

## **COURSE GUIDE**

### **POL 231 ESSENTIALS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND DIPLOMACY**

**Course Team:** Dr. Ademola Adeleke (Course Developer/Writer) - UNILAG  
Remi Anifowose (Programme Leader) - NOUN  
Abdul-Rahoof Adebayo Bello (Course Coordinator) – NOUN

**Course Review:** Dr. Umar Ubandawaki – Sokoto State University, Sokoto (SSU)



## NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

National Open University of Nigeria  
Headquarters 14/16 Ahmadu Bello  
Way Victoria Island, Lagos

Abuja Office 5 Dar es salaam Street  
Off Aminu Kano Crescent Wuse 11,  
Abuja

e-mail: [centralinfo@nou.edu.ng](mailto:centralinfo@nou.edu.ng) URL:  
[www.nou.edu.ng](http://www.nou.edu.ng)

Published by

National Open University of Nigeria

First Printed 2013 ISBN:

978-058-435-8 All Rights Reserved

Printed by

## **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

### **POL 231: Essentials of International Relations and Diplomacy (3 Credit Units)**

This course examines nature, scope and purposes of international relations and diplomacy. It explores some of the fundamental concepts, theories and paradigms of international relations such as Power, Balance of Power, Non-Alignment, National Interest and Foreign Policy as well as Realism and Idealism in the study of International Relations. Meaning, nature and principles of Diplomacy; patterns and levels of participation in international Diplomacy; and the challenges of Globalization to international Diplomacy are to be examined. Thus, the course will enhance understanding and appreciation of events, processes and actions in the international system as they unfold among state and non-state actors in historical times, in the contemporary world and in the future.

CONTENTS	PAGE
Introduction .....	vi
Course Aims and Objectives .....	vi
Working through the Course .....	vi
Course Materials .....	vi
Study Units .....	vii
Textbooks .....	viii
Assessment Exercises.....	viii
Tutor-Marked Assignment .....	viii
Final Examination and Grading .....	viii
Course Marking Scheme .....	ix
Course Overview/Presentation .....	ix
What you will Need in this Course .....	x
Tutors and Tutorials .....	x
How to Get the Most from This Course .....	xi
Conclusion .....	xii
Summary.....	xii
References .....	xiii

## **INTRODUCTION**

POL 231 Essentials of International Relations and Diplomacy is a three credit unit course designed to facilitate your understanding on the essential concepts and theoretical assumptions in the study of international relations and diplomatic practice. It introduces you to the meaning, nature, scope and subject areas of international relations. It covers the nature and level of participation in international diplomacy. The course is structured into 5 modules. Each module is structured into 5 units. In all, the course constitutes 25 units. A unit guide comprises of instructional material. It gives you a brief of the course content, course guidelines and suggestions and steps to take while studying. You can also find self-assessment exercises for your study.

## **COURSE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

The main aim of this course is to provide you with essential elements and comprehensive knowledge of the field of International Relations and Diplomacy; thus, enhancing your understanding and appreciation of international events, decisions and actions as they affect your country, region and the global environment. On successful completion of the course, you are expected to achieve the following specific objectives:

- i. explain the meaning, nature and scope of international relations as well as describe the structure of the international system;
- ii. identify and distinguish between different subject areas of international relations, such as international politics, diplomacy, international law and organizations and etc.;
- iii. explain the origins and development of international diplomacy and describe the levels of participation in international diplomacy; and
- iv. explain some of the basic concepts and theoretical assumptions in the study of international relations with particular reference to Realism, Idealism, National Interest, Alliance and Collective Security, Globalization and Foreign Policy Analysis.

In addition, each unit also has specific objectives. The unit objectives are always given at the beginning of a unit; you should read them before you start working through the unit. You may also want to refer to them during your study of the unit to check on your progress. You should always look at the unit objectives after completing a unit. In this way, you can be sure that you have done what was required of you by the unit.

## **WORKING THROUGH THIS COURSE**

To complete this course you are required to read the study units, as well as other related materials. Each unit contains self-assessment exercises, and at certain points in the course, you are required to submit the assignments for assessment purposes. At the end of the course, you are going to sit for a final examination. The course guide tells you briefly what the course is all about, what you are expected to know in each unit, what course materials you need to use and how you can work your way through these materials.

## **COURSE MATERIALS**

The major components of the course include the following:

1. The Course Guide
2. Study Units
3. Textbooks and references
4. Assignments

## **STUDY UNITS**

There are 25 study units in this course spread through five modules. These are as follows:

### **Module 1 Meaning, Nature and Scope of International Relations**

- Unit 1 Meaning of International Relations
- Unit 2 Nature of International Relations
- Unit 3 Scope of International Relations
- Unit 4 Origin and Development of International Relations
- Unit 5 Structure of the International System

### **Module 2 Dimensions and Approaches to the Study of International Relations**

- Unit 1 International Relations and International Politics
- Unit 2 International Relations and International Law
- Unit 3 Sources and Legality of International Relations Law
- Unit 4 Levels of Analysis in International Relations
- Unit 5 Approaches to the Study of International Relations

### **Module 3 Meaning, Nature and Principles of Diplomacy**

- Unit 1 Concept and Evolution of Diplomacy
- Unit 2 Elements of Diplomacy
- Unit 3 Principles of Diplomacy
- Unit 4 Types of Diplomacy
- Unit 5 Nature and Level of Participations in International Diplomacy

### **Module 4 Paradigms and Theories in International Relations**

- Unit 1 Nature and Importance of Theories in International Relations
- Unit 2 Idealism
- Unit 3 Realism
- Unit 4 Power Theory
- Unit 5 Some Modern Theories of International Relations

### **Module 5 Basic Concepts in International Relations and Diplomacy**

Unit 1	Foreign Policy
Unit 2	National Interest
Unit 3	Power
Unit 4	Balance of Power
Unit 5	Non-Alignment

As noted earlier, each unit contains a number of self-assessment exercises (SAE). These self-assessment exercises are designed to test you on the materials you have just covered. They will help you to evaluate your progress as well as reinforce your understanding of the material. Together with tutor-marked assignments, these exercises will assist you in achieving the stated learning objectives of the individual units and of the course.

