conquer the world for the sake of self-defense. Similarly, Thomas Hobbes' arguments on the

'state of nature' have become well respected in the classical realist tradition. Hobbes' work *Leviathan* argues that prior to the formation of the state, human beings remained in a state of nature which was characterized by insecurity and fear. The formation of the state helped human beings to escape their state of nature. The system of states continued to remain in a state of nature where fear and insecurity prevailed because there was no sovereign power among states to enforce obedience and remove that fear and insecurity.

Classical realism was coherently presented in Hans J. Morgenthau's *Politics among Nations*. The importance of this book was that realism gained a specific identity in the discipline of IP. He points out that the tragic presence of evil in all political action. The desire of power manifests itself as the desire to maintain the range of one's person over others and try to increase it or demonstrate it. Thus power came at the centre of IP. He defined that international politics like all politics is a struggle for power. He proposed six principles of realism;

- a. Politics are governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature
- b. The concept of national interest defined in terms of power and it is the most important in shaping foreign policy goal.
- c. National interest in a particular period of time depends on the political and cultural context of the world.
- d. Universal moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of states, instead state must be function in according to time and place.
- e. Political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe
- f. Politics is an autonomous sphere, not subordinate to economics, law, morality, and so on.

In sum, classical realists present that the nation-state as the primary actor and power is the ultimate goal in IP. The nature of state is similar to the human nature and national interest is determined by the power. International system is anarchical and there is no place for ethics and morality. Every nation seeks to accumulate more and more power.

B) Neo-Realism

Kenneth Waltz's much celebrated book, the *Theory of International Politics*, published in 1979, offered a rigorous systemic theory of world politics. His entire idea of realism was known as neo-realism or structural realism. It mainly focuses on the international system rather than human nature in IP. Waltz's neorealism is a critique of traditional classical realism as well as an intellectual response to the changing context of global politics. According to Waltz, the international system has a well-defined structure and has three important characteristics; the ordering principle of the system, the character of the units in the system and the distribution of capabilities of the units in the system.

Waltz analyses these elements in a wider sense. There are two different organising principles; one is anarchy which corresponds to the decentralized realm of international politics. Second is hierarchy which is the base of domestic order. Moreover, the units of the

international system are functionally similar sovereign states. Hence there are differences in the units such as a state may be democratic or not. By considering the third elements, Waltz's says that the relative distribution of power in the international system is the key independent variable in understanding war, peace, alliance politics and the balance of power. For example, during the cold war from 1945 to 1989, there were two great power- the United States and the Soviet Union and both constituted bipolar international system and after the cold war the international system changed into unipolar. Thus he put forward the concepts of uni-polar, bi-polar and multi-polar systems in international affairs defined by the number of great powers. A uni-polar system contains only one great power, a bipolar system contains two great powers, and a multi-polar system contains more than two great powers suggesting that the bi-polar systems are the more stable ones.

In sum, Neo-realists argue that power is a means to security and more importantly for survival in an anarchic system. The broad outcomes of international politics can be best understood as resulting from structural constraints imposed on the states by their system, rather than from unit behavior.

Differences between Classical Realism and Neo-realism

There are several major differences between classical realism and neo-realism. That are;

- a. First, there is a philosophical disagreement about the roots of realism. Traditional realism is rooted in sociology and history. Neorealism borrows most heavily from macroeconomics.
- b. Second, traditional realists view power as an end in itself, for neorealist security is the end.
- c. Third, traditional realists posit that power and the interests of states drive international behaviour; neorealists examine only anarchy and the distribution of capabilities.
- d. The fourth and fifth differences center on the meaning of capability. Classical realism is a theory of foreign policy, focusing on the relative distribution of capabilities between specific pairs of states or coalition of states, not on the system wide distribution of capabilities or the polarity of the system.
- e. Sixth, the two camps disagree over the meaning of the system. A system refers to an arrangement of certain components so interrelated as to form a whole. For classical realists, the international system is composed of units, interactions, and structure. In neorealism, such process variables are not considered system attributes.

Idealism

Idealism in international relations usually refers to the school of thought associated with American diplomacy by Woodrow Wilson that is why it is often referred to as Wilsonianism or Wilsonian idealism. Idealism stands for improving the course of international relations by eliminating war, hunger, inequality, tyranny, force, suppression and violence from international relations. To remove these evils is the objective before humankind. Idealism accepts the possibility of creating a world free from these evils by

depending upon reason, science and education. Political idealism in international relations represents 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 law. Idealist approach derives strength from the general idea of evolutionary progress in society and the spirit of liberal idealism which was at the back of American policies, particularly during the inter-war years (1919-39).

The Idealist Approach advocates morality as the means for securing the desired objective of making the world an ideal world. It believes that by following morality and moral values in their relations, nations can not only secure their own development, but also can help the world to eliminate war, inequality, despotism, tyranny, violence and force. For the idealists, politics is the art of good government and not the art of possible. Politics provides for the good life and respect for his fellow humans, both domestically and internationally.

Main Features of Idealism

- a. Human nature is essentially good and capable of good deeds in international relations.
- b. Human welfare and advancement of civilization are the concerns of all.
- c. Bad human behaviour is the product of bad environment and bad institutions.
- d. By reforming the environment, bad human behaviour can be eliminated.
- e. War represents the worst feature of relations. By reforming international relations, war can be and should be eliminated.
- f. Global efforts are needed to end war, violence and tyranny from international relations.
- g. International community should work for eliminating such global instruments, features and practices which lead to war.
- h. International institutions committed to preserve international peace, international law and order should be developed for securing peace, prosperity and development

System Theory

A system means a set of actors and entities or a known set of variables (political machinery, attitudes, interests and political activities) which set parameters to the study. System Approach can be regarded as a useful approach to the study of International Politics. It can be used for an overall view of the relations among nations. The emergence of Systems Approach to the study of International Politics can be described as one of the most significant developments of the 20th century. Some of the major thinkers include David Easton, Gabriel Almond and Morton Kaplan. In this, Morton Kaplan's widely quoted work, *System and Process in International Politics* provide a clear theoretical framework to the system analysis in IP. He advocates that international politics offers the best sphere for the application of the concept of 'system' as a tool for investigating all its phenomena. International System is most inclusive as it is constituted by those interactions among international actors which are neither fully cooperative nor totally conflictual. It has its sub-systems and a set of actors, both international and supra-national actors. It is constituted by interactions among the international actors.

Furthermore, Kaplan discusses six models of international system;

(1) The Balance of Power System: It is constituted by 5 or 7 major powers/actors. Each actor seeks to increase its capabilities through negotiations and not through resort to war. The actor is prepared to fight rather than pass on an opportunity to increase capabilities for protecting its national interest. The actors maintain a balance in their power positions, and no actor is permitted to become unduly powerful. An actor or a group of actors in such a system can resort to war for maintaining the balance of power in their relations. No actor is to be eliminated from the system. The actor terminates the war before the opponent is eliminated. An actor or a group of actors acts for opposing any other group or single actor that tends to assume unduly powerful position and dominance with respect to the rest of the system. Attempts are made to check the actors who try to follow supranational organizing principles. The defeated or constrained essential actors are permitted to re-enter the system as acceptable role partners. Actors act to bring some previously inessential actor within the essential actor classification and treat all essential actors as acceptable role partners.

(2) The Loose Bi-polar System: The Loose Bi-polar System comes into existence when two powerful nations are successful in organizing the other nations into their two respective competing blocs or groups. However, the organisation of the blocs is loose and internal differences prevail among the members of each bloc. There are also present several other supra-national and regional actors. In other words, the Loose Bi-polar System is constituted by two major bloc-actors, non-member bloc-actors (like the group of Non-aligned), and universal actor/actors, like the UN. In it, blocs try to increase their relative capabilities as well as to limit or weaken their rival bloc. Each bloc strives to use the universal actor for increasing its own power. The non-bloc actors tend to support the universal actor for reducing the danger of war between rival blocs. Blocs attempt to extend membership but along with it tends to tolerate the status of non-bloc actors.

(3) The Tight Bi-polar System: The Loose Bi-polar System easily gets transformed into a Tight Bi-polar System. It is a bi-polar system in which the two major powers lead their respective blocs of allied powers. Each bloc is dominated by a major power. The international organisation are very weak and there are no neutral blocs or nations. International relations take the form of interactions between the two blocs.

(4) The Universal System: The fourth model is the Universal System in which the nations get organised in a federal system. It is a hypothetical model in which the world gets transformed into a Federal World State based upon the principle of mutual toleration and universal rule of law. It works through a universal actor—an international organisation. The universal actor is powerful enough to check war and preserve peace or a balance in international relations

(5) The Hierarchical System: Such a model can come into existence when a single powerful super power may bring, either through a conquest or a treaty, all other nations under its control. The states as territorial units are then transformed into functional units. The super-power becomes the universal actor and absorbs all other nations. In case this system comes

into existence through conquest, it is a directive system, and when it comes through democratic means, it is a non-directive system.

(6) The Unit Veto System: The sixth model projected by Kaplan is the Unit Veto System. It involves the conception of a situation of multi-polarity in which each state is equally powerful. Each possesses such weapons (nuclear weapons) as can be used by it for destroying any other state. It becomes stable when each state can resist and retaliate threats from every other state. On the basis of these six models, Morton Kaplan believes that international relations can be analyzed as international system.

Game Theory

Fundamentally, game theory is a mathematical method of studying decision-making in situation of conflict, where game theorist study the predicted and actual behaviour of individuals in games, as well as optimal strategies. In 1932 P. G. Cambray published, *The Game of Politics: A Study of the Principles of British Political Strategies*. Perhaps this is the earliest and most methodical work about game theory. In 1943 Neumann and Morgenstern published *Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour*. After Neumann and Morgenstern large number of scholars dealt with the subject and some of them are—Schelling, Riker, Kaplan, Raiffa etc. Since 1960s, game theory got a considerable attentions in international politics.

It has been observed by many, however, the theory was originally used in chess game. In this game, there are two or more players or parties and each party decides its own strategy so that it can maximize benefit. But the strategy of a party or player depends upon the decision-making, cooperation or strategy of another party. Thus, the theory of games is never a one way traffic. In the first place, it has been assumed that there must be at least two players because for any game this is the minimum requirement. The number of players may be greater than two and this depends upon the nature of game and willingness of the participants. Here the word player is used in special sense. Player means decision-maker. The players of the game are concerned with the strategy or decision. Each player of the game is exclusively interested in arriving at a decision which will be beneficial to him. The theory, therefore, assumes that in every game there is a strategy and it is decided by the player of the game.

Likewise, rationality is another assumption. It is assumed that the players of the game are guided by rationality which means that they always act rationally. The player is quite aware of the alternatives which exist before him and he selects one or more than one alternatives from them. The rationality of the player enables him to select the alternatives. While he selects the alternative/alternatives he adopts the rule of priority which means that in order of preference he arranges the alternatives and he selects one or two which he thinks would give him maximum pay-off. Since the player is interested in pay-off him, it is quite natural, will make all sorts of attempts and apply the strategy to maximize the benefit and minimize the loss from the game. This approach of maximization and minimization is the core of game theory and it is called the strategy.

The pay-off received from the game will be in full conformity with players own interests or what he ardently desired. Naturally any amount of pay-off or any kind of pay-off will not be acceptable to the player. The player is quite aware that in the game there are both loss and gain or profit or loss. So the player will decide the strategy and the strategy is what way or technique he will adopt that will give him maximum pay-off. It means that the player is not only rational but also intelligent. In the game certain amount of uncertainty is involved. Although the player adopts strategy, rationality and intelligence in the game all these do not guarantee that his loss will be zero and gain will be maximum. This can never happen because of the fact that both gain and loss are involved. The strategy is an undefined term. What type of strategy is to be adopted cannot be decided beforehand. It depends on the progress of the game, attitude of other competitors and other, factors. We have already noted that the objective of the player is to maximize the pay-off.

There is two type of games that zero-sum and non-zero sum games. In zero-sum games, the total benefit to all players in the game. The game chess is often employed as metaphor implying that one wins exactly the amount of one's opponent losses. In non-zero-sum games work under the assumption that pure conflict is dropped from the game and the players face outcomes where they can both lose or both win, where coordination and cooperation emerge as alternative to pure conflict. In principal, most real world situations in both economic and political fields are of a non-zero-sum nature.

Communication Theory

Communication theory was proposed by Karl Deutsch. Over the years, many thinkers developed this idea and it is also applied in the field of IP. It is a process of establishing commonness (communis in Latin means commonness) through movement of ideas, thoughts, feelings etc. from one to another or between the groups of persons. In other words, it is an exchange of facts, thoughts and information, emotions resulting in a shared understanding. It travels through various agencies or stages in order to reach its destination. But its route of travelling is not always easy. All the stages or layers of an agency are not only connected but also interdependent. One agency aims at an objective that other agencies must act in accordance with the decision of the stage situated at the top of the system/organisation.

Karl Deutsch forward the idea that the communications theory is based on a science which is called cybernetics. Cybernetics is the science of communication and autonomous control systems in both machine and living being. Cybernetics is a theory of information, self-regulating machines, computers and the physiology of nervous system. An important concept of cybernetics is that of a machine which recognizes stimuli learns, adjusts itself automatically upon receiving feedback about its performance and moves through a determined number of possible states". Deutsch's communications theory reveals certain very interesting and important aspects. The inflow or outflow of information/news from one end to another or vice versa is not automatic, there is a specific role of human beings. This we may call steering and coordinating process or role. In any political system there are many channels through which information is transmitted.

Deutsch has assumed that since human efforts are behind the communication of news and information, it has been found that the meaning and context of the information or news undergo changes and this is inevitable. Here lies a major difference between the communications as it prevails in business organisation and in political system. In this, power or the application of physical force is the exclusive determinant of political affairs. Even power does not constitute the essence of politics. There is communication at the centre of politics. In his judgment power/physical force has a very minor role. He says that when persuasion or cooperation or influence fail to achieve desired goals then and then only power is applied. So communication is the most important factor in political system. Political system changes because of the effectiveness of communication. The social goals are to be achieved through co-ordination and co-operation among people of society which is effected by communication.

Deutsch has drawn our attention to another aspect of his communication theory. In every political system authority adopts decision. But Deutsch is of opinion that habit, concurrence with the activities of the system play a very vital role in the implementation of decision. This habit grows and develops through time. Political system is endowed with self-regulating mechanism. Numerous forces or elements make their presence in the political systems and they frequently challenge the political system. But since it has self-regulating mechanism ultimately it succeeds in checking or controlling the forces or their undesirable effects. Because of this self-regulating system the system is able to maintain stability or equilibrium.

The political system is so patterned that whenever the elements from the environment come political system directs their movement to particular communication channels so that they can prove their worthiness or effectiveness. There are many vehicles which carry information. Some of them are political parties, interest groups, pressure groups, various organisation. The groups, parties and organisation enjoy freedom and work as medium between people and the government and in this way they all maintain their relationship with the agencies and government. If any conflict arises parties, groups and organizations try to settle it amicably. In sum, Deutsch's communication theory can work in an open system because only in such a system the agencies can function freely and the inflow or outflow of information takes place without any hindrance or trouble. Thus, the conflict or contradiction cannot lead to destabilization. This interpretation of Deutsch makes a room for a theory of social change. He never says that stability of political system means halt of change. Political system will continue along with it the change.

Decision making Theory

Decision-making is usually defined as a process or sequence of activities involving stages of problem recognition, search for information, definition of alternatives and the selection of an actor of one from two or more alternatives consistent with the ranked preferences. The decision making approach in international politics was introduced by Richard C. Snyder, H.W Bruck and Burton Sapin. They introduced a systematic approach to

conceptualize the role of decision making in the formulation of foreign policy and in the process of IP. Among them, Snyder published a series of writings to propagate the importance of decision-making approach. He analyse that society is not only complex but also dynamic. If so the real approach to the study of politics would be to conceptualize the analysis so that it can manage with dynamic aspects of society. He claims that his decision-making approach is dynamic. While the decision makers make decision they consider all the (or most of the) situations. If they fail to do this the decision will not achieve acceptability and credibility.