### **TEXTBOOKS**

At the end of each unit, you will find a list of relevant textbooks which you may yourself wish to consult as the need arises, even though I have made efforts to provide you with the most important information you need to pass this course. However, I would encourage you, as a student of International Relations and Diplomacy to cultivate the habit of consulting as many relevant materials as you are able to within the time available to you. In particular, be sure to consult whatever material you are advised to consult before attempting any exercise.

### **ASSESSMENTS**

There are two types of assessments in this course: the Self-Assessment Exercises (SAEs), and the Tutor-Marked Assessment (TMA) questions. Your answers to the SAEs are not meant to be submitted, but they are also important since they give you an opportunity to assess your own understanding of the course content. Tutor-Marked Assignments (TMAs) on the other hand are to be carefully answered and kept in your assignment file for submission and marking. This will count for 30% of your total score in the course.

### **TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

At the end of each unit, you will find tutor-marked assignments. There is an average of two tutor-marked assignments per unit. This will allow you to engage the course as robustly as possible. You need to submit at least four assignments of which the three with the highest marks will be recorded as part of your total course grade. This will account for 10 percent each, making a total of 30 percent. When you complete your assignments, send them including your form to your tutor for formal assessment on or before the deadline.

Self-assessment exercises are also provided in each unit. The exercises should help you to evaluate your understanding of the material so far.

These are not to be submitted. You will find all answers to these within the units they are intended for.

### **FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING**

There will be final examination at the end of POL 231: Essentials of International Relations and

Diplomacy. The examination will be three hours' duration and have a value of 70 per cent of the total course grade. The examination will consist of questions, which reflect the types of self-assessment exercises and tutor-marked assignments, you have previously encountered. All areas of the course will be assessed. Take time to revise the entire course before the examination. The final examination covers information from all aspects of the course.

## COURSE MARKING SCHEME

The following table lays out how the actual marking scheme is broken down:

**Table 1 Course Marking Scheme**

ASSESSMENT	MARKS
Assignments	Best three marks of the assignments, 10% each (on the average) = 30% of course marks
Final examination	70% of overall course marks
Total	100% of course marks

## COURSE OVERVIEW PRESENTATION SCHEME

Units	Title of Work	Week Activity	Assignment (End-of-Unit)
Course Guide	<b>ESSENTIALS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND DIPLOMACY</b>		
<b>Module 1</b>	<b>Meaning, Nature and Scope of International Relations</b>		
Unit 1	Meaning of International Relations	Week 1	Assignment 1
Unit 2	Nature of International Relations	Week 2	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Scope of International Relations	Week 3	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Origin and Development of International Relations	Week 4	Assignment 1
Unit 5	Structure of the International System	Week 5	Assignment 1
<b>Module 2</b>	<b>Dimensions and Approaches to the Study of International Relations</b>		
Unit 1	International Relations and International Politics	Week 6	Assignment 1
Unit 2	International Relations and International Law	Week 7	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Sources and Legality of International Law	Week 8	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Levels of Analysis in International Relations	Week 9	Assignment 1
Unit 5	Approaches to the Study of International Relations	Week 10	



<b>Module 3</b>	<b>Meaning, Nature and Principles of Diplomacy</b>		
Unit 1	Concept and Evolution of Diplomacy	Week 11	Assignment 1
Unit 2	Elements of Diplomacy	Week 12	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Principles of Diplomacy	Week 13	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Types of Diplomacy	Week 14	Assignment 1
Unit 5	Nature and Level of Participations in International Diplomacy	Week 15	Assignment 1
<b>Module 4</b>	<b>Paradigms and Theories in International Relations</b>		
Unit 1	Nature and Importance of Theories of International Relations	Week 16	Assignment 1
Unit 2	Idealism	Week 17	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Realism	Week 18	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Power Theory	Week 19	Assignment 1
Unit 5	<b>Some Modern Theories of IR</b>	Week 20	Assignment 1
<b>Module 5</b>	<b>Basic Concepts in International Relations and Diplomacy</b>		
Unit 1	Foreign Policy	Week 21	Assignment 1
Unit 2	National Interest	Week 22	Assignment 1
Unit 3	Power	Week 23	Assignment 1
Unit 4	Balance of Power	Week 24	Assignment 1
Unit 5	Non-Alignment	Week 25	Assignment 1

## WHAT YOU WILL NEED FOR THE COURSE

This course builds on what you have learnt in the 100 Levels. It will be helpful if you try to review what you studied earlier. Second, you may need to purchase one or two texts recommended as important for your mastery of the course content. You need quality time in a study friendly environment every week. If you are computer-literate (which ideally you should be), you should be prepared to visit recommended websites. You should also cultivate the habit of visiting reputable physical libraries accessible to you.

## TUTORS AND TUTORIALS

There are 15 hours of tutorials provided in support of the course. You will be notified of the dates and location of these tutorials, together with the name and phone number of your tutor as soon as you are allocated a tutorial group. Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, and keep a close watch on your progress. Be sure to send in your tutor marked assignments promptly, and feel free to contact your tutor in case of any difficulty with your self-assessment exercise, tutor-marked assignment or the grading of an assignment. In any case, you are advised to attend the tutorials regularly and punctually. Always take a list of such prepared questions to the tutorials

and participate actively in the discussions.