Snyder argue that the decision-making process has been playing a very crucial part in the administration of any business organisation or governmental department. In every society, there is political action and behind every action there is the role of human activity. Again human action relates to policy decision. How the society is to be managed or governmental department is to be administered all is related to the decision taken by human beings. That is the policy/decision is the dynamic force of action. Therefore, in order to study the society or the management of department it is necessary to analyse all the aspects of policy. Analysis of policy-making processes also helps us to acquire a comprehensive knowledge about the dynamics of society. Knowledge about dynamics of society is required for the formulation of future policy. Society is always changing and naturally today's policy may be irrelevant for future policy-making. Different elements such as human beings, economic factors, political phenomena, governmental departments, different institutions, organizations, groups etc. are actively or inactively involved in the social activities. Situations, factors, elements, processes, persons all are to be brought under an umbrella and this is decision.

Snyder has said that there are mainly three factors which in one way or other influence the decision-making process.

a) The first is internal setting of the society: The nature and functioning of the social organisation such as political parties, pressure groups, non-governmental organizations, public opinion, agencies helping the formation of public opinion, nature of the political system etc. All these elements enter into the domain of decision-making process. In a democratic society social, political and other types of organizations enjoy freedom in their day to day activities.

b) External Setting: There is external set up or setting. This condition is especially important for the policy maker who makes decisions for the external relations of the state. It is known to all the students of international politics that today the term international society has earned wide publicity and all the nation-states are the members of this society.

c) Number of stages: The decision-making is a process and passes through a number of stages. Many persons organizations, institutions etc. are involved in the decision making process and even an ordinary decision cannot be taken abruptly. Serious and considerable thought is invested for a proper decision.

Dependency Theory

Dependency was very important tool of analysis in the 1960s and 1970s. The dependency theory explains the dependence of developing countries on powerful developed countries.

There are various positions of dependency theory because of intellectual disagreements among thinkers. Therefore, Raul Presbisch (Argentine economist) proposed dependency theory to analyse international politics in the initial years. Later years, Andre Gunder Frank and Immanuel Wallenstein modified this idea in according to their point of view. They primarily characterizes the international system as comprised of two sets of states, variously described as dominant/dependent, center/periphery or metropolitan/satellite. The dominant states are the advanced industrial nations in the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The dependent states are those states of Latin America, Asia, and Africa which have low *per capita* GNPs and which rely heavily on the export of a single commodity for foreign exchange earnings.

The dependency theorists think that the success of the developed economies was marked by a specific time period in global economic history which was dominated by exploitative colonial European powers. They do not measure economic growth just based on indicators like GDP or trade indices. They link economic growth with economic development by paying attention to indices like life expectancy, infant mortality, education etc. They argue the rational central distributive mechanisms could work for a well-integrated economy where consumption patterns are not affected by non-economic forces such as racial, gender, ethnic biases etc. Moreover, dependency theorist say that market alone cannot be a sufficient distributive mechanism for poorer economies where economic activities are susceptible to social and economic changes.

Dependency theory identify that centre economies are industrialized, technically advanced, have advanced research facilities and run on the capital-intensive industrial model. On the other hand, the countries on the periphery survive on agricultural production and resource extraction as the major sectors of economy. They provide labour to the countries in the centre. For example, the periphery serves the interests of the centre, but the centre serves the interests of the centre only. there is a clear divide between the rich and poor people in all states. The rich control the political system and the economy and are the social elites. They want to stay in power and accumulate more income. In order to do so, the rich elites of all the states co-operate with each other to keep the system going for their own benefit. The poor remain poor in the whole process.

According to the dependency theorists, the system of liberal economic theory dominates among all the states. The liberal economic theory makes way for free-trade, unfettered market links with little or no interference from the governments. This global capitalistic system serves the interests of the countries at the centre and exploit the rich economy of under-developed countries. For instance, MNCs, banks, international institutions like World Bank and IMF, media etc. serve the interest of centre economies. It is the reason for growing economic inequality between and within different states of the world. They blame the exploitative nature of the international economic system which serves the interests of dominant states.

MODULE: III

RESTRUCTURING THEORY, PRACTICE AND AGENCY: NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS GREEN POLITICS, ORIENTALISM AND GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY

New Social Movements

The current global economic system optimizes the values and criteria of performance, efficiency and productivity, performance and so on. This global economic shift has major consequences for the development of social movements. The concurrent processes of globalization underpin that the internationalization of politics through the emergence of transnational actors, networks, and institutions, and the economic integration produced by the dizzying growth of international trade, the media and financial integration. In this sense, globalization itself makes room for the expression of international contestation by creating opportunity structures and favourable circumstances for the acts of anti/alternative globalization movements. These movements are not an isolated spontaneous series of events, but rather a conscious tactic of an increasingly coordinated and powerful social movement against economic and financial globalization that often targets international organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). These protests caused to organize World Social Forum in Porto Alegre in 2001.

In the last four decades, important social movements have emerged in Europe, America and in the Third world countries. They are regarded by many western social theorists as possible and relevant agents of social transformation, as authentic representatives of post-industrial social forces. These movements are particularly revealing in current world politics, where the classical clear-cut distinctions between domestic and foreign policies, high and low politics, hard and soft power. Global social movements also act transnationally in order to generate domestic outcomes, but they mainly aim at changing practices and influencing ideas and norms in world politics. These movements are emerging in a local or national space, movements always extend themselves to a wider scope, likewise asserting an epochal context (e.g. feminism, pacifism, anti-nuclear, anti-apartheid, human rights, environmentalism etc). Social movements are made up of actors with a creative capacity and a desire to transform; thus, they contribute to the debate and the outlining of the virtuousness of social justice as the foundation of societies, as well as for transnational relationships and exchanges. Participant actors contribute to redeeming the value of freedom as a basic element of emancipation, demanding that this value and its associated factors not be understood as an abstract principle of emancipation, as prevailed in the formation of the modern political citizen.

The intense degree of connectivity in contemporary collective action is no doubt favored by the communication facilities provided by modern technology, such as the internet and others. Despite the digital divide among and within countries and regions, available technology covers, most places on the global frontier. This accelerates *information* and intensifies conditions for debate, exchange and mobilization. Nonetheless, the most significant aspect of information, in relation to convergences, is the increase in the capacity to

circulate ideas and to transform contents very quickly. Information has, we would say, a crucial role for convergences at two levels. On the intellectual one, it nurtures the capabilities for (de)constructing discourses and issues by capacitating knowledge, critical analysis and propositional attitudes. Further, it provides actors with the intellectual tools to create discernment about conflict, contention, dialogue and agreement, contributing to the reshaping of politics and the sense of being a political actor, as discussed above. It is possible to say that it contributes, together with experience and values, to the development of expert knowledge and to empowerment. On the practical level, information fosters purposive mobilization, integrating actors on different scales and providing substantive platforms for joining broader scenarios, as well as dealing with multiple organization fields and multiple political environments. That is to say, it expands political opportunities and strengthens the organizations themselves.

New social movements are an open space as compared to conventional organizations or agencies; that is to say, they present a fluid structure and loose boundaries. Nonetheless, they concretely form a visible event. As an element of convergences, *visibility* is not merely part of the strategy of putting together so many issues, organizations personalities, people and ideas. Visibility has to do with the assertion that the gathering has taken place, no matter how contentious the ideas, slogans or tactics that are advocated by so many different participants and militants together, providing strength to the movements. But most of all, as we see it, it has to do with legitimizing social movements as actors that cannot be ignored by governments and international agencies, those who do not dispute power and space because of being the dominant power. In this sense, visibility, through confrontation or dialogue, could, eventually, facilitate negotiation on issues that governments and agencies might consider relevant.

Social movements as cosmopolitan moral agents that (aim to) regulate and/or resist the instrumental and power rationalities driving inter-state politics and the global economy. Either as collective actors or as discursive social forces, movements are portrayed as involved in the extension of citizenship, community, and human agency beyond state borders. Social and protest movements can be both democratic and nationalist (many color revolutions and secessionist movements), anti-regime and conservative (recent middle-class protests in South America), radical and liberal (libertarianism), counterhegemonic and exclusive (religious fundamentalists), pro-market and nationalist (Brexit), or pro-European and nativists (many European right-wing movements). Therefore, movements do not always coincide with the reductive categories through which social action is generally schematized in IR.

In sum, there is fully developed theoretical frame in IP to study about the emerging phenomenon of new social movements. Therefore, alternative liberal and constructivist perspectives have tried to articulate the complex pattern of social movements in the global politics. Liberals highlight that the social movements in the global politics is a part of international affairs. However, critical IR authors stressed the emancipatory potential of social movements, as bottom-up forces counterbalancing the technocratic, economic, and hegemonic character of neo-liberal globalization. Thus new social movement invite the

attention of the scholars to develop an appropriate theoretical frame work in the field of international politics.

Green Politics

Since the 1960s the 'modern' environment movement as a widespread and persistent social movement that has publicized and criticized the environmental 'side-effects' of the long economic boom following the Second World War. Rapid economic growth, the proliferation of new technologies, and rising population in this period generated increasing energy and resource consumption, new sources (and rising levels) of pollution and waste production, and the rapid erosion of the Earth's biodiversity. However, it was not until the late 1980s that a distinctly 'green' social and political theory emerged to give voice to the interrelated concerns of the new social movements (environment, peace, anti-nuclear, women's) that have shaped green politics. Green politics is the most recent of developments in the discipline of international politics. The major focuses of green politics is that economic and political implications of climate change, peak oil, overconsumption, resource competition and conflicts, and rising levels of global and national inequalities.

This idea is appeared in IP by different theoretical stages. First stage, green politics was primarily concerned with articulating the distinctiveness of ecologism as an ideology and green politics as a distinctive approach. In the second stage, ecological thought was characterized by a concern with debates between green politics and other schools of thought such as liberalism, feminism, critical theory and socialism, as well as focusing on some key concepts within political thought such as democracy, justice, the state and citizenship. Recently, the developments can be termed 'third generation' green politics are noticeable for its explicitly interdisciplinary and applied focus.

The central concern of green theory and practice to overcome both the separation of 'human' from 'nature' and also the misperception of humans as above or 'superior' to nature. Green politics can be seen as an attempt to bring humanity and the study of human society 'down to earth'. The science of ecology played an important part in arguing that humans as a species of animal (that is, we are not just *like* animals, we *are* an animal species) are ecologically embedded in nature, and exist in a web-like relation to other species, rather than being at the top of some 'great chain of being'. It is crucial to note the significance of green political and social theory having a strong basis in the natural sciences (mainly ecology, evolutionary and environmental psychology, the biological life sciences and thermodynamics). In fact, humans as a species of natural being, which like other species has its particular species-specific characteristics, needs and modes of flourishing (and non-flourishing).

Green politics consider that social environmental relations are not only important in human society, but also *constitutive* of human society. In its attention to the naturalistic bases of human society, the green perspective is 'materialistic' in a different and arguably much more fundamental. Green politics can be understood as a form of applied political theory, and here it shares this feature with other ideologies all of which seek to make a difference and change the world or society according to their particular political principles. The task of an

applied approach to political theory is to analyse some basic political or ethical principles – democracy, justice, and citizenship for example – and see what follows from them given the empirical ‘reality of the situation’ that faces humanity today, or a particular human society.

There has also been an increasing engagement by green political theorists with some of the core debates within normative IR theory, particularly those concerned with human rights, cosmopolitan democracy, transnational civil society, and transnational public spheres. This scholarship has also fed into, and helped to shape, a distinctly green branch of normative IR theory concerned with global environmental justice. Green IR theory may be usefully subdivided into an IPE wing, which offers an alternative analysis of global ecological problems to that of regime theory, and a normative or ‘green cosmopolitan’ wing that articulates new norms of environmental justice and green democracy at all levels of governance. Both of these sub-fields remain indebted to critical theory, particularly the neo-Gramscian inspired critical political economy of Robert Cox, and the cosmopolitan discourse ethics of Jurgen Habermas, and therefore can be located clearly on the critical/constructivist side of the rationalism versus constructivism debate in IR theory.

The major concern of Green IR theories are that environment justice demands: recognition of the expanded moral community that is affected by ecological risks (i.e. not just all citizens, but all peoples, future generations, and non-human species), participation and critical deliberation by citizens and representatives of the larger -community-at-risk in all environmental decision-making (including policy-making, legislating and treaty-making, administration, monitoring, enforcement, and adjudication), a precautionary approach to ensure the minimization of risks in relation to the larger community, a fair distribution of those risks that are reflectively acceptable via democratic processes that includes the standpoint of all affected parties and public interest advocacy groups; and redress and compensation for those parties who suffer the effects of ecological problems.

In sum, green IR theory has undergone significant development in the last decade to the point where it is recognized as a significant new stream of IR theory. The new green discourses of environmental justice, sustainable development, reflexive modernization, and ecological security have not only influenced national and international policy debates. Taken together, they have also recast the roles of states; economic actors, and citizens as environmental stewards rather than territorial overlords, with asymmetrical international obligations based on differing capacities and levels of environmental responsibility. This recasting has important implications for the evolution of state sovereignty. If it is accepted that sovereignty is a derivative concept, the practical meaning of which changes over time in response to challenges in the constitutive discourses of sovereignty, then to the extent that some of these discourses (on development, justice, and security) take on a greener hue, it is possible to point to ‘the greening of sovereignty’. Moreover, to the extent that states – and citizens within states - become increasingly accountable to communities and environments beyond their own borders, then they may be characterized as transnational states and citizens rather than merely nation-states or national citizens. Of course, the society of states is a long

way short of this ideal. However, green IR theorists have brought this ideal into view and made it thinkable.

Orientalism

The idea of Orientalism was proposed by Edward Said, an outstanding figure in post-colonial theory. He articulated the theory of orientalism in his famous work *Orientalism*. This thesis expose and explain that how Western dominance over the East. Orientalism was what he described as a form of Western imperialism that the East had been subjected to since Colonial times. Said talks of the earlier Orientalist writers who never seemed to capture the true nature of the Orient. They wrote or painted the stereotypes that had been a custom by others to record. This was subconsciously followed by the Orientalists or European colonialists who wanted to necessitate knowledge over the conquered peoples in the region. This is what he calls Orientalism. According to Said, the discourse of the Orientalists throughout history has often depicted the Eastern world as either a dark, mysterious and threatening place or as an overly romanticized mythical landscape. Said writes: ‘ a very large mass of writers, among whom are poets, novelists, philosophers, political theorists, economists and imperial administrators, have accepted the basic distinction between East and West as the starting point for elaborate theories, epics, novels and social descriptions concerning the Orient, its people, customs..’

These distinctions and the negative Orientalist discourse that Said refers to are dangerous to Muslims now as the image portrayed is deeply harmful. The main thread of Said’s argument in *Orientalism* is that the otherness of the East depicted by the Orientalists effectively justified imperial ambitions from the West. His theory of otherness and of the cultural stereotype of the East can be seen in the military occupancy of Arab countries by the West. It could be argued that the contemporary Orientalism that he talks of in the last 50 years is another form of Islamophobia. Said credits the popular media, films, news, books, articles and images coming from the West for instilling an underlying feeling of superiority and inherent racism (what he calls manifest Orientalism) even nowadays, when depicting the Orient.

The context surrounding the time that Said wrote *Orientalism* must be noted when discussing its usefulness in understanding the relations between the West and Middle East. The Arab-Israeli War of 1973 was a turning point for this observation. He describes how he conceived the idea for *Orientalism* whilst watching news coverage in America reporting on the unfolding events of the war. He posits that the Arabs were being depicted as less modern than the Israelis and that their methods of fighting were cowardly and backward. Here he demonstrates how the nature of the Western world’s patronizing understanding of the Arabic world even in modern warfare was seen to be barbaric and less advanced than that of the enemy. Therefore it could be argued that Orientalism as a concept is useful into gaining an insight into the Middle East and some of the ways the media seems to portray the Arab world and perhaps why this stereotype is applied.

When looking at current relations between the West and the Middle East an obvious point to consider is the current military occupancy of Iraq and Afghanistan by American and

Britain. However it could also be argued that post 9/11 and 7/7 Orientalism as a concept is outdated. For the better part of the Cold War the Western powers were still not particularly involved in the Middle East. The West had seemingly looked down on the various conflicts in the region such as the Iran-Iraq war and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as it was not of direct relevance to them. The end of Cold War saw Russia fighting with Afghanistan. Here America stepped in to support Russia's enemy, by supporting the Taliban. However as quickly as the Taliban defeated the Russians they started to fight the Americans, who they had received economic and military support from. It would appear that at the time the West was more concerned with the collapse of the Soviet Union and to bring an end to the communist threat. The end of the Cold War saw the end of the balance of power between America and the USSR. This meant that after the Cold War America was able to extend its influence in regions of the world previously that Russia would have stopped them controlling or that they had their eyes on themselves. However it could be suggested that America did this at the cost of its own security in the long run by arming its later enemies.