## HOW TO GET THE MOST FROM THIS COURSE

1. There are 25 units in this course. You are to spend one week in each unit. In distance learning, the study units replace the university lecture. This is one of the great advantages of distance learning; you can read and work through specially designed study materials at your own pace, and at a time and place that suits you best. Think of it as reading the lecture instead of listening to the lecturer. In the same way a lecturer might give you some reading to do. The study units tell you when to read and which are your text materials or recommended books. You are provided exercises to do at appropriate points, just as a lecturer might give you in a class exercise.
2. Each of the study units follows a common format. The first item is an introduction to the subject matter of the unit, and how a particular unit is integrated with other units and the course as a whole. Next to this is a set of learning objectives. These objectives let you know what you should be able to do, by the time you have completed the unit. These learning objectives are meant to guide your study. The moment a unit is finished, you must go back and check whether you have achieved the objectives. If this is made a habit, then you will significantly improve your chance of passing the course.
3. The main body of the unit guides you through the required reading from other sources. This will usually be either from your reference or from a reading section.
4. The following is a practical strategy for working through the course. If you run into any trouble, telephone your tutor or visit the study centre nearest to you.
5. Remember that your tutor's job is to help you. When you need assistance, do not hesitate to call and ask your tutor to provide it.
6. Read this course guide thoroughly. It is your first assignment.
7. Organize a study schedule - Design a 'Course Overview' to guide you through the course. Note the time you are expected to spend on each unit and how the assignments relate to the units.
8. Important information; e.g. details of your tutorials and the date of the first day of the semester is available at the study centre. You need to gather all the information into one place, such as your diary or a wall calendar. Whatever method you choose to use, you should decide on and write in your own dates and schedule of work for each unit.
9. Once you have created your own study schedule, do everything to stay faithful to it.
10. The major reason that students fail is that they get behind in their coursework. If

you get into difficulties with your schedule, please let your tutor or course coordinator know before it is too late for help.

11. Turn to Unit 1, and read the introduction and the objectives for the unit.
12. Assemble the study materials. You will need your references for the unit you are studying at any point in time.
13. As you work through the unit, you will know what sources to consult for further information.
14. Visit your study centre whenever you need up-to-date information.
15. Well before the relevant online TMA due dates, visit your study centre for relevant information and updates. Keep in mind that you will learn a lot by doing the assignment carefully. They have been designed to help you meet the objectives of the course and, therefore, will help you pass the examination.
16. Review the objectives for each study unit to confirm that you have achieved them. If you feel unsure about any of the objectives, review the study materials or consult your tutor. When you are confident that you have achieved a unit's objectives, you can start on the next unit. Proceed unit by unit through the course and try to space your study so that you can keep yourself on schedule.
17. After completing the last unit, review the course and prepare yourself for the final examination. Check that you have achieved the unit objectives (listed at the beginning of each unit) and the course objectives (listed in the course guide).

## **CONCLUSION**

POL 231:Essentials of International Relations and Diplomacy focuses on the fundamental concepts and theoretical assumptions of international relations as well principles, patterns and levels of participation in international Diplomacy. Therefore, if you cultivate habit of getting best out of the course, you will enhance your understanding and appreciation of events, processes and actions in the international system as they unfold among state and non-state actors in the past, present and the future.

## **SUMMARY**

POL 231 aims at equipping you with the skills required in understanding the essentials of international relations and diplomacy. Upon completion of this course, you should be acquainted with the various theories, principles and concepts of international relations and diplomacy. You will also be able to appraise these theories, principles and concepts as the basis for enhancing your understanding of past and current events in the international system.

We wish you success with the course.

## REFERENCES

The following books are recommended for further reading:

Akinboye, S. & Ottoh. F. (2007). *A Systematic Approach to International Relations*. Lagos: Concept Publications.

Alozie, C. C. & Nwadike, J. (2014). *Fundamentals of International Relations in a New World Order*. Enugu: Rhyce Kerex Publishers.

Charles, F. Hermann, Charles, W. Kegley Jr., & James, N. Rosenau (1987). (Eds). *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Charles, W. Kegley Jr. & Gregory, A. Raymond (2012). *The Global Future: A Brief Introduction to World Politics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Canada: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Christopher, Thorne (1973). *The Limits of Foreign Policy*. New York: G. P. Putman's Sons.

EKemam, H. I. (2016). *Theories of International Relations from Classical Realism to Globalism*. Owerri – Imo State: AMBIX Publishers.

Frank-Collins, N. O. & Peter, A. C. (2012). (Eds.) *Thoughts on International Relations*. Lagos: Absolute Media Production.

Hans, J. Morgenthau (1966). *Politics among Nations*. (4th ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Holsti, K. J. (1983). *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*. (4th ed.). Prentice-Hall.

James, Rosenau (1966). "Pre-theories and Theories of Foreign Policy." In R. B. Farrell (Ed). *Approaches in Comparative and International Politics*.

Johari, J. C. (2014). *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Delhi: Sterling.

Orngu, C. S. (2013). *The Evolution of Diplomatic Practice: A Historical Perspective* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.

Richard, Snyder, Henry, Bruck, & Burton, Sapin (1954). *Decision Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics*.

Rourke, J. T. (2005). *International Politics on the World Stage* (10<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York:

McGraw-Hill

Walter, S. Jones & Steven J. Rosen (1982). *The Logic of International Relations*. (4th ed.). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

**MAIN COURSE  
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>Module 1 Meaning, Nature and Scope of International Relations</b>	<b>1</b>
Unit 1      Meaning of International Relations.....	1
Unit 2      Nature of International Relations .....	6
Unit 3      Scope of International Relations .....	9
Unit 4      Origin and Development of International Relation.....	12
<b>Unit 5 Structure of the International System .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Module 2 Dimensions and Approaches to the Study of International Relations:.....</b>	<b>23</b>
Unit 1      International Relations and International Politics.....	23
Unit 2      International Relations and International Law.....	27
Unit 3      Sources and Legality of International Law.....	30
Unit 4      Level of Analysis in International Relations.....	34
Unit 5      Approaches to the Study of International Relations.....	38
<b>Module 3 Meaning, Nature and Principles of Diplomacy.....</b>	<b>43</b>
Unit 1      Concept and Evolution of Diplomacy.....	43
Unit 2      Elements of Diplomacy.....	49
Unit 3      Principles of Diplomacy.....	51
Unit 4      Types of Diplomacy.....	54
Unit 5      Nature and Level of Participations in International Diplomacy.....	58
<b>Module 4 Paradigms and Theories in International Relations.....</b>	<b>63</b>
Unit 1      Nature and Importance of Theories of International Relations.....	63
Unit 2      Idealism .....	67
Unit 3      Realism .....	71
Unit 4      Power Theory.....	76
Unit 5      Some Modern Theories of International Relations.....	79
<b>Module 5 Basic Concepts in International Relations and Diplomacy.....</b>	<b>85</b>
Unit 1      Foreign Policy .....	85
Unit 2      National Interest .....	90
Unit 3      Power.....	94
Unit 4      Balance of Power.....	99
Unit 5      Non-Alignment .....	105