Said claimed that the West never understood the Middle East and regarded it as inferior barbaric nations who were not an immediate threat to Western security. Perhaps the usefulness of Orientalism as a concept is in the way we can now understand why and how the Afghan freedom fighters were willingly armed by the Americans. This is because they were in fact not seen as harmful or threatening to the West, which goes against the line of Orientalism which talks of the demonization of the Muslim world. Ultimately one could say that nowadays Orientalism as a concept to understanding current international relations is slightly off point as there is a war going on at the moment between the West and the Middle East and that the threat faced is very real.

Global Civil Society

The concept of an emergent global civil society (GCS), an identifiable public sphere of voluntary association distinct from the architecture of states and markets, has become vogue in some approaches to international relations and international political economy, and in the practices of global governance. The international politics of sovereign states is held to be increasingly challenged in juridical and practical terms by the transnational and deterritorialized character of contemporary social relations. Such restructuring has given rise to a range of concepts, often devised in relation to well-worn notions that seek to characterize and bring meaning to change. It is the concept of 'global governance' that has, however, become the most prominent in accounts and policy prescriptions of the decent red, multilayered and overlapping character of contemporary political authority. State institutions increasingly engage in multilateral agreements (regional and international), and international organizations such as the G-7, OECD, World Bank, IMF and WTO take on an expanded importance.

Similarly, a wide array of 'private' institutions including industrial and financial associations and professional 'experts' such as accountants, consultants and economists also come to exercise significant authority. With such proclaimed global governance has come a sharp growth in the activities of so-called non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that

include the likes of Oxfam, Save the Children and the Red Crescent. While forging close working relationships with international organizations. It is fact that enormously diverse array of NGOs and social movements that tends to be the focus in a discourse of GCS that has become ubiquitous in the discussions and practices of global governance. The World Bank describe civil society as ‘the arena in which people come together to pursue the interests they hold in common-not for profit or the exercise of political power, but because they care enough about something to take collective action’. As activists in Asia, Latin America and particularly Eastern Europe recognised during the 1970s and 1980s, the ideal of societal space, autonomous from the state, wherein self-management and democracy could be worked out is of considerable utility to those seeking social transformation.

GCS constitutes an agent for empowerment in a dual sense, enabling the political participation of GCS whilst authorizing and legitimating the practices of the formal institutions of global governance. Perhaps not surprisingly, international organizations themselves are keen to invoke the assumed empowerment qualities of GCS. For example, the 1996 WTO *Guidelines for arrangements on relations with NGOs* clearly states that Members recognize the role NGOs can play to increase the awareness of the public in respect of WTO activities and agree in this regard to improve transparency and develop communication with NGOs. It can be seen, then, that implicit in much of the academic advocacy of GCS is the belief that by acting as a progressive force for good, GCS provides the key to resistance in the contemporary world order. While for the likes of Richard Falk this resistance hinges upon the establishment of more participatory and substantive democratic arrangements, others expect GCS to take the lead in a wider and perhaps ultimately more emancipatory transformation. In the Gramscian terms of many of these writers, civil society’s organic intellectuals, including academics, church leaders, trade unionists, environmentalists, social activists and leaders of community organizations, are enacting a so-called counter-hegemonic war of position to establish a higher form of society. Whilst uncertain and far from determined, the qualities of such a society seem likely to combine equitable and environmentally sustainable economic provisioning with a republican vision of democracy.

The practices of global civil society, it seems to us, cannot be decisively situated in a bounded space that is non-governmental and non-economic. In the World Bank’s framing of civil society, for example, local networks and voluntary associations become a means to mitigate the more damaging forces of the global economy. In the World Development Report *Attacking Poverty*, the Bank makes its use of GCS as a means of governing more explicit. In their guidelines on helping poor people to manage risk they describe microfinance as a risk management tool that can help poor household’s smooth consumption during an adverse shock. Though the report refers to NGOs such as the Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA), Home Net, and Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO), the participation of these groups is understood to be the responsible and proactive obligation of global citizens. The critical voices that these groups bring to the inequalities of the global economy are masked by a discourse of harnessing global forces and providing channels for legitimate participation that enable poor people to get the best from globalization.

MODULE IV

CONFLICT, PEACE AND INSECURITY DILEMMA POLITICAL, MILITARY, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, TERRORISM AND NATIONAL SECURITY- THEORIES OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PEACE RESEARCH

Peace has always been among humanity's highest values--for some, supreme. Martin Luther says "The most disadvantageous peace is better than the most just war. I prefer the most unjust peace to the justest war that was ever waged. There never was a good war or a bad peace." Perhaps the most popular (Western) view of peace is as an absence of dissension, violence, or war.

Peace is a social and political condition that ensures development of individuals, society and nation. It is a state of harmony characterized by the existence of healthy relationships. It is a condition related to the social or economic welfare and equality. It is also related to a working political order that serves true interests of all. In the context of intra-national and international relations, peace is not merely the absence of war or conflict, but also the presence of socio-cultural and economic understanding and unity.

When we talk about peace, we mostly relate it to its traditional or liberal notion that has been focused since ages on the danger of military or armed conflicts or threats. And the source of the danger has been a nation threatening to take or being suspected to take military action against the other. This endangers sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the nation, and also the lives of its people. As a measure of ensuring peace, the cause of the threat of military action is sorted out by the concerned nations through a bilateral agreement, or a long-term treaty for not taking military action against each other. The nations also take preventive measures by increasing their defence capabilities, deploying more armed forces on borders. Some also adopt balance of power approach through entering into a treaty with other nations to take joint action in the case of military attack on any one of them. As we know, the international organizations like United Nations have been created to save the humanity from the threat of war or armed conflicts.

But the new or non-traditional notion of peace is much broader and goes beyond military threats to include wide range of dangers and threats to human existence. This conceptualization includes not only regions and nations, but also individuals or communities and the human kind at large. This notion is primarily addressed to individuals. It is true that protection of people from foreign attacks is a necessary condition for peace and security, but it is not the be all and end all. In fact, peace is to be seen as the precondition to socio-economic development and to the maintenance of human dignity. The new notion of peace also includes freedom of individuals from hunger, freedom from wants, diseases and epidemics, environmental degradation, exploitation and sub-human treatment. In this background the new notion of peace is based on threats beyond military attacks. These threats may be from terrorism, insurgency, genocide, denial of human rights, health epidemics, narcotics trade and irrational use of natural resources.

NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE PEACE

Johan Galtung, the father of peace studies often refers to the distinction between ‘negative peace’ and ‘positive peace’ (e.g. Galtung 1996). Negative peace refers to the absence of violence. When, for example, a ceasefire is enacted, a negative peace will ensue. It is negative because something undesirable stopped happening (e.g. the violence stopped, the oppression ended). Positive peace is filled with positive content such as restoration of relationships, the creation of social systems that serve the needs of the whole population and the constructive resolution of conflict. Peace does not mean the total absence of any conflict. Peace exists where people are interacting non-violently and are managing their conflict positively – with respectful attention to the legitimate needs and interest of all concerned.

DEMOCRATIC PEACE THEORY

Democratic peace is the proposition that democracies are more peaceful in their foreign relations. This idea dates back centuries, at least to Immanuel Kant and other 18th-century Enlightenment thinkers. In recent decades it has constituted a major research agenda, competing with and arguably supplanting other research agendas such as neo-realism. The democratic peace proposition has many possible empirical and theoretical forms. On the empirical side, some propose that democracies are more peaceful in their relations with all other states in the system (“monadic” democratic peace); some propose that democracies are more peaceful only in their relations with other democracies (“dyadic” democratic peace); others argue that the more democracies there are in a region or the international system, the more peaceful the region or international system will be (“systemic” democratic peace); and still others doubt the existence of any significant relationship between democracy and peace. Notably, most although not all empirical research on the democratic peace has employed quantitative methods of analysis. On the theoretical side, there are many different accounts of the relationship between democracy and peace, with most focusing on domestic political institutions, domestic political norms, and constructed identities. The democratic peace proposition is connected to many other propositions linking domestic politics and international relations, including that democracies are more likely to cooperate with each other, that democracies are more likely to win the wars they fight, that escalating military casualties degrade public support for war, that leaders initiate conflict to secure their domestic hold on power (the diversionary hypothesis), that democracies fight shorter wars, that different kinds of democracies experience different kinds of conflict behaviour, that different kinds of authoritarian systems experience different kinds of conflict behaviour, and others. The democratic peace also overlaps with related ideas such as the liberal peace and the commercial peace.

The democratic peace proposition has been lurking in Western thought for millennia, as Weart 1998 shows, but Kant 1991 provides its first modern formulation. The idea that global democracy would provide a solid foundation for global peace was restated in 1917 by Woodrow Wilson as a justification for American entry into World War I and then as part of his vision for a new world order. Modern political science first observed the dyadic

democratic peace—that democracies tend not to fight each other—in the 1970s. The observation enjoyed greater attention in the 1980s in particular in two pathbreaking 1983 essays by Michael Doyle, reprinted in Doyle 2011. It received fuller theoretical and empirical attention in the 1990s. Fukuyama 1992, a famous argument that humanity had reached “the end of history,” incorporates the democratic peace proposition. Other scholars sought to develop the theory and push forward more advanced research designs in works such as Russett 1993; Ray 1995; and Rousseau 1996. In the 2000s, proponents of the democratic peace responded to their critics and embedded the democratic peace in a broader Kantian peace .

THE CONFLICT AND PEACE- MODELS AND CONCEPTS

Conflict is a dispute in a situation defined by the parties' underlying goals and beliefs, mutual perception and communication, and the facts involved. The conflict itself is a process of communication--an engagement of fields of expression.⁴ Passions and beliefs become evident; the nature and intensity of hidden interests surface. In the process of achieving a new structure of expectations, conflict integrates underlying goals and mutual perceptions into a balance among the central interests at stake, the resolution, and the ability of the parties to support them. The balancing process can be shortened, intensity reduced, antagonism lessened, and the resulting expectations made more realistic by clarifying the conflict situation. In this four rules should help the parties.

- Uncover the underlying or hidden goals and beliefs. Look beneath the conflict. A dispute really may be about hidden, perhaps even unconscious, beliefs and values.
- Determine the facts. Fact finding is essential to resolving conflict, for often conflicts are generated by a misperception or misunderstanding of the facts involved.
- Be sensitive to the other's position and perspective. See the conflict through his eyes. Resolving conflict is partially empathizing with the other, understanding his⁵ frame of reference, and sensing this reading of one's field of expression.
- State the other's argument and demands. Miscommunication and misperception can play a large role in conflict. One way to reduce these problems is to seek mutual agreement on the issue, claims, and justifications.

These four rules--look underneath, look at the facts, look at oneself, and look at the other--alone will not make peace, but they help to focus on the real issues and reduce the emotional content.

One of the most influential early models of conflict was developed by Johan Galtung (also known as founding father of peace research institute, Oslo). Galtung proposed that conflict could be viewed as a triangle, with contradiction, attitude, and behaviour at its points. Contradiction refers to the underlying conditions of conflict, which include the actual or perceived incompatibility of goals or clashes of interest between the conflict parties. Attitude includes the parties' perceptions and misperceptions of each other, such as stereotypes of the other. Behaviour includes cooperation as well as coercion, but in violent conflict it is characterised by threats, coercion and destructive attacks. Galtung argued that

conflict resolution must involve all three components of the triangle: de-escalation of violent behaviour, a change in attitudes and a transformation of the relationships or clashing interests that are at the core of the conflict structure or contradiction. In his later writing, Galtung (1990) developed a model of conflict that distinguished between direct violence (linked to behaviour) , cultural violence (linked to attitude) and structural violence(linked to contradiction).

In peace research literature, common terms for responses to conflict are ‘conflict management’, ‘conflict resolution’ and ‘conflict transformation’. Conflict management is the art of appropriate intervention to achieve political settlements, particularly by those powerful actors having the power and resources to bring pressure on the conflicting parties in order to induce them to settle. Conflict management more commonly refers to interventions to control conflict , keep violence at bay or keep conflict from escalating further . Under this definition, conflict management is successful if violence is contained and symptoms of conflict (that is direct physical violence) are suppressed. The term conflict resolution refers to efforts to resolve a conflict by addressing the underlying contradictions or incompatibilities of interest of the parties to a conflict.

The term peace building refers to activities that go beyond crisis intervention or conflict management. As defined by UN Secretary general Boutros Boutros Ghali in his 1992 report *An Agenda for Peace* ,the concept of peace building was introduced as ‘the construction of a new environment’ to avoid the break down of peaceful conditions and prevent recurrence of crisis , recognising that ‘only sustained, cooperative work to deal with underlying economic ,social, cultural and humanitarian problems can place an achieved peace on a durable foundation .Peace building is an approach to post-conflict settings that recognises the need for reconciliation, developing a capacity for conflict resolution and working towards sustainable peace .Peace building is distinct from both peace making and peace keeping as it is pro active rather than reactive in dealing with conflict.

Conflict transformation essentially aims at changing the ways that individuals and communities perceive and accommodate their differences, away from adversarial approaches towards collaborative problem solving, if necessary, redefining social relationships in order to bring forth social justice and equality for parties in conflict. This is seen as process that engages a society on multiple levels, encouraging people to develop the knowledge, understanding and skills that empower them to coexist peacefully. Transformation necessitates a reframing of the positions, goals and approaches of the actors or stake holders.

THE IDEA OF HUMAN SECURITY

According to Canadian diplomat Rob McRae, the idea of human security “takes the individual as the nexus of its concern, the life as lived, as the true lens through which we should view the political, economic, and social environment. As its most basic level, human security means freedom from fear.”

In contrast to realists who remain focused on the security of states from other states, liberal theorists have long argued that famine, disease, crime, and natural disasters cost far

more lives than do wars. But, until recently, few countries were concerned about the welfare of individuals other than their own citizens. The idea of human security, then, emphasize the welfare of individuals rather than states.

THE IDEA OF SECURITY DILEMMA

In international relations theory, the security dilemma refers to the difficulty of increasing a state's security without simultaneously (and inadvertently) decreasing the security of other states. Coined by John H. Herz in a 1950 article, the term has become an integral part of explanations of how peace-seeking states may blunder into arms races, crises, or wars. For example, a state may seek to increase its own security and deter outside aggression by building up arms. A neighbouring state, witnessing the build up, will misinterpret the move as preparation for future aggression. Feeling threatened, it will attempt to increase its own security by acquiring arms. The first state's suspicions about its neighbour's belligerence are confirmed, leading to an arms race, increase in tension, or war. Conflict in this case is a product of mutual misperceptions and miscommunications that arise not only from the cognitive failures of policy makers but also from the inherent difficulty of credibly conveying peaceful intentions while building up arms or establishing buffer zones. In the domestic realm, as Robert Jervis points out, people can seek to increase their security in ways that do not threaten others—for instance by putting bars in their windows or avoiding high-crime areas. Sovereign states, on the other hand, rarely have such options available to them. What Herz called the “tragic implication” of the security dilemma is that uncertainty and fear about the intentions of other states can lead to war even when all sides are desperate to avoid one.

Several factors can mitigate the dangers associated with the security dilemma and help induce cooperation among states. One is the recognition that the dilemma exists in the first place. Failure to recognize it as such leads to two related problems. First, statesmen will not realize that their own attempts to increase security—even if done for genuinely peaceful reasons—will inevitably threaten other states, despite all assurances to the contrary. Second, they will fail to recognize that other states may arm because they fear attack, seeing their attempts instead as symptoms of aggression. A state that genuinely sees itself as peaceful, and assumes that others do as well, will wrongly conclude that any objections to their own arms build up must mean that those who object are belligerent. The difficulty here lies in conveying what the policy makers may take for granted: that outsiders should not feel threatened by the state's attempt to increase its security. Of course, merely recognizing this problem does not eliminate the dilemma. Even if policy makers recognize that others may simply be trying to increase their own security, and even if they take into account how their own attempts to do so may be misperceived by others, they cannot rely on the promises and sworn good intentions of others to maintain their security. The problem becomes not a failure of communication or empathy, but instead a failure to credibly commit to peaceful intentions in the absence of an external enforcer. (A functioning collective security system is thus another factor that can make the security dilemma more or less acute. A state will feel less threatened by a neighbour's arms increases if it believes that collective security

agreements will deter potential aggressors. In this case the security concept takes the role of an external enforcer.)

In certain situations, an acute awareness of the security dilemma can actually increase the chances of conflict. This happens if aggressors are perceived to be misunderstood security seekers. Hitler's belligerence in the 1930s was initially met with little resistance precisely because European statesmen were intensely aware of the possibility that Germany was merely acting as a security-seeking status quo power. The fact that the security dilemma was felt to be less acute after World War I than beforehand did not prevent the outbreak of another global conflict.

In a foundational 1978 article, Robert Jervis argued that two factors are crucial in determining the severity of the security dilemma. One is whether offense has the advantage over defence the other is whether an offensive posture can be distinguished from a defensive one. The security dilemma is more acute when offense holds the advantage and conquest is relatively easy. When offense has the advantage, a nation eternally poised on the brink of foreign conquest will be more suspicious of others, is more likely to interpret moves by others as aggressive, and is constantly tempted to attack pre-emptively when facing a threat (real or perceived) lest it be attacked first. In a world of offense dominance, ambiguous signals are more likely to be interpreted as threats, and crises more likely to escalate because of mutual insecurity. Relatively secure states, by contrast, can take a more leisurely view of threats. States that do not feel as readily threatened by their neighbours—due to geographic isolation, for instance—will not feel the need to cajole or threaten others to safeguard their own security. Britain's foreign policy in the 19th century, especially as contrasted with the foreign policy of continental states, reflects this distinction. Unlike Austria, surrounded by great powers and vulnerable to internal unrest, Britain could afford to take a more relaxed view of minor disturbances and revolutions within the European state system. Geography is thus an important factor in determining whether offense or defence has the upper hand in a world of impregnable border defences the security dilemma is greatly ameliorated. Oceans, mountains, rivers, and buffer zones all serve to ease the security dilemma by giving advantage to the defence.

In a world of total offense dominance, the only sure way for even peace-seeking states to increase security is through pre-emptive aggression and expansion. In such a world, even a small increase in one's own security can threaten others. On the other hand, in a world where defence dominates, where it is easier to protect or hold territory than to conquer or destroy it, even large increases in a state's security will only slightly decrease the security of others. When conquest is impossible, spiraling arms races are readily perceived as inefficient, insecurities associated with international anarchy are ameliorated, and unnecessary conflict can be avoided. Offense dominance, by contrast, greatly increases what Thomas Schelling called the "reciprocal fear of surprise attack," increasing the incentives for arms races in the long term, and incentives for pre-emptive or preventive first strikes in the short term. Technology, therefore, is another factor that determines whether offense has the advantage over defence. When offense is believed to possess technological superiority, as was

the case before World War I, there is a greater incentive to strike first in order to pre-empt a potentially debilitating attack. Although the origins of World War I remain a subject of vigorous academic debate, the mistaken belief in offense dominance among European statesmen of the time is often cited as one of its major causes. According to this line of thought, the Franco-Prussian war instilled in policy makers the belief that the next conflict would be short, cheap, and decisive, its outcome favouring the aggressor rather than the defender. Thus the run-up to World War I created incentives for spiralling arms races, and once war seemed inevitable, all sides had a strong temptation to act pre-emptively.

Because nuclear weapons render defence impossible, mutually assured destruction paradoxically resembles a world where defence dominates. The incentives for a first strike disappear, because the attacking state ensures its own destruction through retaliation (provided that a second-strike capability is maintained). Defence becomes relatively cheap, and the security dilemma becomes less acute. It is for this reason that some academics and policy makers view mutually assured destruction as an effective and credible instrument of peace among security-seeking states.

The second factor mitigating the dangers of the security dilemma, according to Jervis, is the difficulty in distinguishing defensive weapons from offensive weapons. If it can, a state can increase its own security without threatening the security of others. The use of purely defensive weapons or fortifications allows others to differentiate between aggressors and security seekers. In practice, however, such distinctions are extremely difficult to make. A fortress built for purely defensive reasons can still be used to shelter offensive forces or serve as a forward base for attacks, especially if built close to the border.

The emphasis on offense-defence theory within the environment of a security dilemma shifts the emphasis from considerations of pure power to considerations of military capability. As Charles Glaser argues, focusing on military capabilities can explain state behaviour ignored or contradicted by theories that focus only on power. While anarchy remains a constant, the variation in the amount and intensity of cooperation across space and time becomes easier to explain when examining the relationship between offense and defence under the security dilemma.

Although the concept of the security dilemma originated within international relations theory, the term has since been applied in explaining ethnic conflicts and civil wars within states. In the same way that uncertainty about the intentions of other states may lead a state into unwanted conflict, uncertainty and the accompanying fear of other groups can lead to spirals of intrastate violence in those situations in which the central government is unable to provide security (such as in failed multi-ethnic states), thus replicating the condition of anarchy on a domestic scale.

IDEA OF INSECURITY DILEMMA

Insecurity dilemma, in which national security, defined as regime security by state authorities, becomes pitted against the incompatible demands of ethnic, social, and religious forces in the Third World in the 1990s.

POLITICAL AND MILITARY DILEMMAS

These are the main political and military dilemmas facing 21st century nation states which are more severe than any other decades in the world history.

REFUGEE PROBLEM

In December 1950, the UN established the office of High commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), responsible for implementing the 1951 convention relating to the status of Refugees, reaffirmed in 2001. Since its establishment, UNHCR has aided over 50 million refugees by providing humanitarian assistance, including food, shelter, and medical aid, and the agency was awarded Nobel peace prizes in 1954 and 1981. Today UNHCR has offices in over 110 countries and a budget of about \$3 billion, based largely on voluntary contribution. In recent years, its resources have been stretched to cope with refugee population around the world.

By the 1951 convention countries are obliged to give asylum to refugees, defined as those who are outside the country of their nationality and are unable or unwilling to return home “owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion.” According to the principle of non-refoulement, a country cannot expel or forcibly return a refugee.

Between 1984 and 2004, the number of refugees almost doubled, peaking in 1994 following the Rwanda genocide. By the end of 2009, UNHCR was responsible for over 36 million “persons concern”, including 10.4 million refugees, a record 15.6 million Internally displaced persons (IDPs), almost a million asylum seekers, and millions more stateless persons. IDPs including the millions of the people displaced in Pakistan owing to conflict and natural disaster, pose a growing problem, with hundreds of thousands of new displacements in Somalia, Sudan, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka and Yemen in 2009 alone.

The number of refugees globally has stabilised in recent years. Today, the major source of refugees are Afghanistan (2.8 million), Iraq (1.7 million), Somalia (678,000), Democratic Republic of Congo (455,900) and Myanmar (406,700). Most refugees flee to neighbouring countries. As a result, Pakistan, Afghanistan's neighbour, is the foremost host country for refugees. Pakistan, Iran, Syria, Germany, and Jordan account for almost half of all refugees under the UNHCR mandate. Massive refugee flow can place economic, social and political strains on host countries, many of which like Pakistan and Kenya, already suffer from state weakness and conflicts of their own. Thus many refugees remain in exile for years.

In South Asia, Rohingyas of Myanmar, often described as “the world's most persecuted minority” is at the height of crisis with the Myanmar government moving in a mission of ethnic cleansing. The issue escalated when the insurgents attacked 30 police stations, triggering a massive military response. In the wake of the violence, at least 5 lakh Rohingyas have fled to Bangladesh since August 2017.

Rohingyas are an ethnic group, majority of whom are Muslim, who have lived for centuries in the province of Rakhine in the majority Buddhist Myanmar. They are not granted

full citizenship too. According to the 1982 Burmese Citizenship Law, a Rohingya or any ethnic minority, is eligible for citizenship only if he/ she provides proof that his/her ancestors have lived in the country. Things remained the same even after the political change in 2015. The democratically- elected government headed by President Htin Kyaw also was unwilling to grant citizenship to the group. They have been rejected by the country they call home and were shunned by the neighbouring nation. Currently, they are about 1.1 million Rohingya who live in the South east Asian country. Owing to their mass fleeing from Myanmar the UN Refugee agency (UNHCR) have placed them “ the most vulnerable groups of the forcibly displaced”.

Another notable feature, in 2018 elections, many European nations , anti immigration and anti refugee parties made significant gains. Particularly Sweden (Swedish Democrats), France, Hungary, Slovenia, Poland, Austria, Italy. Again American President, Donald Trump calling Mexican immigrants rapists and criminals, to his threats to wall off the border, deport millions, and punish U.S. exporters who invest in Mexico, Trump has put Mexico on a state of red alert. Trump has signed an executive order banning travel from Sudan, Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia and Yemen and nation's refugee programme will be suspended for 120 days. The number of refugees to be admitted this year, 2018, has been reduced to 50,000 from the 1,10,000 cap set by the Obama administration. The indefinite ban on Syrian refugees has been lifted.

INSURGENCY

An insurgency is an armed rebellion against a constituted authority, the government. The collapse of the “Soviet Empire” was followed by the emergence, or re-emergence, of many serious insurgencies in several areas that had been relatively quiescent during the Cold War. Some of these new insurgencies have been taking place within the former Soviet Union, such as the war between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh, and the fighting in Chechnya. But some conflicts also erupted or intensified in several countries outside of it and many Third World conflicts in which the superpowers were not deeply involved during the Cold War have persisted after it, like the secessionist movements in India, Sri Lanka, and Sudan.

Ethnopolitical conflicts aside, there have been other threats to international order that are, indeed, beyond the full control of major powers, even the United States, the victor of the Cold War. The most notable ones include religious militancy, terrorism, North-South conflict, and severe competition over scarce resources. Thus, the end of the Cold War can be said to have brought about both stability and instability to international relations. The purpose of this article is to evaluate nearly two decades of the post-Cold War era in terms of the elements of stability and instability. In this respect, the study will start with an overview of the general characteristics of the international system. This will be followed by a more detailed discussion on basic trends and new threats in international relations. Several observations will also be outlined in concluding the study with respect to possible future directions of international affairs.

Ever since independence, India has experienced violence related to insurgent movements. Broadly, these can be divided into movements with political motives and movements for social and economic justice. The most prominent militant groups are violent extremist separatists operating in Jammu and Kashmir and Assam, and different militant groups in India's northeastern States of Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland and Tripura. Although all the members of these groups are Indians, these groups receive support from neighbouring countries. Whereas, these militant movements are going on because the groups involved in it are dissatisfied with their present state of affairs, there are certain groups, especially in Jammu and Kashmir and Assam that have political agenda. They are fighting for secession from the country. These groups have active support from the neighbouring countries and even certain international terrorist groups.

TERRORISM

Terrorism is a quintessentially political act. The political purposes may be more or less explicit, the depending on the nature of the perpetrating group. It has typically been viewed as a weapon of the weak who cannot achieve their political aims through normal political processes. Contemporary terrorism differs in some respects from that of the past. Terrorist acts are directed not only at heads of state but against innocent civilians. The goals are not limited to over throwing a government or leader, or gaining an interdependent Tamil, Palestinian or Basque home land, but include eliminating western, and especially American, presence in Islamic Holy Lands. The ease of international travel and telecommunications have made transnational terrorism less confined to a particular geographic place and enabled terrorist groups to form global net works and to move money, weapons, and people easily from one area to another. An implicit link has come also from groups copying each other's tactics – the so-called demonstration effect. The possibility that terrorist might acquire biological, nuclear, chemical or miniaturized weapons has raised the dangers of terrorist attacks and also made detection more problematic.

Terrorism involves four major elements :

1. Premeditation, where the perpetrator has decided to commit a terrorist act to instill terror or fear in others;
2. Political, religious or ideological motivation- a cause;
3. Targets that are generally noncombatants and often appear to be chosen at random, ranging from innocent bystanders, tourists, soldiers and bureaucrats to those holding prominent positions;
4. Secretiveness, where terrorist belong to clandestine groups or are sponsored by states.

Legal instruments have been a primary means by which the international community has responded to terrorism. Twelve conventions now form the core body of international law dealing with terrorism. Hijacking, for example led to three treaties on air line and air port safety that declared terrorist acts against civil aviation illegal and sought to ensure the safety of the flying public.

The September 11, 2001, attacks on the world trade centre and the pentagon were the most devastating terrorist acts to date. They elicited immediate and general condemnation by the international community. A day after the attacks, the UN Security Council passed resolution 1368 condemning the heinous acts of terrorism and calling for international co operation to punish those responsible. Most important, the resolution affirmed that the attacks were a breach of international peace under chapter VII , Thus giving the council authority to take action and legitimising US responses as self defence.

One of the major responses to the September 11 attacks was the US led action in Afghanistan to root out the terrorist trainingcamps, the Taliban government that had sanctioned Al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups, and the Al – Qaeda leadership. In December 2001 with the Taliban removed, the international security assistance force (ISAF) became operational in Afghanistan.

Terrorism has been one of the greatest threats to peace and security in India. The illustration on the terrorist attack in Mumbai on 26 November, 2008, popularly called 26/11, symbolizes one of the worst such incidences. The terrorists who conduct violent activities are persons belonging to foreign countries or are Indian youth indoctrinated, supported and trained in neighbouring countries.

Terrorism , especially in its newer forms, has been described as the “ privatisation of war” in the 21st century. As such, it presence new treats to security and new governance challenges. Many pieces of security governance – such as preventive diplomacy, adjudication, mediation , peace keeping and arms control- are irrelevant when dealing with terrorism. The weakness of most states ‘banking regulation and the ease of moving large amounts of money rapidly around the globe pose major problems for efforts to block terrorists’ funding. This requires new modes of enforcement ranging from controls on money laundering and transparency of banking transactions to targeted sanctions such as those on conflict diamonds and leaders of states that support terrorism. In cases such as Al-Qaeda where there are no specific political objectives, but rather broad anti -American sentiments, fundamentalist Islamic or other religious concerns, or deep alienation from static societies such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, identifying appropriate governance responses is a far more elusive task.

The United Nations is being increasingly called upon to coordinate the global fight against terrorism. Eighteen universal instruments against international terrorism have been elaborated within the framework of the United Nations system relating to specific terrorist activities. In September 2006, UN Member States adopted the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. This was the first time that Member States agreed to a common strategic and operational framework against terrorism.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMICAL DILEMMAS

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

In the case of severe climate change, corresponding to an average increase in global temperature of 2.6°C by 2040, massive nonlinear events in the global environment give rise

to massive nonlinear societal events. In this scenario, nations around the world will be overwhelmed by the scale of change and pernicious challenges, such as pandemic disease. The internal cohesion of nations will be under great stress, including in the United States, both as a result of a dramatic rise in migration and changes in agricultural patterns and water availability. The flooding of coastal communities around the world, especially in the Netherlands, the United States, South Asia, and China, has the potential to challenge regional and even national identities. Armed conflict between nations over resources, such as the Nile and its tributaries, is likely and nuclear war is possible.

The social consequences range from increased religious fervor to outright chaos. In this scenario, climate change provokes a permanent shift in the relationship of humankind to nature. The catastrophic scenario, with average global temperatures increasing by 5.6°C by 2100, finds strong and surprising intersections between the two great security threats of the day— global climate change and international terrorism waged by Islamist extremists. This catastrophic scenario would pose almost inconceivable challenges as human society struggled to adapt. It is by far the most difficult future to visualize without straining credulity. The scenario notes that understanding climate change in light of the other great threat of our age, terrorism, can be illuminating. Although distinct in nature, both threats are linked to energy use in the industrialized world, and, indeed, the solutions to both depend on transforming the world's energy economy—America's energy economy in particular. The security community must come to grips with these linkages, because dealing with only one of these threats in isolation is likely to exacerbate the other, while dealing with them together can provide important synergies. Poor and underdeveloped areas are likely to have fewer resources and less stamina to deal with climate change—in even its very modest and early manifestations. The impact on rainfall, desertification, pestilence, and storm intensity has already been felt in much of Africa, parts of Central Asia, and throughout Central and South America. Some of the nations and people of these regions lack the resilience to deal with modest—let alone profound—disturbances to local conditions. In contrast, wealthier societies have more resources, incentives, and capabilities to deploy, to offset, or to mitigate at least some of the more modest consequences of climate change. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that climate change will not be a problem for affluent countries, including the United States. Such nations may also face dire conditions such as permanent agricultural disruptions, endemic disease, ferocious storm patterns, deep droughts, the disappearance of vast tracks of coastal land, and the collapse of ocean fisheries, which could well trigger a profound loss of confidence in the most advanced and richest states.