## **MODULE 1: MEANING, NATURE AND SCOPE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

This module will examine the meaning and nature of the field of International Relations (IR). However, the various definitions from scholars of IR will be presented. The module will also examine the scope or subject boundaries of international relations. The module will discuss the origin of international relations from legalistic and moralistic study of IR in the 1920s that gave way to a new approach in post WW II to the emergence of the realist school of IR. This module is made up of five units, the framework upon which we would base our discussions of the meaning, nature and the scope of international relations. The units are as follows:

- Unit 1        Meaning of International Relations
- Unit 2    Nature of International Relations
- Unit 3        Scope of International Relations
- Unit 4        Origin and Development of International Relations
- Unit 5        Structure of the International System

### **UNIT 1 MEANING OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

#### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0    Introduction
- 2.0    Objectives
- 3.0    Main Content
  - 3.1    Concept of International Relations
  - 3.2    Definitions of International Relations
- 4.0    Conclusion
- 5.0    Summary
- 6.0    Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0    References/Further Reading

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

International relations (IR) is a continuously popular subject. It concerns peoples and cultures all over the world. The scope and complexity of the interactions between the various groups makes IR a challenging subject to master. IR is new and dynamic and has a special appeal to everybody. However, some people perceive IR as a distant and abstract ritual conducted by a small group of people like presidents, generals and diplomats. This assumption is not accurate because despite the fact that leaders play a major role in international affairs, many other people participate as well. For instance, students and other citizens participate in international relations every time they vote in an election or watch the news. In fact, the

choices we make in our daily lives ultimately affect the world we live in. This unit is therefore to introduce you to the meaning of international relations; first, by providing some of the definitions, and second, by explaining the boundaries or limits of the subject-matter of international relations.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- Explain the concept of international relations
- present relevant definitions of international relations;
- enumerate activities involve in the international relations.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Concept of International Relations

Indeed, no nation can live in isolation independent of other nations. Whether big or small, rich or poor, powerful or weak, every nation depends on other nations. This explains why all states in the international system live in an atmosphere of interdependence and relationships. International Relations (IR) is the study of these relationships and cooperation by international actors. These relationships linked with other actors such as international organisations (IOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs), transnational corporations (TNCs) and notable individuals make them interdependent. What is relevant in our attempt to understand the meaning of IR is the fact that people from different countries or societies get in contact and interact or relate with one another in search of one objective or the other. These relations among people of different nations representing governments, organizations, corporations, religious bodies, groups and individuals are referred to as international relations.

Literally, the concept of international relations comprises two words; these are: 'international' and 'relations'. The prefix 'inter' denotes between; from one to the other. While 'national' is connected with a nation; or refers to share by a whole nation. Therefore, the word international here indicates the involvement of people from two or more countries or societies. In the other hand, the word 'relation' shows that the people do not just meet but as well interact or relate among themselves. The 's' at the end of the word relation connotes plurality of these interactions. Basically, the concept of IR has two broad meanings. – IR as an activity and as an academic discipline. IR as an activity can be viewed as interactions among people of different nationalities in one side representing states organizations, corporations and international personalities. In the other side, IR as an academic field of study is about the study of these relations' structures, processes and issues as they relate to the activities. However, you will learn about the details of IR as an academic discipline in Module 2.

Example of the practical meaning of IR can be seen by considering the fact that Nigerian business men and women travel to various countries in Europe, Asia, America and Africa to buy different products and goods or work in offices or factories as people of other nation. Others go to foreign universities to acquire knowledge. Equally, representatives of governments, international organizations, transnational corporations, leaders of terrorist, liberation, human right groups and private individuals meet in conferences, seminars, summits, ceremonies, wars, peace missions etc. with the view to achieving one policy objective or the other. Recently, outbreak of pandemic of Corona virus (Covid-19) in 2020 has made it possible for Nigeria to receive in support materials and personnel for curtailment of the spread of the pandemic. Indeed, the bulk of such contact, affairs and interactions constitutes the practice of IR and has attracted volumes of literature within the global scholarship.



### 3.2 Definitions of International Relations

Owing to the fact that IR is in transition following emerging realities in the international system, it has become difficult arriving at a universally acceptable definition of the subject. Aja (1992) opines that the conceptual problem of IR arises primarily because of the multiplicity of actors in the international system. Prior to 1945 contact and interactions were about nation state, but beginning from 1945 and beyond, interactions have tremendously changed with the emergence of non-state actors and individuals whose actions and activities influence greatly the course of events and outcomes in international affairs. However, scholars have attempted defining international relations. In the words of Karl Deutsch, “international relations is that area of human action where inescapable interdependence meets with inadequate control.” Trevor Taylor defines IR “as a discipline that tries to explain political activities across states boundaries.” Another scholar, Seymon Brown postulates that international relations is the investigating and study of patterns of actions and reactions among sovereign states as represented by their governing elites.”

Quite often, some IR scholars view international relations as a mix of **power structure** and **cooperation** in relationships among nations. Power is germane to international politics. Indeed, power is the currency of the international system. This explains why some scholars define international relations in terms of power relations between states. For example, Stanley Hoffman posits that “the discipline of international relations is concerned with the factors and the activities which affect the external policies and power of the basic units into which the world is divided.” Wright (1955) defines IR as “the study of relations between and among powerful groups.”

According to Houston (1972), IR suggests

“ a vast and variegated phenomenon composed of international conferences, the comings and goings of diplomats, the signing of treaties, the deployment of military forces and the flow of international trade. It also includes more subtle but none the less profoundly significant determination of ideas and ideologies among multitudes of men, shaping their perceptions of reality and influencing their allegiances and loyalties.

Similarly, Alozie & Nwadike (2014) define IR as “the sum total of interactions between and among both state and non-state actors in the international system. These definitions have indicated the elastic nature of the field of IR. To some extent, the field is interdisciplinary relating international politics to economics, sociology, history and other disciplines. This justifies decisions of some Universities to offer separate degrees or Departments of IR, whereas others teach international relations as part of political science.