Perhaps the most worrisome problems associated with rising temperatures and sea levels are from large-scale migrations of people — both inside nations and across existing national borders. In all three scenarios it was projected that rising sea levels in Central America, South Asia, and Southeast Asia and the associated disappearance of low lying coastal lands could conceivably lead to massive migrations—potentially involving hundreds of millions of people. These dramatic movements of people and the possible disruptions

involved could easily trigger major security concerns and spike regional tensions. In some scenarios, the number of people forced to move in the coming decades could dwarf previous historical migrations. The more severe scenarios suggest the prospect of perhaps billions of people over the medium or longer term being forced to relocate. The possibility of such a significant portion of humanity on the move, forced to relocate, poses an enormous challenge even if played out over the course of decades.

The term “global climate change” is misleading in that many of the effects will vary dramatically from region to region. Changes in ocean currents, atmospheric conditions, and cumulative rainfall will vary across different geographies, making it difficult to predict truly global outcomes. Most localities will likely experience rising temperatures, but some places might see temperature declines due to the complexities of local climate processes. Changes across the board are unlikely to be gradual and predictable and more likely to be uneven and abrupt. Certain ecosystems—such as polar ice regions and tropical rainforests—are much more susceptible to even modest changes in local temperatures. And these regions are particularly important when it comes to both regulating and triggering conditions associated with climate change. Global climate change involves the entire planet but it will play out very differently with varying levels of intensity and significance in different regions—a key observation of the group.

On June 1, 2017, United States President Donald Trump announced that the U.S. would cease all participation in the 2015 Paris Agreement on climate change mitigation. Trump stated that "The Paris accord will undermine (the U.S.) economy," and "puts (the U.S.) at a permanent disadvantage." Trump stated he will move to negotiate a new “fair” deal that would not disadvantage US businesses and workers. He claimed the agreement would cost the US, 3 trillion dollar lost in GDP and 6.5 million jobs- while rival economies like China and India were treated more favourably. The US is world’s second largest greenhouse gas emitter and contributes about 15% of global emissions of carbon, but it is also a significant source of finance and technology for developing countries in their efforts to fight rising temperatures. Analysts say the US withdrawal from the Paris agreement will make it more difficult for the world to reach the goals that it set for itself in the Paris agreement. The Paris accord is meant to limit the global rise in temperature attributed to emissions. As of October 2017, 195 UNFCCC members have signed the agreement, 168 of which have ratified it.

GLOBALISATION

In the social front globalisation signifies closer interactions of people and homogenisation of culture and values and the world being transformed into a global village. Politically it refers to the complex networks of global governance and shared political values resulting in the development of a tendency towards homogenisation of global political culture. Economically, it is manifested in the form of liberalisation tendencies, privatisation, deregulation leading to a free market regime.

According to Deepak Nayyar Globalisation can be more precisely defined as “a process associated with increasing economic openness growing economic independence and deepening economic integration between countries of the world economy” After the implementation of the globalization policies deepening of gap between the rich and poor countries and their contention that the geographical distinction such as the North – South divide is disappearing in favour of a single global market is hardly tenable. The world has witnessed series of protests and movements against globalisation with its apparatus, especially those like the IMF and the World Bank, the mantra of liberalization and privatization.

DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The post-Cold War period also witnessed the resurgence of North-South economic antagonism. Such confrontation is not new. It has occurred before in international arena. But in accordance with the decline of ideological clashes, it has begun to occupy a more significant agenda in international affairs.

To understand the greater consequences of the present North-South conflict, some historical perspective is needed. In the early 1970s, developing countries at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) coalesced into what became known as the Group of 77 to press their demands for a New International Economic Order (NIEO). This aspiration grew out of the neo-Marxist political economy theory of the 1960s, which argued that the international trading system was condemning the “periphery” -Latin America and other developing countries- to poverty, exploitation, and dependency. Among other measures, the NIEO specifically called for a system of price supports for a number of key developing country commodity exports, indexation of developing country export prices to developed countries' manufactured exports, technology transfer, and the negotiated re-deployment of some developed country industries to developing nations. By the 1980s, the NIEO agenda at the United Nations had foundered due to divergences in developing country interests, the inability to replicate OPEC's success with other commodities and, most importantly, the discrediting of its command-based economic theories. This was evidenced by the astonishing success of Taiwan, South Korea and others that pursued trade liberalization and export-led growth.

Thirty years later, at Cancun, many officials opined that the harsh rhetoric employed by major developing countries, such as Brazil and India, as well as smaller African and Caribbean countries, was strongly reminiscent of the 1970s UNCTAD experience. The themes of Northern economic exploitation have become fashionably recurrent, even though the remedies demanded by the South at the WTO now differ from the NIEO. Rather than price supports for commodities and exports, developing countries at Cancun called for unilateral trade concessions and compensation by the rich countries.

While there were many reasons enumerated for the failure at Cancun, the common theme was that talks fell apart along a North-South divide. The G-21 opposed developed countries' agricultural subsidies. The Lesser Developed Countries (LDC) refused to lower

their astronomical agriculture and manufacturing tariffs, which stoked the frustration of the United States and others .

With the talks ended with no clear success, the conflict between the poor developing nations living in the Southern Hemisphere and the rich industrial countries of the North has entered a new phase. The phenomenon of the economic dependence of the developing countries on the multinational companies from the industrialized countries is named today neocolonialism, what refers to the economic exploitation of these countries, which resembles the conditions in the colonial age in various regards. With global problems like the climate change, a further dimension of injustice is added: Whereas the problems are caused over proportionality in the North, the consequences of the desertification or extreme weather conditions occur over proportionally in the South. This extends to the threat to the existence of numerous small island states, which will no longer exist if the sea level continues to rise any further.

It remains marking that the economic North-South conflict has not led so far to military conflicts. Many critics, nevertheless, see to the neo colonialism as one main cause for the re-flashing of terrorism in the 21 century. Growing economic globalization in the post-Cold War era does not appear to be breaking the historical stratifications between the North and South. Rather, it is economic globalization that channelled by past grooves of strong and weak growth. The national units already integrated to the world economy become more integrated to the world economy; the less well-connected often stay that way. So far only a very small number of states have managed to break out of the low-growth ruts of the world system. The implications of this grim outcome for world political stability are stark. To the extent that poverty and under development facilitate continuing conflict between the North and South, we may expect to see international order as fragile.

CONCLUSION

Traditionally, international peace and security have meant states 'security and the defence of states' territorial integrity from external treats or attack. as suggested by our discussions of an emerging norm of humanitarian intervention and a responsibility to protect, the concept of human security – the security of human beings in the face of many different kinds of threats – is beginning to take hold. It has become the foundation of some middle power's foreign policy, such as Canada. These concerns for human security needs to eradicate poverty and reduce the inequalities exacerbated by globalisation, to promote environmentally sustainable development and greater respect for human rights norms, as well as to address the growing security threats posed by HIV / AIDS pandemic. It also grows out of the increased involvement of actors other than states, and especially of civil society. In short, threats to peace and security are being defined not only in terms of state security but also in terms of human security. Existing security governance structures are ill equipped to deal with many new issues. Hence, the challenge is to enhance the effectiveness of existing piece of governance for dealing with on going problems and to find innovative approaches for new ones.

MODULE V

FOREIGN POLICY: CHANGING CONCEPT OF NATIONAL INTEREST: DEVELOPMENTS IN COLD WAR -POST COLD WAR PERIOD, NEO LIBERALISM

States as units of international system cannot remain isolated from each other. Especially, in this age of growing interdependence, there are always reasons for interactions among them. Their interactions constitute what is known as the international processes. These interactions are best reflected by the policies pursued by the states towards other states. These policies are generally identified as the foreign policies which involve regulating and conducting external relations of the states, with respect to others in the international scenario. Foreign Policy is such wheel around that the huge machinery of international politics revolves and operates. It is a sovereign relation between/among sovereign states of the world, to protect their own interest as well as of other states. It is foreign policy through that a state can achieve their respective goals and objectives. Without foreign policy, a country is like a ship having no direction. Foreign policy is a strategy, planning or decision for specific goals. Every state wants to achieve certain specific goal and on the basis of these objectives foreign policy is formed.

Definitions

Foreign policy is the out put of the state into a global system. Policy is generally considered as "a guide to an action or a set of actions intended to realise the goals of an organization that it has set for itself" which involve choice or choosing actions to achieve one's goal. Foreign implies those territorially sovereign units that exist beyond the legal boundaries of a particular state. That is to say, anything beyond that legal territorial boundary, not under the legal authority of the state concerned, is foreign. Therefore, foreign policy is considered to be a set of guidelines to choices being made about people, places and things beyond the boundaries of the state concerned.

George Modelski opines, "foreign policy as the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment". A state's foreign policy takes into account several factors such as an estimate of its own power and capabilities, the broad principles of conduct which the state holds and its government advocates with respect to international affairs, the specific objective of national interest which the state seeks for itself in foreign relations as well as for the course of world affairs generally. Foreign policy also involves the strategies and commitments and tactics which are undertaken for the realisation of a states objectives and national interests.

According to Professor Gibson: "Foreign policy is well defined comprehensive plan based on knowledge and experience for conducting the business of the government with the rest of the world".

According to Professor Joseph Frankel: "Foreign policy consists of decisions and actions that involve to some appreciable extant relations between one state and other"

Padelford and Lincoln defines, ‘ Foreign policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete courses of action to attain these objectives and preserve its interests’. Padelford and Lincoln have explained two functions of foreign policy. Its first function is to attain its broadly conceived goals and second function is to preserve the national interests.

In the opinion of C.C Rodee, ‘Foreign policy as a group of principles which are adopted by the states to protect the national interests and to change the behaviour of others’.

Shortly Foreign Policy of Each Nation Contains:

1. A set of principles, policies and decisions adopted and followed by the nation in international relations.
2. Objectives, goals or aims of national interest which are to be secured.
3. Means to be used for achieving the goals of national interest.
4. Broad policy principles and decisions for conducting international relations.
5. Assessment of the gains and failures of the nation in respect of its goals of national interest.
6. Policies, decisions and action-programmes for maintaining continuity or change or both in international relations.

Objectives of Foreign policy

Professor Jayantanuja Bandyopadhyaya perceives the making of foreign policy as a continuous exercise in the choice of ends and means on the part of the nation-state in an international setting. A broad end or goal is necessary to give a sense of direction to foreign policy.

Broadly speaking, by foreign policy objectives, one means those things that statesmen pursue in the course of their interactions with other states. Objectives evolve, and there is hardly any consensus on how those objectives are best pursued or what the foreign policy objectives should be. This brings us to a discussion on the relation between objectives and strategy or between ends and means. Things thought of as objectives appear to be ends in themselves, but are rather means for the achievement of still more abstract or distant ends (happiness, security, success, prestige etc) and objectives, which originated a means of attaining something sometimes become an end in itself. The commonly cited example is that of the United States, objective of winning the war in Korea and Vietnam. The real motive was to contain communism which in turn was ultimately linked to the US interests to maintain stability in the international system to protect American security. Again, the objective of winning the Vietnam war was containing communism but gradually it became an end in itself because the reputation of the policy-makers depends upon the victory in the war although it became evident that the outcome of the Vietnam war surely going to weaken the US and place the communists in a favourable position.

Therefore, according to Legg and Morris, a rational policy making process to a large extent is the process of organizing clear and reliable means-end chain, controlling the

tendency of means to become ends in themselves and seeing that the original and more fundamental objectives are kept in perspective.

Holsti identifies objectives of the states ,which he arranges according to the priorities depending upon a variety of external circumstances and domestic pressures as:

• **SECURITY AND NATIONAL INTEREST**

" The General and continuing ends for that a nation acts is called National Interests".

National interest is one of the most important objectives of foreign policy. The Primary Interest of every state is self-presentation, Security and wellbeing of its citizens. National Interests is the permanent Interests of each state and every state want to protect it by using the following methods.

- a) Coercive Measures and Forcible Means
- b) Alliances are generally concluded by two or more Nations for the protection and promotion of common Interest i.e. NATO.
- c) Diplomatic Negotiations
- d) Economic aid i.e. US Aid under Marshal Plan (1948) to Europe and Third world
- e) Propaganda i.e. US Propaganda in Iraq War
- f) Collective Security i.e. against Iraq in Gulf War 1991

Another objective of foreign policy is maintenance of links i.e. relations with other members of international community, and adoption of policy of conflict or co-operation towards them with a view to promote its own interests i.e. economic, political, security, social etc. for gaining these interests for instance Pakistan have adopted the policy of co-operation towards China and Policy of conflict towards India because India is also the enemy of China.

AUTONOMY

The Protection of the territorial integrity of the country and the protection of the interest of its citizens both within and outside the country is the objective of foreign policy. Generally, for this purpose the state prefer to follow policy of status quo. Moreover, it includes Economic security, Political Security, Military Security and Psychological Security.

WELFARE IN THE BROADEST SENSE

Economic development is the process that not only effect economic relations but also social, political and cultural relations of the Society". "Economic development means increase in national income or increase in Per-Capita Income". Economic development is an attack on the chief evils of the world today i.e. disease, illiteracy, unemployment and inequality". Economic development is one of the most important objectives of Foreign Policy. As the status of a state in International Sphere is determined by the economic condition of a state thus a state pursue the policy to contribute to economic prosperity.

STATUS AND PRESTIGE

Another aim of foreign policy is the enhancement of the influence of the state either by expanding its area of influence or reducing the other states to the position of dependency i.e. USA and USSR followed this policy during Cold War era. Enhancing of power is the

most unique principle of F.P aims because; power in this modern period is the corner stone of the state's foreign policy.

Undoubtedly, the ends that the states seek vary from one state to another depending on several factors such as geo-strategic location, needs, political culture, national interests and power factors.

•Another classification of objectives are shown in the table,

OBJECTIVES	NECESSITIES AND BELIEFS
1. CORE VALUES AND INTERESTS	NATIONAL SECURITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
2. MIDDLE RANGE OBJECTIVES	INTERESTS OF PRESSURE GROUPS, NON POLITICAL CO OPERATION, PROMOTION OF NATIONAL PRESTIGE, TERRITORIAL EXPANSION.
3. UNIVERSAL LONG RANGE OBJECTIVES	FOREIGN POLICY ORIENTATION (which includes 3 types—NON ALIGNMENT, ISOLATION, COALITION MAKING AND ALLIANCE CONSTRUCTION)

From the above discussions, we understood, the protection of national interest is the primary aim of any type of foreign policy. Then we will analysing the nature and features of national interest.

NATIONAL INTEREST

National interest, as a concept and term, is frequently employed in the study of international studies. States justify often the most inhuman measures and spend exorbitant sums of money on defence by invoking “National interest”, Just like power and sovereignty, this too could mean different ideas to different people. Few would contest the statement, however, that every state acts in its imagined national interest. The British foreign minister made the memorable statement that no nation has permanent friends or permanent enemies. It only has permanent interest. This national interest is most often invoked to place the nation before any individual or institute, which reinforces the supremacy of the state. Palmerston’s statement might be drawn to substantiate a state’s policy on innumerable occasions, but its simplicity is far from the truth. National interest surely cannot be permanent. The identity and interests of a state are subjected to constant change. For example, America’s foreign policy has changed over time reflecting the change in its national interest. As a new nation after the Revolutionary War, America’s prime national interest was to maintain its independence from more powerful European countries. Protected by the Atlantic Ocean, its major foreign policy, as typified by the Monroe Doctrine, was to limit European attempts of further colonization of the Western Hemisphere.

Emerging from World War II as the most powerful economic power on Earth, the United States changed its foreign policy dramatically. It took the lead in founding the United Nations. It invested billions of dollars through the Marshall Plan to help strengthen

war-devastated European democracies. It created a system of alliances, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

When states are geographically divided- such as partition, which created India and Pakistan- the interests of the states change too. The British intellectual Nobel Maxwell's comment on this context is noteworthy. He argues that in determining the national interest of any state, the state's powerful and elitist class plays an influential role, and determines policies, which are in that class interest. It must be noted that those who support this view are not merely Marxist. Realists too accept the fact that the elite play an enormous role in framing the national interest. Nevertheless, in democracies, the idea has been perpetuated that the masses help in moulding national interest, but Marxists remain sceptical about this. States do not find it difficult to rouse national attention to specific issues in order to justify certain decisions. This is the politics of determining the national interest of a state and possibly every state has indulged in this manipulation. Efforts are made to justify the harsh measures, which often impinge on national liberty and freedom of expression. In India security acts have been passed in response to the Naxal threat. Nazi Germany also took extreme measures in the name of national security. And the US did the same in order to invade Iraq.

W.W. Rostow defines, "National interest is the concept which nations apply in trying to influence the world environment to their advantage"

K.J. Holsti holds that the national interests are "an image of a future state of affairs and future set of conditions which governments through individual policy makers aspire to bring about by wielding influence abroad and by changing or sustaining the behaviour of states"

Morgenthau's Views

In his book, 'In Defense of National Interest', Morgenthau writes that national interest is the guiding star of a state's foreign policy. He is reluctant to include strategic culture or the study of norms in the study of foreign policy. To him national interest is both a means and an end. National interest is of foremost importance for a state, and comes before everything else, including morality. In his "six principles" of realism, Morgenthau emphasises not only on the tension between morality and national interest, but also argues that the latter has a greater priority. The tools to maintain the national interest are as follows:

- (a) The use of force
- (b) Balance of power
- (c) Diplomatic decisions

Types of National Interest

Thomas D. Robinson, 'In National Interest' has listed *six types* of national interests.

- (1) Primary interests - The nation should be capable of defending its national territory and borders at any given moment. This ability should not be compromised at any cost.
- (2) Secondary interests -- They are vital, but are not so crucial as the primary ones. They relate basically to protection of citizens of the state, including those overseas and ensuring diplomatic immunity to the diplomatic staff.

- (3) Permanent interests -- States long term and constant interests which rarely change. For example, Britain's long term interest was to protect her overseas colonies and trade.
- (4) Variable interests--- They are basically for national good at a particular period of time and place and are often determined by the factors like personalities, public opinion, sectional interests, and partisan politics.
- (5) General interests—They comprise conditions which apply to a large number of nations in such areas as trade, economics, diplomatic intercourse etc.
- (6) Specific interests--- It is the logical outcome of general interests but defined in terms of time and space.

Besides the above categories Robinson identified *three kinds* of international interests- ***Identical, complementary and conflicting***.

- (1) **Identical interests**--- An interest held in common by many states, eg: US, UK and countries of western Europe did not want expansion of Soviet power and its ideology in the region.
- (2) **Complementary interests**—They are not identical but form some kind of a basis for agreement and compromise. Example, USA and Pakistan served complementary interests of each other at the time of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan.
- (3) **Conflicting interests**--- Such interests fall in the category of opposed interests. They are not permanent and offer change due to force of events and diplomacy, eg: the case of Kashmir is one of conflicting interests between India and Pakistan.

A state relies on a vast array of resources to maintain its national interest. These could be material forces such as the army or economy. They could also be the culture or ideational forces, what Joseph Nye refers to as "soft power". Ideologies, ideas, diplomacy or even a certain way of life could be soft power. It is most frequently used to refer to the sway the American culture -whether Hollywood movies or McDonald hamburgers or Microsoft software -has over the world.

States also form alliances in order to project national interest. In time of peace, alliances as well as other forms of mediation are used by the states to save the costs of war. This is recognised in the UN charter, which provides a number of means to avert a crisis. It lists several alternatives available to the state to avoid a conflict with another state. These include diplomatic means such as negotiation, mediation, reconciliation and arbitration. The UN also supports the use of sanctions to force a state to enter into negotiations. Collective security is another means to protect a state's national interest. States frequently align to form a coalition to face a threat which would have been impossible to overwhelm if they were to face it alone. Collective security is a means to ensure that status quo is maintained and a threat is effectively stamped out.

DEVELOPMENTS IN COLD WAR PERIOD

During World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union fought together as allies against the Axis powers. However, the relationship between the two nations was a tense one.

Americans had long been wary of Soviet communism and concerned about Russian leader Joseph Stalin's tyrannical rule of his own country. For their part, the Soviets resented the Americans' decades-long refusal to treat the USSR as a legitimate part of the international community as well as their delayed entry into World War II, which resulted in the deaths of tens of millions of Russians. After the war ended, these grievances ripened into an overwhelming sense of mutual distrust and enmity. Post-war Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe fuelled many Americans' fears of a Russian plan to control the world. Meanwhile, the USSR came to resent what they perceived as American officials' bellicose rhetoric, arms build up and interventionist approach to international relations.

When Walter Lippmann first used the term 'cold war', he was obviously referring to a war likesituation between two power blocs, yet it was not a war. It was a 'diplomatic war', not an armed conflict between two or more powers. Fleming described the cold war as a 'warthat is fought not in the battle field, but in the minds of men, one tries to control the minds of others'.

Peace during the cold War years was pursued through international institutionalism and the creation of the United Nations. The UN drew from the lessons of the failure of the League of Nations and was intended to peace and international cooperation, while serving US national interests. The UN, however, was unable to ensure peace because of the political ambivalence of a number of countries, including the US, that wanted an international institution strong enough to keep the peace but not so strong as to threaten nation-state supremacy or sovereignty. The onset of the Cold War and the ensuing priority given to considerations of Power significantly undermined the ability of the UN to achieve its original vision.

Cold war period was divided into four phases.

The first phase - 1945 to 1953,

Second phase - 1953 to 1962

Third phase -1962 to 1973

Fourth phase-1979 to 1989

During the coldwarperiod, foreign policy of world nations have been based on three major determinants, such as,

- (1) Ideological interests,
- (2) Geo—political interests,
- (3) Military interests.

Therefore, it is rational to discuss the determinants of foreign policy, which would help us to understand the pattern of interaction in cold war arena.

Ideological interests

There were long seeded differences between the United States and the Soviet Union over ideologies. In the Russian Revolution of 1917 the communists took power. The United States and Britain were worried that the same thing might happen in their countries. They thus helped support the White Army, the side against communism, in the Russian Civil War

that followed (though they failed). In fact, the United States did not acknowledge the communist government until 1933.

Things had changed temporarily though because Hitler came to power and Stalin and the Soviet Union were redesigned as a kinder people. Although the two sides were able to unite over the common enemy of Germany, after the War people in the United States started to remember their differences.

The Cold War and related conflicts started almost at end of World War II, when Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill arranged a meeting denominated the Yalta Conference, in which they discussed the situation of Germany and the possible solutions to end the war (Spielvogel, 2007). It was stated that Germany had to be demilitarized and in order to control it; it would be divided into four zones. Around this time idealism seemed like the theory that could explain the mechanics of the world because the States were willing to cooperate, proving that it is possible to achieve common good. The powers that emerged from the war got together for a cause and their main objective was progress in peace. Everything seemed fine until the greed for power started to get in the way of the goals that had been established. Berlin had to be divided between the United States, France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union as well, and in 1946 Churchill said that an iron curtain had fallen over the European continent, metaphor that was used during the Cold War to refer to the ideological division of the time. Soon the Berlin Wall became the real iron curtain and also the symbol of the bipolar system.

These differences between the two countries stemmed from their ideologies. Communism was the ideology followed by the Soviet Union. Originally founded by Karl Marx, it said that everything should be owned by the government and then divided up equally among the people who would then all work for it. Not only was the Soviet Union communist, they were totalitarian, meaning all the power was with the rulers.

Communism is an economic system that is based on the principles of socialism, especially the earlier development of Marxism and the ideas of Karl Marx as expressed in the Communist Manifesto. Similar to Marxism, communism is centered on the idea of establishing a society based upon public ownership of the means of production and the removal of any form of social classes. For example, communism generally focuses on the conditions of the working-class, and the wide income gap that existed in laissez-faire capitalist societies. Communist countries such as the Soviet Union are also often dictatorships. Communism differs from capitalism because it focuses on the government having much more control over the economy, and is often referred to as a command economy.

A dictatorship is a form of government in which most or all authority of the country is in the hands of a single individual; the leader. While the term has been used several times throughout history, most common usage of the term is in relation to different types of dictatorships that existed in the 20th and 21st centuries. In general, a dictatorship is the opposite of democracy, which is a system of government in which the people hold the power

and the ability to choose who represents their government. Essentially, in a democracy the people have the power over the major aspects of government and have the responsibility to elect their leaders. In contrast, a dictatorship is ruled by a single person who generally acts to protect his own position and power over the welfare of the citizens.

The United States was capitalist which meant that people could own land and businesses and compete for themselves. This led to a stark contrast between poor and rich. They were also a democracy, which meant it was the people who had a say by electing rulers. At its heart, capitalism is an economic system based upon the values of individualism and promotes individual liberty over government regulation and control. For example, laissez-faire capitalism is a form of the ideology that translates to “leave us alone” meaning that the government should remain out of the economy and instead allow individuals to freely carry out their own economic affairs. The development of capitalism as an economic system, sought to reject the idea of government control of the economy and instead put the focus on individuals. On the economic spectrum, capitalism is a right-wing ideology that is fundamentally based on: private ownership, competition, free trade, self-reliance, self-interest, and the principles of supply and demand. Capitalist societies are often based on free-market economies. This system differs from communism wherein the government usually controls the means of production and makes all important economic decisions.

Democracy is a political system that is associated with the idea that power or authority in a society rests with the people. In general, the people exercise their authority through elections in which they choose others to represent their interests in a formal legislative structure. This system differs from dictatorships wherein many of the decisions are made by the government which is often a single person and single political party.

Geo-political interests

The US continued to propagate that the USSR was an expansionist state, an imperialist power which had not only installed Communist regimes by force in East European countries but even crushed Hungarian and Czechoslovak communist leaders who desired to act independently of Soviet control and free from Russian domination. On the other hand, Soviet leadership described the Americans as colonialists, imperialists and capitalist exploiters. The USSR was selling the concept of Communism as panacea of all ills in Asia and Africa. The Soviet Union exploited anti-west feelings of Afro-Asian peoples, and encouraged the newly independent countries of the third world to nationalise those projects where Anglo-American capital had been invested. America charged the Soviet Union with ideological imperialism and pledged to contain communism so that freedom of the rest of the world was not endangered by communist onslaught. Both the sides had many clients. Thus, Britain, France, Canada, Australia, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Greece, Pakistan and Turkey were some of the American Bloc countries, the Soviet Bloc included Poland, Hungary, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. Yugoslavia, which was initially in the Soviet Bloc, decided in 1948 to follow an independent policy while remaining a Communist

state. She had thus, 'defected' from Eastern Bloc and became a non – aligned country like India and Egypt. In short world was divided in to two blocs, communists and capitalists.

In China, Americans worried about the advances of Mao Zedong and his communist party. During World War II, the Nationalist government under Chiang Kai-shek and the communist forces waged a civil war even as they fought the Japanese. Chiang had been a war-time ally, but even American support could not bolster a government that was hopelessly inefficient and corrupt. Mao's forces finally seized power in 1949, and when he announced that his new regime would support the Soviet Union against the "imperialist" United States, it appeared that communism was spreading out of control, at least in Asia. The Korean War brought armed conflict between the United States and China.

Cold War struggles were also occurring in the Middle East. Strategically important as a supplier of oil, the region appeared vulnerable in 1946, when Soviet troops failed to leave Iran as promised, even after British and American forces had already withdrawn. The U.S. demanded a U.N. condemnation of Moscow's continued troop presence. When the United States observed Soviet tanks entering the region, Washington readied for a direct clash. Confronted by U.S. resolve, the Soviets withdrew their forces.

In Latin America ,particularly Chile, Salvador Allende, a socialist who had been elected in Chile, nationalized mines. Some of those he turned away were American companies. The United States helped to overthrow him. Another example, Jacobo Arbenz decided to try democracy in Guatemala, and in doing so shared power with the communists and socialists. Promising land reforms, he took over land from large landowners. Some of these people were powerful friends of the head of the CIA, Nixon, and Eisenhower, including shareholders in the United Fruit Company. The United States said that communism would not be allowed in its sphere. Eisenhower reformed the Monroe Doctrine (a 1823 policy which had kept Europeans out of the Americas) to say this as well. They used covert operations and worked from 1950-1954 to overthrow Arbenz until he fled. After 1945, Africa became caught up in the confrontation between America and the Soviet Union, the so-called Cold War. Anti-Communism informed almost every aspect of the South African government's foreign policy and much of its domestic policy. Fear of Communism haunted the white minority government of South Africa from the 1950s to the collapse of single party rule in Eastern Europe in 1989. South Africa, along with Egypt, were the first two countries on the continent to give rise to Communist parties - both in the 1920s. But the significance of this in domestic politics was only felt after the Second World War.

The South African government's stand found support in the Portuguese colonial regimes of Angola and Mozambique, which hung on until 1975, and the white government of Ian Smith in Rhodesia (modern Zimbabwe), which only yielded to majority rule in 1980. All these regimes equated political opposition with a desire to overthrow capitalism and nationalise the private sector. In this they were discreetly supported by most of Western Europe and America. The West was willing to turn a blind eye to institutionalised racism and

minority rule government, if that meant keeping commercial and mining investments safe from nationalisation.

The Zairean leader President Joseph Mobutu was similarly supported by the West for making a public stand against Communism, while at the same time he systematically stripped his country of its wealth and resources.

For its part the Soviet Union was happy to give military support to the governments of Angola and Mozambique and to the ANC. They had tried to achieve their goals of majority rule through peaceful means and failed. Now they had to contemplate using violent means. From 1960, the Soviet Union became involved in several Marxist, African struggles, providing political support, weapons and military training, including to the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) in their fight against the Portuguese. Aside from military aid, the Soviet Union also offered a number of educational scholarships to young people, mainly in the former English and Portuguese territories. But the Soviet Union gave little in the way of aid or trade. There was no great Soviet strategy for taking over Africa, and generally the Soviet Union was under informed about history, political structures and the needs of the countries it supported.

African nations such as Angola, Mozambique and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) provided the stages for some of the most bloody proxy battles between "East" and "West" in cold war period, the United States, apartheid-era South Africa tried to prevent the spread of communism in the global south, while Cuba and the Eastern Bloc sought to support it.

A question may emerge, why the superpowers needed any allies at all. After all, with their nuclear weapons and regular armies, they were so powerful that the combined power of most of the smaller states in Asia and Africa, and even in Europe, was no match to that of the super powers. Yet, the smaller states were helpful for the super powers in gaining access to,

- (1) Vital resources, such as oil and minerals,
- (2) Territory, from where the superpowers could launch their weapons and troops,
- (3) Locations from where they could spy on each other, and
- (4) Economic support, in that many small allies together could help pay for military expenses.

Cracks and splits within the alliances were quick to appear. Communist China quarrelled with the USSR towards the late 1950s and in 1969, they fought a brief war over a territorial dispute. The other important development was the Non Aligned Movement (NAM), which gave the newly independent countries a way of staying out of the alliances.

Military interests

It is said that there never was a direct armed conflict between the two superpowers but the indirect conflicts that took place during this period of time must be taken into account considering that both countries were involved in most of them. The rivalry between the two

countries led to the strife for power that realists talk so much about and in the process dragged them into a few foreign wars.

A clear example of this was the Korean War. At the beginning of the 50's Korea was divided in two: North Korea (with a People's Republic) and South Korea (with a pro-American doctrine). Stalin was interested in getting some territories in Asia back and decided to support North Korea by attacking the south of the peninsula. The US, afraid of the expansion of communism went to the rescue of South Korea, responding to the attack and proving once again that cooperation is possible, and even more so during a conflict.

In 1962 there was another confrontation, the USSR started to install nuclear missiles in Cuba, they represented a counterattack to the American nuclear weapons in Turkey (Miller, 2003). Kennedy's team found soviet ships transporting more missiles to Cuba and decided to block the island. The US had to compromise and settle with a deal where they agreed not to invade Cuba in exchange for the ships to leave. Right at this moment security became the main national interest for the US, and as the realism stated, it acted in a way that it would protect and achieve that interest. The tension that took place in this specific moment in history switched the dominant theory again and following idealist ideas the red phone was installed creating a direct line between the Kremlin and the White House in order to be able to resolve future issues before they got out control.

The struggles that took place during the Cold War kept the world population on alert because of the possibility of a nuclear war. The Missile Crisis was the period of strongest tension, but there were other situations that put entire cities in danger, such as the Vietnam War and the Prague Spring. The only control there was on the possible breakout of world war III was the enormous arsenal that both sides had accumulated for their protection, which became useless due to the consequences that would've been brought on if any of the two decided to act on it.