Traditionally, the study of IR focused on questions of war and peace. The movement of armies and of diplomats, the creating of treaties and alliances, the development and deployment of military capabilities- these issues dominated the study of IR in the past, particularly in the Cold War era. Although they still hold central position in the field, the end of the Cold War in 1990 brought in new challenges. Indeed, IR as relations among nations cover a range of activities- diplomacy, war, trade relations, cultural exchanges, participation in international organisations, alliances and counter- alliances. The study of IR involves the mastery of some basic concepts. It is advisable that you internalise these concepts in the course of your study rather than memorizing them piecemeal. Some of these concepts are international politics, international system, foreign policy, domestic politics, defense policy, national interest, sovereignty,

diplomacy, international law, security, conflict and conflict resolution and so forth. The field of IR reflects the world's complexity, and IR scholars use many theories and concepts in trying to describe and explain it. Underneath this complexity, however, lie a few basic principles that shape the field. Within domestic societies, governments solve collective goods problems by forcing the members of society to contribute to common goals, such as by paying taxes. Conversely, the international system lacks such governments. Three core principles—dominance, reciprocity, and identity—offer different solutions to the collective goods problem.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What is international relations?
- ii. Mention activities covered in the conduct of international relations.

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

The complexity of the interactions among countries, organizations, corporations, groups and individuals make international relations a challenging subject to master. Indeed, there is always more to learn. Largely, the field is interdisciplinary relating international politics to economics, sociology history and other disciplines. IR revolves around some key concepts, activities and problems of interaction: for instance, how can a group— such as two or more nations— serve its collective interests when doing so requires its members to forgo their individual interests.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

In this unit, we have examined the meaning of international relations and the various definitions given by different scholars. We established that, IR is a new subject that affects our daily life profoundly and that we all participate in it. Broadly, IR concerns the relationships among individuals and governments in the global environment. We also established the international system is a set of relationships among the world's states, structured according to certain rules and patterns of interaction. Why some of these rules are explicit, others remain implicit. The field of IR reflects the world's complexity, and IR scholars use many theories and concepts in trying to describe and explain it.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Discuss the meaning of international relations.

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

- Aja, A. A. (1992). "Theories of International Relations." Unpublished Monograph, Abia State University, Uturuu
- Alozie, C. C. & Nwadike, J. (2014). *Fundamentals of International Relations in a New World Order*. Enugu: Rhyce Kerex Publishers.
- Deutsch, K. (1968). *The Analysis of International Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

- Houston, J, (1992). "International Relations." In Wasby, S. L, (ed.). *Political Science: the Discipline and its Dimension: An Introduction*. CalCutta: Scientific Books Agency.
- Johari, J. C. (2014). *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Delhi: Sterling.

## UNIT 2 NATURE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Nature of International Relations
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Like the world community, which is rapidly changing, international relations is in transition. Indeed, contemporary international relations is a study of the world community in transition. The world that we live in is increasingly complex and consistently changing.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the nature of international relations

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 Nature of International Relations

IR deals with the relationship between nation states, international organisations and other groups. These are the *actors* in international relations. The most important actors in IR are states. This accounts for the *state-centric-view* of the international system. The nature of the international system from the realists' perspective is anarchical. This state of anarchy does not imply a complete chaos or absence of structures and rules; rather it portrays a lack of central government that can enforce rules. In domestic society within states, governments can enforce contracts, deter citizens from breaking rules and use their monopoly on legally sanctioned violence to enforce a system of law. In the case of international relations, the great power system and the hegemony of a superpower can provide relative peace and stability for decades on end but then can break down into costly wars among the great powers.

The development of sovereign states dictates the very structure of international politics and determines the pattern of relations in IR. Since the actors in world politics are sovereign, international relations must be anarchical. This essential anarchy of a system of sovereign states leads to the conclusion that the study of IR must be distinct from the study of domestic politics. Where domestic politics denotes the study of the institutions of government, IR remains the study of the institutions of international governance and of power politics. Indeed, a history of the

practice of war, diplomacy and international law offers intriguing insights into the nature of modern international society and the politics of what Hedley Bull famously called the anarchical society. The key is to recognise that a grasp of the nature of the balance of power is essential to an understanding of IR.

When we look at the world of global politics, we inevitably see international or trans-national governmental organisations (IGOs) such as the United Nations (UN) or the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We see regional organisations, such as the European Union (EU) or the African Union (AU), and important non-governmental organisations (NGOs) such as the Red Cross, Amnesty International, and powerful multinational corporations (MNCs) with bigger annual turnovers than the gross national product (GNP) of many countries. We also find that many issues that we associate with IR transcend this basic description. Undoubtedly, Hitler's violent assault on the post-World-War I had important consequences on the ways in which scholars in IR approached their subject. Many observers became impatient with the descriptive, moralistic and legalistic orientation of the 1920s and realised that as important as treaties and international organisations were to IR, objectives such as security and expansion, processes such as trade and diplomacy, and means such as propaganda and subversion had to be studied as well. Thus, while one group of scholars continue to emphasise the traditional concerns of law, institutions, and current affairs, another branched off to begin more systematic and comparative studies of objectives, processes, and means, as well as those basic forces assumed to affect a state's foreign policy behaviour. These studies assessed the phenomenon of nationalism, the influence of geography on a country's foreign policy, and particularly the effect of power or lack of it on a nation's fate. The content as well as the approaches to the subject is continuously expanding as scholars apply the insights and techniques of many disciplines and the tools of modern technology to the problems of international affairs. To this end, the traditional approaches of a **historical**, **descriptive** and **analytical** nature, which are gradually supplemented or replaced by other approaches; attempt to give greater order and form to the volume of data available.

This explains the multi-disciplinary approach to the study of international relations that allows the gathering of information from a wide variety of sources like the international aspects of politics, geography, economics, history, law, strategic studies, peace and conflict studies, and cultural studies. These approaches have already made a significant impact on the study of international relations. They are designed to bridge the gap between theory and practice and to provide better tools for analysis of the increasingly complex data of international relations research. Indeed, the best way to begin to get a grip on this wide-ranging and challenging subject is not to become an expert in every aspect of world politics.