The Vietnam War which lasted from 1955-1975, followed the First Indochina War, or the French Indochina War is another example

MIDDLE EAST

Yom Kippur War:

In 1967 some of the Arab states around Israel had lost land after the Six Day War, a conflict between Israel and some Arab states including Syria and Egypt. Syria and Egypt were mad about this and attacked Israel on Yom Kippur. The superpowers created a buffer zone, but Israel and the United States crossed it. The Soviet Union offered to use their troops to hold the line, and the possible confrontation of the two superpowers again had the world on edge.

Afghanistan:

The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979 to support the communists there, and the United States backed an anti-Soviet and anti-communist action that same year. These actions brought an end to detente between the two countries.

THE CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS

Possibly the highest point of tension during the Cold War was the Cuban Missile Crisis which saw the world preparing for nuclear war. The United States saw the Caribbean as being in their sphere of influence so when, in 1959, Fidel Castro and the socialists took power after a revolution in Cuba and nationalized the economy, they were not happy.

Thus in March 1961, in what was known as the Bay of Pigs, the CIA unsuccessfully tried to invade Cuba with 1500 Cuban exiles and overthrow Castro. After this, the United States decided to stop trading with Cuba so they turned to the Soviet Union. In 1961 secret Soviet missiles were put into Cuba by Soviet Leader Nikita Khrushchev and Castro, but the plan was exposed when the ships were spotted. This made the United States and President Kennedy really nervous since it was so close they could easily be hit. At the same time though, they had their own weapons in Britain and Italy, and to a lesser extent Turkey.

The United States put a blockade on the water so no more weapons could enter and became ready for war, while the whole world watched. An agreement was finally reached though and the United States would not invade Cuba and take back their weapons from Turkey (although this was secret) and the Soviet Union would remove their weapons from Cuba.

NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty (NATO) was essentially a military pact against the Soviet Bloc. This treaty was signed in April 1949 at Washington DC by 12 countries, Article 5 of the treaty said that an armed attack against one or more of the signatories in Europe or North America 'shall be considered an attack against them all', and they agreed to work for collective defence and to assist each other. This would include use of armed forces to restore and maintain the security of North Atlantic area.

ARMS RACE

The political climate of the Cold war became more defined in January 1954, when U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles announced the policy that came to be known as "massive retaliation" -- any major Soviet attack would be met with a massive nuclear response. As a result of the challenge of "massive retaliation" came the most significant by-product of the Cold War, the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM).

The ICBM's were supported with the thermo-nuclear bomb (with a much greater destructive power than the original atomic bomb), inertial guidance systems (defines the difference between weight, the influence of gravity and the impact of inertia), and powerful booster engines for multistage rockets. As a result, ballistic missiles became sufficiently accurate and powerful to destroy targets 8000 km (5000 mi) away. For more than thirty years, the ICBM has been the symbol of the United States' strategic nuclear arsenal.

In October 1961, The Soviet Union detonated a nuclear device, estimated at 58 megatons, the equivalent of more than 50 million tons of TNT, or more than all the explosives used during World War II. It is the largest nuclear weapon the world had ever seen at that time. The Tsar Bomba (King of the Bombs) is detonated after US and USSR agree to

limit nuclear testing. It is the largest nuclear device ever exploded. Having no strategic military value, Tsar is viewed as an act of intimidation by the Soviets.

MUTUAL DEFENCE ALLIANCES

In the Cold War, both sides created alliances to cement their ties. This ensured that if one country was attacked, all of the allies on that side would unite behind them.

MUTUALLY ASSURED DESTRUCTION

Mutually Assured Destruction, or MAD, was a way to avoid war, rather than fight it. Ironically however, it required a large number of weapons. MAD said that there could be no winner in a nuclear war. This became the strategy on both sides as the main threat moved from bombs to missiles. It involved holding enough weapons to deter the other side from attacking. NORAD thus drew heavily on this strategy when it came to the defence of North America.

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE POST COLD WAR PERIOD

Gorbachev's internal reforms had meanwhile weakened his own Communist Party and allowed power to shift to Russia and the other constituent republics of the Soviet Union. In late 1991 the Soviet Union collapsed and 15 newly independent nations were born from its corpse, including a Russia with a democratically elected, anti-Communist leader. The Cold War had come to an end. The main features of the foreign policy formulations in the post cold war period are given below ,

1. Disintegration of Soviet union and decline of ideological factors

F.Fukuyama (The End Of History and The Last Man,1992) claimed that the collapse of the soviet union in 1991 proved that liberal democracy had no serious ideological challenge. It was 'the end point of mankind's ideological evolution', and the liberal democracy is 'the final form of human government'. For Fukuyama, 'the end of Cold war represented the victory of ideal state', and liberal capitalism. Fukuyama revived the traditional liberal internationalist theory that the spread of legitimate domestic political order will eventually bring an end to international conflict. While Wilson and other liberal institutionalists believed that lasting peace would come through international organisations and international law, Fukuyama argued that countries domestic structure would be an assurance of end of conflict, implying end of war. For Fukuyama, the projection of liberal countries principles to international arena are said to provide the best prospects for peaceful world because 'a world made up of liberal democracies.....should have much less incentive for war ,since all nations would reciprocally recognise one another's legitimacy'.

With the collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and disintegration of the Soviet Union, the bipolar international system dominating the Cold War period disappeared, leaving its place to basically a unipolar system under the leadership of the United States, speaking especially from a military/political point of view. The former rivals of the United States, especially the Soviet Union and China, have either collapsed or jettisoned the central features of their ideologies that were hostile to the United States. Other countries have turned to American military protection. The "American Empire" may best be seen operating in the

Persian Gulf, Iraq, and the Middle East, in general, where the armed forces of the United States have established a semi permanent foothold and thousands of soldiers deployed at bases keep a watch on Iran, Syria, and other “potential enemies”. American military power serves a number of critical functions. In some areas, in the Persian Gulf for example, it guarantees weak states against attacks by their stronger neighbors. In Asia, the presence of the United States stabilizes the region in which a number of states might otherwise feel compelled to develop much larger military forces than they currently have. American military power in Japan does only protect Japan against foreign enemies. It indirectly protects China and other Asian states against the consequences that might flow from a heavily re-armed Japan. Moreover, American military power serves as an organizer of military coalition, both permanent (such as NATO) and ad hoc (such as peacekeeping missions). American military participation is often necessary to the command and control of coalition operations. When the Americans are willing to lead, other countries often follow, even if reluctantly. However, these are certainly not to argue that American interventions occur in every large conflict around the world. But it means that almost any country embarking on the use of force beyond its borders has to think about possible reactions of the United States.

From an economic/political point of view, on the other hand, the international system can be said to be multipolar, rather than unipolar. The United States certainly a great economic power, but it is not the only power. There are other power centers, most notably, the European Union, the Organization of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, as well as many nation-states outside of these integrations or organizations . As a matter of fact, when the United States exercised military operations to “stable” the world in Kuwait, Afghanistan, Iraq and elsewhere, it insisted on sharing the costs of the operations with other major powers or relevant countries. Thus, the international system of the post-Cold War era actually reflects a mixture of both unipolar and multipolar system in which at least five major powers, the United States, Europe, China, Japan, and Russia, dominate international affair.

Post- cold war scenario has come to be characterized by the return of multipolarity where there is a presence of great powers and small powers. Some scholars also uphold the view that the world has become unipolar with the presence of the sole surviving super power ,the United States. On the other hand,there are other scholars who profess multipolarity and project the emergence of a five-way balance of power system rotating around the United States, Europe, Japan, China and the present Soviet Union.

Cold war national security is determined by hard power that is military power. Now,post cold war period, we can find certain kind of shift and departure in the relative decline in the status of hard power and focus shifted to soft power,that is scientific and technological power. In military domain, the national interest priorities of the major states especially USA shifted from high intensity conflict to low intensity conflict .For example, US influence in Georgia and Chechnia.

Again another important feature is east ward expansion of NATO. USA further consolidated military dominance through east ward expansion of NATO by providing

membership to former Soviet Union countries such as Poland, Hungary, Rumania. A fourth challenge is that many new foreign policy issues transcend borders.

That is, there are no longer simply friendly states and enemy states. Problems around the world that might affect the world states, such as terrorism, the international slave trade, and climate change, originate with groups and issues that are not country-specific. They are transnational. So, for example, while we can readily name the enemies of the Allied forces in World War II (Germany, Italy, and Japan), the U.S. war against terrorism has been aimed at terrorist groups that do not fit neatly within the borders of any one country with which the United States could quickly interact to solve the problem. Intelligence-gathering and focused military intervention are needed more than traditional diplomatic relations, and relations can become complicated when the United States wants to pursue terrorists within other countries' borders. An ongoing example is the use of U.S. drone strikes on terrorist targets within the nation of Pakistan, in addition to the 2011 campaign that resulted in the death of Osama bin Laden, the founder of al-Qaeda.

Another main goal of U.S. foreign policy is the protection of human rights and democracy. The payoff of stability that comes from other U.S. foreign policy goals is peace and tranquility. While certainly looking out for its own strategic interests in considering foreign policy strategy, the United States nonetheless attempts to support international peace through many aspects of its foreign policy, such as foreign aid, and through its support of and participation in international organizations such as the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the Organization of American States.

2. Trade relations and Economic factors

Since the mid 1980s, USA gradually shifted foreign policy and national security objectives. By effectively completing the Uruguay round trade negotiations and implementing Dunkel report, USA played a major role in the subsequent formations of WTO IN 1995. USA and western countries were extensively utilized IMF, World bank and WTO for materialising its economic and political objectives against developing countries.

Third world, especially the Middle East, still continues to be the vital interest zone for the west, especially the United States. The first post-Cold war National Security Strategy report sent to the US Congress in March 1990, recognized that military power must target the Third World, primarily the Middle East, where the "threats to our interests" that have required force "could not be laid at the Kremlin's door". Therefore, the prime concern continued to be the control of the countries of the South.

The decreasing ideological clashes between the United States and Russia manifested itself most clearly in the decline of the veto at the Security Council. From 1945 to 1990, the permanent members of the Security Council cast the following number of vetoes: China, 3; France, 18; United Kingdom, 30; US, 69; and the Soviet Union, 114. Then between June 1990 and May 1993, there was no single veto. One exception occurred in May 1993 when Russia blocked a resolution on financing the peacekeeping force on Cyprus. With this exception, the post-Cold War capacity of the Security Council to reach agreement has

survived and constituted a key reason for the increase in the number of peacekeeping operations.

Another feature of the post-Cold War era is that since the West has become the victor of the East-West ideological rivalry, Western systems and Western influences, in general, started to dominate the whole world. For example, the United States has visibly enhanced its influence in the Middle East and in Caucasus since the end of the Cold War. The invasion of Kuwait by Iraq in August 1990 and the following Gulf Crisis, in a way, created an opportunity for the United States to exercise its hegemonic power in the Middle East. In the following years, in the absence of a counter-power, the influence of the United States increased further. With the military operation to Afghanistan and invasion of Iraq after the September 11, 2001 attacks, the United States perpetuated its dominance in the region. The region of Caucasus was formerly under the Russian sphere of influence. But the United States managed to enter this energy-rich region with some new allies, used to be the part of the Soviet Union, such as Azerbaijan, Ukraine, and Georgia. Although Russia certainly did not want the United States presence in the region, its ability to prevent it has remained limited.

Likewise, NATO expanded to involve Eastern Europe, a region also used to be under Soviet influence. Russia, in the beginning, tried to resist NATO expansion, posing several threats, including creating a counter defence organization. But it was eventually convinced with the project of “partnership for peace”, through which it preserved many of its privileges in Eastern European countries .

In the same way, the European Union expanded towards Eastern Europe, symbolizing, once again, Western dominance. Particularly with the 2004 expansion, eight formerly-communist countries, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Slovenia, Slovakia, and Check Republic (with the exception of Cyprus and Malta) joined the Union. And in 2007, two other previously-communist states, Bulgaria and Romania, became full members as well.

The domination of South is now ensured not through the use of force but, dominantly by the use of trade and economic weapons. The international financial regimes such as the IMF, the World Bank and WTO, with their policies of structural adjustments, are spreading their tentacles of domination all over the developing South. The other mechanism includes multinational corporations (MNCs) through which the developed West tries to reduce the functions of the Third World governments merely to police functions while the MNCs and TNCs gain free access to their resources ,control their decision making, pattern of development, new technology and global investment. All in all, the entire dependency syndrome and neo-colonialism would continue even in the post -cold war scenario.

Trade policy is the way the United States interacts with other countries to ease the flow of commerce and goods and services between countries. A country is said to be engaging in protectionism when it does not permit other countries to sell goods and services within its borders, or when it charges them very high tariffs (or import taxes) to do so. At the

other end of the spectrum is a free trade approach, in which a country allows the unfettered flow of goods and services between itself and other countries. At times the United States has been free trade-oriented, while at other times it has been protectionist. Perhaps its most free trade-oriented move was the 1991 implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). This pact removed trade barriers and other transaction costs levied on goods moving between the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

The post cold war foreign policy is to ensure the nation maintains access to key resources and markets across the world. Resources include natural resources, such as oil, and economic resources, including the infusion of foreign capital investment for U.S. domestic infrastructure projects like buildings, bridges, and weapons systems. Of course, access to the international marketplace also means access to goods that American consumers might want, such as Swiss chocolate and Australian wine. U.S. foreign policy also seeks to advance the interests of U.S. business, to both sell domestic products in the international marketplace and support general economic development around the globe (especially in developing countries).

3. Globalisation

The internationalization of economic activity in Europe first took off in the 15th and 16th centuries, with the development of new shipping technology that led to Spanish colonization of Latin America. Similarly, 19th century proved to be an era of increased international commerce, triggered by the industrial revolution but, in the 1930s, this economic expansion was reversed as political turmoil created the Great Depression. The contemporary phase of globalization only started to return global economic activity to 19th century levels in the late 1970s.

Liberals argue that governments should want to promote free trade to make everyone wealthier. From a political perspective, foreign competition can bankrupt domestic businesses.

The liberals suggested that government attempts to kick start development had been highly wasteful and had tended to crowd out private sector entrepreneurs. The solution to the debt crisis was for governments to spend less, sell off assets that would be better run by private sector and reduce government control over economic activity. At this juncture, globalisation results in an erosion of state capacity, that is, the ability of government to do what they do, particularly the protection of national interest. All over the world, the old welfare state is now giving way to a more minimalist state that performs certain core functions such as the maintenance of law and order and the security of its citizens. In the place of welfare state, it is the market that becomes the prime determinant of economic and social priorities. The entry and the increased role of multinational companies all over the world leads to a reduction in the capacity of governments to take decisions on their own.

The concept of national interest has come under the threats of globalisation. The operation of MNCs and their interference with the domestic policies of their host countries have really undermined the sovereignty of the states.

4. Foreign aid and Environmental concern

In the post cold war period, Foreign aid and global environmental policy are the final two foreign policy factors. With both, as with the other types, the United States operates as a strategic actor with its own interests in mind, but here it also acts as an international steward trying to serve the common good. With foreign aid, the United States provides material and economic aid to other countries, especially developing countries, in order to improve their stability and their citizens' quality of life. This type of aid is sometimes called humanitarian aid; in 2013 the U.S. contribution totalled \$32 billion. Military aid is classified under military/defence or national security policy (and totalled \$8 billion in 2013). At \$40 billion the total U.S. foreign aid budget for 2013 was sizeable, though it represented less than 1 percent of the entire federal budget.[6]

Global environmental policy addresses world-level environmental matters such as climate change and global warming, the thinning of the ozone layer, rainforest depletion in areas along the Equator, and ocean pollution and species extinction. The United States' commitment to such issues has varied considerably over the years. For example, the United States was the largest country not to sign the 1997 Kyoto Protocol on greenhouse gas emissions.

The states have a common interest in preventing the depletion of environmental resources, which is occurring at a rapid rate due to the pace and scope of global industrialisation. The problem is not confined within particular national borders, nor can it be resolved with traditional power politics, violence or unilateral action. All states have a common interest in finding a solution to the problem, which their collective but overlapping activity has created. It is also a problem which can only be resolved through cooperative efforts among them. The same dynamics can be found in other issue areas some times disparagingly referred to as 'low' politics, such as global economics, climate change, refugees or immigration. These issue areas have become increasingly important to states and, because they are characterized by interdependence, are also the areas in which there is the greatest potential for international co operation.

Many leaders and intellectuals in the leading developing states believe the West's promotion of human rights and democracy is detrimental to their countries' political and social stability. Some even claim Western countries are deliberately using democracy and human rights as tools to prevent the economic and political rise of new challengers from the developing world. A recent international conference in Moscow hosted by the Russian military and attended by prominent representatives of developing world militaries identified the spread of Western-backed "color revolutions" as one of the most acute security threats facing Russia and other developing states. In China, party cadres are instructed to be vigilant against American efforts to overthrow the communist system through "peaceful evolution", i.e. the spread of Western ideas and culture .

NEO – LIBERALISM

Neo-Liberalism refers to the revival of economic liberalism that has been taken place since the 1970s. Neo liberalism was counter-revolutionary: its aim was to halt, and if possible reverse, the trend towards 'big' government and state intervention that had characterised much of the 20th century. Neo liberalism had its greatest initial impact in the two countries in which free-market economic principles had been established most firmly in the 19th century, the UK and the USA. However, in the case of both 'Thatcherism' in the UK and 'Reagonism' in the USA, neo liberalism formed part of a larger, new-right ideological project that sought to fuse laissez faire economics with an essentially conservative social philosophy.

Neo liberalism amounts to a form of market fundamentalism. The market is seen to be morally and practically superior to government and any form of political control. In that sense, neo liberalism goes beyond classical economic theory. For instance, although Adam Smith is rightfully viewed as the father of market economics, he also recognised the limitations of the market and certainly did not subscribe to a crude utility – maximising model of human nature. From the neo liberal perspective, the defects of government are many and varied. Free market economists, such as Friedrich von Hayek and the US economist Milton Friedman attacked the economic role of governments. Hayek advanced a damning economic and political critique of central planning in particular and economic intervention in general. He argued that planning in any form is bound to be economically inefficient because state bureaucrats, however competent they might be, are confronted by a range and complexity of information that is simply beyond their capacity to handle. Friedman criticised Keynesianism on the grounds that 'tax and spend' policies fuel inflation by encouraging governments to increase borrowing without, in the process, affecting the natural rate of unemployment.

In contrast, the market has near-miraculous qualities. First and foremost, because they tend towards long-term equilibrium, markets are self-regulating. Hayek likened the market to a vast nervous system that is capable of regulating the economy because it can convey an almost infinite number of messages simultaneously via the price mechanism. Second, markets are naturally efficient and productive. Market economies are efficient at a macroeconomic level because resources are drawn inexorably to their most profitable use, and because rich and poor alike have an incentive to work. At a micro economic level, private business are inherently more efficient than public bodies because they are disciplined by the profit motive, forcing them to keep costs low, while the tax payer will always pick up the bill for public losses. Third, markets are responsive, even democratic, mechanisms. Competition guarantees that producers produce only what consumers are willing to buy, and at a price they can afford; the consumer, in short, is king. Finally, markets deliver fairness and economic justice. The market gives all the people the opportunity to rise or fall on the basis of talent and hard work. Material inequality thus simply reflects a natural inequality among human kind.

Neoliberal ideology and policies became increasingly influential, as illustrated by the British Labour Party's official abandonment of its commitment to the "common ownership of the means of production" in 1995 and by the cautiously pragmatic policies of the Labour Party and the U.S. Democratic Party from the 1990s. As national economies became more interdependent in the new era of economic globalization, neoliberals also promoted free-trade policies and the free movement of international capital. The clearest sign of the new importance of neoliberalism, however, was the emergence of libertarianism as a political force, as evidenced by the increasing prominence of the Libertarian Party in the United States and by the creation of assorted think tanks in various countries, which sought to promote the libertarian ideal of markets and sharply limited governments.

The central defining characteristic of this new brand of neoliberalism can be understood at one level as a revival of many of the central tenets of classical liberalism, particularly classical economic liberalism. The central presuppositions shared include:

1. **The self-interested individual:** a view of individuals as economically self-interested subjects. In this perspective the individual was represented as a rational optimizer and the best judge of his/her own interests and needs.
2. **Free market economics:** the best way to allocate resources and opportunities is through the market. The market is both a more efficient mechanism and a morally superior mechanism.
3. **A commitment to laissez-faire:** because the free market is a self-regulating order it regulates itself better than the government or any other outside force. In this, neoliberals show a distinct distrust of governmental power and seek to limit state power within a negative conception, limiting its role to the protection of individual rights.
4. **A commitment to free trade:** involving the abolition of tariffs or subsidies, or any form of state-imposed protection or support, as well as the maintenance of floating exchange rates and "open" economies .

If neoliberalism continues to reign as the dominant ideology and policy stance, it can be argued that world capitalism faces a future of stagnation, instability, and even eventual social breakdown .Beginning in 2007, the financial crisis and Great Recession in the United States and western Europe led some economists and political leaders to reject the neoliberals' insistence on maximally free markets and to call instead for greater government regulation of the financial and banking industries.

At conclusion, the increasing exploitation and other social problems generated by neoliberal global capitalism might prove the socialist movement back to life at some point. Should socialist movements revive and begin to seriously challenge capitalism in one or more major capitalist countries, state regulationism might return in response to it.

MODULE VI

FUTURE ORDER AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

GLOBALISATION AND POST-COLD WAR TRENDS, QUESTIONS ON IMPERIALISM AND HARMONY—IMPACT OF GLOBALISATION ON STATE SYSTEM

A variety of global problems cannot be managed by sovereign states acting alone—such as global terrorism, HIV/ AIDS, weapons of mass destruction, global financial markets, globalised economy, the persistence of poverty and climate change— even by the sole super power, the USA. All require cooperation of some sort among governments and the increasing number of non-state actors in the world; many require the active participation of ordinary citizens; some demand the establishment of new, international mechanisms for monitoring or the negotiation of new international rules; and most require the refinement of means for securing state's compliance.

In short, there is a wide variety of international policy problems that require governance. Sometimes the need is truly global, other cases, the governance problem is specific to a region of the world or group of countries.

What is Global Governance?

Commission on global governance defined governance as “the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and cooperative action may be taken. It includes formal..... as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest”.

Global governance is not global government; it is not a single world order; it is not a top-down , hierarchical structure of authority. It is collection of governance, related activities, rules, and mechanisms, formal and informal, existing at a variety of levels in the world today. We refer to these as the “pieces of global governance”.

The pieces of Global Governance

The pieces of Global Governance are the cooperative problem- solving arrangements and activities that states and other actors have put into place to deal with various issues and problems .They include international rules or laws, norms or “ soft law” and structures such as formal international inter governmental organisations (IGOs) as well as improvised arrangements that provide decision making processes information gathering and analytical functions , dispute settlement procedures, and operational capabilities for managing technical and development assistance programmes, relief aid, force deployment .

INTERNATIONAL LAW: The scope of public international law has expanded tremendously since the 1960s. Although the Statute of the International Court of Justice recognizes five sources of international law (treaties or conventions, customary practice, the writings of legal scholars, judicial decisions and general principles of law), much of the growth has been in treaty law. Between 1951 and 1995, 3666 new multilateral treaties were concluded. By far the largest number of new multilateral agreements deals with economic issues.

For purposes of global governance, one major limitation of public international law is that it applies only to states, except for war crimes and crimes against humanity. Another problem in the eyes of many is the absence of international enforcement mechanisms and the role of self-interest in shaping states' decisions about whether or not to accept treaties and other forms of international rules.

INTERNATIONAL NORMS OR SOFT LAW: Many international legal conventions set forth what are not in fact binding obligations for states, but rather norms or standards of behaviour, sometimes referred to as "soft laws". Some human rights and labour rights, the concept of the global commons applied to the high seas, outer space, and polar regions, as well as the concept of sustainable development are all examples of such "soft laws". Protocols are used to supplement the initial framework convention, and they are considered to form the "hard" law dealing with the issue.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (IGOs): IGOs are organizations whose members include at least three states, that have activities in several states, and whose members are held together by a formal intergovernmental agreement. In 2003/04, the Yearbook of International Organisations identified about 238 IGOs. Although some IGOs are designed to achieve a single purpose (OPEC), others have been developed for multiple tasks (UN). Most IGOs are not global in membership, but regional where a commonality of interest motivates states to cooperate on issues directly affecting them.

NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS: NGOs are private voluntary organizations whose members are individuals or associations that come together to achieve a common purpose. Some organizations are formed to advocate a particular cause such as human rights, peace or environmental protection. Others are established to provide services such as disaster relief, humanitarian aid in war-torn societies or development assistance. In fact, they have become key sources of information and technical expertise on a wide variety of international issues from the environment to human rights. They participate at least indirectly in IGO-sponsored conferences, raising new issues, submitting documents, and disseminating their expertise.

GLOBAL CONFERENCES: During the 1990s, the United Nations convened nine global conferences on economic and social matters, following a similar series in the 1970s and 1980s. Some were designated world summits rather than global conferences because they included meetings of heads of state and government. Conferences like the Summit for Children (1990), the Earth Summit in Rio (1992), or the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing (1995) have become an important part of the global political processes for addressing interdependence issues, for seeking ways to improve the lives and well-being of humans, and for strengthening other pieces of governance.

Major actors in global governance are the states, IGOs, NGOs, Experts, global policy networks, Multi National corporations (MNCs).

SIGNIFICANCE OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

An increasing need for global governance given the necessity of curbing terrorism, blocking the international flow of disease, crime, controlling the weapons of mass destruction, reducing barriers to trade, alleviating poverty, ensuring environmental protection, promoting human rights, and other issues of global concern. Globalization is playing a major

role in shrinking the planet, proliferating issues, and changing the roles of key actors. The cold war's end contributed also to increased needs for governance. The emergence of transnational civil society and the contested nature of state sovereignty likewise factor into the rising need for global governance.

GLOBALISATION

Globalization is enabling individuals, corporations and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before. It has spurred the proliferating networks of NGOs, terrorists, drug traffickers, financial markets and empowered individuals. In its broadest sense, Globalisation refers to the "emergence and spread of a supraterritorial dimension of social relations".

Globalisation affects all spheres of human activity - economic, social, cultural, technological, environmental and political- but it is not necessarily inevitable; change is not necessarily linear; and not all peoples or areas of the world are equally affected.

Globalisation encompasses two simultaneous, yet contradictory patterns in world politics. One involves greater integration and interdependence between people and states, between states and other states, and between states and international bodies. This has been facilitated particularly by the communications revolution and by the pre-eminence of two core philosophies, economic liberalisation and democracy. Economic liberalism emphasizes the role of the private sector over the state (that is, the government) in economic life. The demise of communism in eastern Europe and Soviet Union discredited socialist economic systems and brought down many barriers to the movements of goods, communications and people, while economic difficulties in many less developed countries (LDCs) with state dominated economies forced them to liberalize and privatize, often under pressure of International Monetary Fund (IMF) conditions. Consequently, since the mid-1980s, many former socialist states as well as developing countries have changed their economic policies, opened their borders to trade and invest, and become more integrated into the global economic system. Likewise democratization spread to all regions of the globe in the 1980s and 1990s. From Latin America to Eastern Europe, and from the former Soviet union to Africa and Asia, many authoritarian governments have been forced to open the political process to competing political parties, to adopt international human right norms, to hold free elections, and to curb corruption. In many cases democratization and economic liberalism have been linked as integrative forces.

The integrative side of globalisation is contradicted by disintegrative tendencies. Many weak states have been unable to accommodate technological changes and the challenges of more open economies that make them vulnerable to competition and exploitation. Weak states may also be unable to provide the necessary public goods. The resulting disjuncture between the states' persistence as central structures of the international system and an eroding loyalty and confidence of individuals in the institutions of the state has contributed to the resurgence of ethnic and religious identities, ethnic conflicts, and further weakening of some states. The disintegrative tendencies of globalisation affect both states and individuals' perceptions of uncontrollable global processes. No longer are territorial states necessarily the central governing units in the international system. Global financial markets, transnational policy networks, and multinational corporations provide collective goods and elements of

governance. Individuals themselves are increasingly alienated as they become further removed from political institutions that lack democratic accountability, or worry about a homogenization of cultures and declining value of labour in global markets.

The Globalization Index, constructed by A.T Kearney, affirms more global countries have greater income inequality than less global countries. Yet technological and personal integration continue strongly, even when economic integration is low. The 1999 Human Development Report (UNDP 1999) argues, “today’s globalization is being driven by market expansion – opening national borders to trade, capital, information – outpacing governance of these markets and their repercussions for people. More progress has been made in norms, standards, policies and institutions for open global markets than for people and their rights”. The gap between rich and poor is increasing, a report shows, in the developed world, with 20 percent of the world’s population ,enjoy 80 percent of its wealth. Between 1970 and 2000,the gap between rich and poor expanded by 65 percent. In the 1970s, the average earnings in the North were 14 times that of the South; by 2000 ,the gap had expanded to 23 times earnings. Even within many states , the gap has widened, not only in the USA but also in developing states like India, Peru and Colombia,where wage differentials between the rich and poor have increased.

For antiglobalizers, the only alternative is to roll back aspects of economic globalization. They want to return to governance at the local (national) level. To many, goals of economic efficiency, of being able to buy the cheapest goods, should be replaced by support for local economies, providing local employment not exporting jobs, and by fair and environmentally friendly conditions of workers. Economic justice is a major goal. Although economic localization may not maximise economic welfare, some see it as preferable to globalization over which people have little control. There is an unprecedented degree of consensus on core concepts and approaches now, with poverty alleviation and sustainability at the core, along with good governance, empowering women, and raising levels of human well being.

POST COLD WAR TRENDS

The end of the cold war was brought about by both political changes toward democratization and economic changes toward liberalization of the economy in the Soviet Union. The fall of the Berlin wall in 1989 symbolized the end of the cold war , and two years later the Soviet Union it self disintegrated in to 15 separate, independent states.The cold war’s end marked the ending of one historical era and the beginning of another. The international system shifted from a bipolar structure to a post- cold war structure that was simultaneously unipolar and a non polar, net worked system of a globalised world.

At the outset , some suggested that history itself was at an end with the triumph of liberal capitalism (Fukuyama) and the end of ideological competition, but those high expectations have not been borne out. Instead , the disintegration of the former Soviet Union and end of the cold war system revived ethnic rivalries and conflicts in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, the Caucasus, Balkans, and elsewhere, leading some to postulate a clash of civilizations as the new source of enduring conflicts in international politics (Samuel P. Huntington) . Although democracy and economic liberalism are now largely unchallenged and the United States is the sole super power, the Cold War’s end produced neither peace nor

stability, but a new series of governance challenges. The United Nations and regional IGOs, states and NGOs have been challenged as never before to deal with ethnic and other intrastate conflicts, weak and failed states, genocide and ethnic cleansing, and the complex humanitarian disasters resulting from these problems.

EMERGENT TRANSNATIONAL CIVIL SOCIETY

Contributing to the cold war's end and benefiting from both increased democratisation and accelerating globalisation is the growth of civil society within many countries and transnationally. The spread of democracy to many corners of the globe has bolstered the growth of civil societies in countries where restrictions on citizens groups have been lifted. Civil society groups communicate with each other domestically and cross-nationally, creating new coalitions from the local to the global. These "networks of knowledge and action" are unconstrained by geographic borders largely beyond state's control. Traditional civil society groups permeate numerous issue areas, including the environment, human rights, technology, economic development and security. Their demands for representation in processes of global governance contribute to the increased need to reform existing international institutions and to find new ways to incorporate actors other than states in governance.

CONTESTED NATURE OF SOVEREIGNTY

These trends pose direct challenges to state sovereignty. The norm that states enjoy internal autonomy and cannot be subjected to external authority has been the bedrock of the Westphalia state system that has persisted from 1648 to the present. Some theorists focus on the erosion of sovereignty, suggesting that it may at one time have been absolute, but is compromised by states own weaknesses, by external influences such as flow from globalization or the development of international human rights norms, or other actors such as MNCs, NGOs, and global financial markets. Others see sovereignty as always having been contested—for example, from within by ethnic groups seeking autonomy or self determination – and it varies across time, place and issues.

Over time, the nature of sovereignty has changed with the blurring of the lines between domestic and foreign issues, contributing further to the increased need for pieces of global governance. The acceleration of globalisation, the rise of powerful nonstate actors, and the emergence of transnational civil society all undermine state sovereignty. Globalisation is linking issues and actors together in complex new ways, where economic, humanitarian, health, and environmental problems respect no state boundaries.

CONCLUSION

The challenges of global governance include a variety of international policy problems and issues that require governance. The need for more pieces of governance is clearly rising with globalisation and other developments, the processes are complex; and US continue to shape many of the pieces of global governance, especially the liberal international economic system, and ensures that U S interests are accommodated in many regimes.