This might be an ideal solution but it is simply not a realistic goal. Rather, you need to find a way to cope with complexity and multidisciplinary approach. This is what IR, as an academic discipline, and you, as a student of IR, must try to achieve. IR, at its most basic level, is a matter of orientation. It attempts to manage the deeply complex nature of world politics by breaking it down into understandable chunks and helpful general theories. The key is to find ways of describing and analysing world politics that can both acknowledge the vast array of causal and determining factors yet give us the critical leverage we need.

## SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

- i. Who are the main actors in IR?

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

IR deals with the relationship between nation states, international organisations and other groups. Its nature from the realists' perspective is anarchic. The anarchical nature of IR does not mean a state of chaos; it only suggests the lack of a central government that is supreme to others since all sovereign states are equal in the international system. The legalistic approach to the study of IR in the pre-World War I became obsolete in the post-World War II era. Today, the multidisciplinary approach remains the best approach to the study of international relations. Therefore, you will need to master a whole range of historical and conceptual skills to understand IR. Learning to understand the historical development of the state, the international system, globalisation, and so forth offers huge insights in to the nature of IR.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

States are the most important actors in IR. The international system rests on the sovereignty of the independent states. The nature of the international system from the realists' perspective is **anarchical**. This state of anarchy does not imply a complete chaos or absence of structures and rules; rather it portrays a lack of central government that can enforce rules. The content as well as the approaches to the subject is continuously expanding as scholars apply the insights and techniques of many disciplines and the tools of modern technology to the problems of international affairs. We have also discussed different approaches to the study of international relations. The multidisciplinary, multifaceted and inter-disciplinary approach bridges the gap between theory and practice. It provides better tools for analysis of the increasingly complex data of international relations research.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

1. Outline the salient features of international relations.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Bull, H. (1995). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. (3rd ed.). New York: Palgrave Books.
- Olson, W. C. & Fred, A. S. (1966). *The Theory and Practice of International Relations*. (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Palmer, N. D. & Perkins, H. C. (2004). *International Relations: The World Community in Transition*. (3rd ed.). Krishan Nagar, Delhi: A.I.T.B.S.
- Wright, Q. (1965). *The Study of International Relations*. New York: Appleton- Century-crofts.

## **UNIT 3 SCOPE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Scope of International Relations
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

As a field of study, IR has elastic boundaries. Its scope has often been thematically and analytically confined to events and issues determined by the available data and facts. The core concepts of international relations are foreign policy, international law, international organisation, international politics, international economic relations, diplomacy, military thought and strategic studies. IR also covers issues such as trade, tourism, transportation, communication, technology and its transfer, cultural exchange, refugee and asylum, terrorism, energy and environment etc.

### **OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- outline and explain the scope of international relations
- identify the focus and subject-areas of international relations

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

#### **3.1 Scope of International Relations**

The scope of international relations has greatly expanded over the years and of late scholars have tried to build up certain theories of international politics. Fundamentally, all students of IR must begin with an introduction to the basic vocabulary of the discipline known as IR theory. IR theory is basic to the study of world politics in that it represents a series of attempts to explain or understand the world in ways that frame the debates in foreign policy, law, ethics, security studies etc. Traditionally, the scope of IR was pre-occupied with an analysis of special kind of power, force and influence relationships that exist among nation-states over the issues of war and peace. In other words, the study of IR arises over the problems of war and how peace can be maintained among nations. However, in recent years, scholars under the impact of behavioural sciences have tried to build up theories of international politics and the scope of the subject has undergone great changes. The scholars, instead of giving a historical narrative of the world have preferred to discuss the various events.

Given the cross-cutting nature of contemporary socio-economic, political and security issues between the domestic and international affairs, the actors involved and the interests they represent, the discipline of IR now by-far addresses issues beyond the politics of and nuances of power relations and inter-state relations. The scope of the discipline of IR in addressing the contemporary experiences has no longer be restricted to issues of power alone; it has come to encompass events and issues that borders on trade, tourism, transportation, communication, technology and its transfer, cultural exchange, refugee and asylum, terrorism, energy and environment. Equally, the actors now ranges from the powerful multinational corporations to transnational social movements, environmental rights groups, human rights organizations, inter-governmental organizations, transnational terrorist and criminal networks and of course the state that still remains the modal point in contemporary international politics and discourse as was the case in the earlier centuries.

Stanley Hoffmann has suggested, “the discipline of international relations is concerned with the factors and activities which, affect the external policies and the power of the basic units into which the world is divided and these include a wide variety of transnational relationships, political and non-political, official and unofficial, formal and informal. All of these and many related considerations are of deep concern to the social philosopher. Thus, a philosophy of international relations may be an appropriate term for this area of ideology, visions, values, principles, plans and solutions in the area of foreign politics. Essentially, Akinboye & Ottoh (2007) summarizes the scope of IR to cover six subject areas: International politics, foreign policy analysis, diplomacy, global defence and strategic studies, international law and organizations and international economic relations. Other scholars count theories of international relations as a field of study of IR. This latter field focuses attention on theories, assumptions or perception underlying events and results of international relations. It is important note that theories of international relations cut across all fields of IR for the possibilities of a more meaningful organization of existing knowledge. Brief explanation of these subject areas of sub-fields of IR will follow in Module 2 and other subsequent modules of this study guide.

Obviously, one way to keep abreast of current trends in international relations research is to consult professional journals in the field, such as *Journal of International Affairs* (Published by the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, (NIIA) Lagos. Similarly, any student of international relations should also have some knowledge of the most important writings and the distinctive contributions of eminent scholars in the field. Among these are E. H. Carr, Hans Morgenthau, Quincy Wright, Morton Kaplan, Karl Deutsch, David Singer, Walter Lippmann, and so forth.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. List some of the focused issues and subject areas of IR.

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Over the years, international relation’s scope has greatly expanded as scholars try to build up certain theories of international politics. The discipline of IR deals with important aspects of human nature and conduct, with the behaviour and standards of groups, with the principles and forces underlying and motivating national and international actions and decisions in the past, present and the future.



## 5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have studied the scope of international relations. We established that as a field of study, IR has uncertain scope delimitation. It has often been thematically and analytically confined to focus areas determined by the available data and facts. The discipline of IR is concerned with the factors and activities which affect the external policies and the power of the basic units into which the world is divided and these include a wide variety of transnational relationships, political and non-political, official and unofficial, formal and informal. As a field of study, IR subject areas can be summarized into six; namely, International politics, foreign policy analysis, diplomacy, strategic studies, international law and organizations and international economic relations.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

1. Outline clearly the scope of international relations.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Akinboye, S. & Ottoh. F. (2007). *A Systematic Approach to International Relations*. Lagos: Concept Publications.
- Goldstein, J.S. & Pevehouse, J. C. (2011). *International Relations*, (9th ed.). San Francisco: Longman, Pearson Education.
- Hoffmann, S. (1960). (Ed). *Contemporary Theory in International Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Kaplan, M. (1957). *System and Process in International Politics*. New York: John Wiley.
- Saka, L. (2012). "International Relations: An Introduction." In Ogundiya, I. S. & Hamzat, J. (ed.). *The Basic of Social Sciences*. Lagos: Matlhouse Press Limited.

## **UNIT 4 ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Origin of International Relations
  - 3.2 Phases in the Development of IR
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Account of the origin and development of the conduct of IR is as old as human history and the state system. The earliest writings on international relations were largely concerned with proffering practical advice to policy makers. For instance, the Chinese philosopher Mencius in the fourth century B.C, Kautilya, under the Indian emperor Chandragupta (326-329 B.C) and Niccolo Machiavelli wrote works that are studied today for their insights into the kinds of problems that still confronts political leaders. However, in this unit, our concern is not the intermittent records of IR development in the ancient times; rather, our attention will be on the explanation of the emergence of IR from the start of the nation-state system in modern times and outline the phases of the development from that period to date.

### **OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the origin of international relations
- trace the phases in the growth and development of IR

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

#### **3.1 Origin of International Relations**

IR as an academic discipline is of recent origin. This has not discredit the fact that relations phenomenon among nations are as old as history itself. Scholars of IR often trace the origin of IR as field of study back to the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, when the modern state system was developed. It was believed that prior to this period, the medieval Europe political organisation was based on a vaguely hierarchical religious order. Accordingly, the Westphalia Peace treaty instituted the legal concept of sovereignty, which essentially meant that rulers (who are the legitimate sovereigns) had no internal equals within a defined territory and no external superiors as the ultimate authority within the territory's sovereign borders. It can be argued that although actual relations between states had taken place since the ancient civilizations, such as Egypt, Greece, and

Rome but were incidental, sporadic and limited in nature. However, with the Westphalia Treaty of 1648 international relations assumed a new character. The treaty ushered in the concept of “territorial sovereignty” and birth of “independent nation state.”

Ever since, for instance in the political territory of present day Nigeria, there had been organized political entities of city-states, empires, kingdoms, communities and nations that had been relating between them based on economic (trade) and on political (war, territorial expansion and of latest colonization). Other civilizations, for example, Ethio-Egyptian priests, the early Greek philosophers like Plato and Aristotle, the Roman Empires, the Byzantine Empire and Chinese philosophers, were some of the pre-Westphalia Treaty international relations known to history. The earliest writings on international relations were largely concerned with proffering practical advice to policy makers. For instance, the Chinese philosopher Mencius in the fourth century B.C, Kautilya, under the Indian emperor Chandragupta (326-329 B.C) and Niccolo Machiavelli wrote works that are studied today for their insights into the kinds of problems that still confronts political leaders. Indeed, it is relevant to stress that neither Westphalia Treaty nor those before it ever started IR as special field of study, but they were indications and the origin of present day IR. Rather peace Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 stands unique as it did not only set the origin and procedures for modern day IR but it primary ended the Thirty Years War (1618 – 1648 ) which was the most destructive conflicts in European history and formalized the present day sovereign independent states.

### 3.2 Phases in the Development of IR

Academic studies of IR as a field started in the period following the First World War, when chairs were created to leading English and American universities with the effort to understand and explain international political development. Establishment of the League of Nations gave great impetus to this movement. Quite a substantial number of the leaders of the world such as Austen Chamberlain of England, Aristide Briand of France, Gustav Stresseman of Germany and Frank B. Kellogg of the United States Made efforts for the maintenance of international peace and security through the League of Nations. Likewise, some scholars such as Sir Alfred Zimmern and Philip Noel-Baker of Britain and J.T. Shotwell and P.T. Moon of the United States wrote books and lengthy papers on the theme of international peace and security. These writers were given the name of the “idealists.” However, in 1930, with the aggressive actions of Japan followed by that of Italy and Germany, the subject matter of study of IR changed. Thus, in the late 1930s and through the 1940s a reasonable number of scholars like Reinhold Niebuhr, N.J.Spykman. H.J. Morgenthau, Quincy Wright, F.L Schman, G.F. Kennan, Arnold Wolfers, Kenneth Thompson etc. contributed significantly to the development of IR. These scholars defined politics as “struggle for power” and attached much concern to “national interest” in terms of which the struggle must be understood and defined. These scholars belong to the community of “realists”

Another turning point in the development of IR discipline took place in the 1950s and 1960s, when a generation of some scholars took to the course of “behavioural studies.” Inspired by the writings of social theorists like Talcon Parsons, Easton and Almond developed the model of “system theory” for the study of national and international politics. M.A. Kaplan applied it particularly to the study of the international system and its processes. These writers subscribed strictly to the course of ‘empiricism.’ Later, scholars such as Karl Deutsch, J. David Singer, Richard Snyder,

H.W. Bruck, B.Sapin and alike devised new methods, tools, techniques and paradigms for the understanding and explanation of international political reality in exclusively empirical terms. They discarded all forms of normative considerations and instead sought to study international politics in scientific forms. These groups of scholars are named 'behaviouralists. In the 1970s, flaws of behaviouralists were realized, there emerged a new crop of scholars called 'post-behaviouralists.'

The foregoing illustrates that the study of IR has ostensibly passed through many developmental stages. According to Kenneth Thompson, study of IR has passed through four stages as follows

- i. the first stage was before the First World War, in the 1920s, when the emphasis was then on diplomatic history and current affairs. The diplomatic historian dominated the field of IR.
- ii. The second stage was the period immediately after the commencement of First World War, in the 1930s. This stage witnessed the study of international institutions and establishment of League of Nations.
- iii. The third stage was also after the First World War that had existed throughout inter-war period and even beyond before 1940s. The emphasis shifted progressively to the study international laws and organizations.
- iv. The fourth stage was the outbreak of the Second World War where emphasis had been on forces and influences which shape and condition the behavior of the conduct of foreign relations and mode of resolution of international conflicts. This period saw the emergence of realists school of IR.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. How did IR emerge?
- ii. explain the stages that marked the Development of IR as field of study.

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Clearly, Scholars of IR often trace the origin of IR as field of study back to the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, when the modern state system was developed. However, Academic studies of IR as a field started in the period following the First World War, when chairs were created to leading English and American universities with the effort to understand and explain international political development. Establishment of the League of Nations gave great impetus to this movement.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

In this unit, we have studied the origin and development of International relations. Fundamentally, the study of international relations has seen important changes since the start of First World War. Ostensibly, the study of IR has passed through many developmental stages, Scholars of idealism, realism, empiricism behavioural and post-behavioural tendencies have all contributed to the development of IR addressing issues and concepts of international peace and security, power, national interests, nature of international system, etc.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Explain the origin of international relations.
2. Trace the growth and development of international relations.

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Kenneth, W. T. (1952). "The Study of International Politics: A Survey of Trends and Development." In *Review of Politics*, October 14, Pp. 433 – 467.

*Johari, J. C. (2014). International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Delhi: Sterling*

## UNIT 5 STRUCTURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 The International System: The Arena of Interaction
  - 3.2 The Structure of the International System
    - 3.3 Actors in the International System
      - 3.3.1 State Actors
      - 3.3.2 Non-State Actors
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 4.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The unit discusses the structure and characteristics of the international system. It identifies the character of the actors and describes the extent to which power determines the structure of inter-relationships within the system.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- describe the features of the international system
- explain structure of the international system
- identify and explain actors in the international system

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 The International System: The Arena of Interactions

The first arena in the conduct of international relations is the global system or the world earth. According to Waltz (1979), the system is composed of a structure and interacting units. The structure is both anarchic and interactive among the units - the states..In the 18th and 19th centuries, international relations was largely a European affair with not more than 20 countries fully engaged in the interaction process. The dominant states in this period were the so-called great powers namely, Great Britain, France, Austria, Russia, and Prussia (later Germany). The extension of the European state system into the rest of the world in the last decades of the 19th century and the subsequent emergence of over 200 independent political units in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and in other corners of the world has created a truly global international system. In essence, the arena of the contemporary international system is global in scope and dimension.

The second arena is the existence of multiplicity of actors in the international system.. Oran Young defined an actor in world politics as “any organised entity that is composed, at least indirectly, of

human beings, is not wholly subordinate to any other actor in the world system in effective terms, and participates in power relationships with other actors.”In general, actors are classified into two: **state** and **non-state** actors. Traditionally, state actors considered the most powerful actors in the international system.Indeed, there is a great diversity in the size, population resource endowment, military capability, economic strength and industrial capacity among the state actors. This has created relationships of dependence and interdependence among the state actors. The growth of non-state actors, particularly multinational corporations (MNCs), international organisations such as the United Nations, and transnationally organised groups, in the post-World War II period, led to the abandonment of the traditional view which saw states as the only actors in the international system.

International relations occur through the regularized interactive processes among state and non-state actors within the larger arena of global *international system*. Therefore, interactions constitute the third arena for the conduct of IR. Although interactions take numerous and diverse forms they can be classified either by *type* or *issue areas*. Issue areas include trade and commerce, security, tourism, finance, technology transfer, cultural exchange, sports, educational exchange, immigration, crime and criminality, etc. The classification by type shows that irrespective of the issue area, interactions are either *conflictual* or *collaborative*. Conflict and cooperation are the inherent characteristics of international relations and can be viewed in relation to power configurations into unipolar, bipolar, tripolar and multipolar. Thus, the rules of interaction revolve around the concepts of sovereignty, territorial integrity and equality of states.

Finally, the fourth arena of the conduct of IR is the resultant problems of conflict or cooperation of interests, which are common to many actors and require the concerted of a combination of international actors for solutions. In the contemporary international system, the existence of nuclear weapons and terrorists networks groups like Al Qaeda that have demonstrated their capacity to precipitate conflict that could lead to the death of millions as well as the pandemic of corona virus constituted problems that require common and concert effort of the international actors.

### 3.2 The Structure of the International System

The structure examines the distribution of power and influence in the system, particularly the forms of dominant and subordinate relationships. The structural paradigm reveals the great or major powers in each system, the nature of their dominance, and their relationship with other political units. It also reveals the degree of stratification within the system, the major subsystems, the most important rivalries, issues, alliances, blocs, or international organisations.

In some cases the most powerful actors will define the structure of the international system. In that respect, according to Waltz (1979), international politics is like economics where the structure of a market is defined by the number of firms that compete. For example, sometimes, in the history of the African nations such as Western Sudan demonstrated that power was concentrated disproportionately in one state, as it was in Ghana Empire, Mali Empire, Oyo Empire or the Asante Kingdom, etc. Another example is the contemporary international system in which, following the demise of the Soviet Union, the United States has emerged as the only hyper power, the most powerful state in the world, with a preponderance of power incomparable to that of any other state, or a group of states for that matter. Such a system is described structurally as a unipolar.

In other historic international systems, such as in Europe from the 17th to the 19th centuries, power is distributed equally among a large number of states in such a way that none is capable of dominating or leading the others for any length of time. This typified a multipolar structure system. Sometimes, the structure of international system appeared to be as bipolar one. The system is structured into two or more antagonistic blocs of states, each led by a state of superior strength. This had been the structure of the international system during the Cold War; thus, after the World War II and before the collapse of the Soviet Union (from about 1947 to 1990). The two blocs were the United State and its NATO allies in the West, the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact satellites in the East.

Mortan Kaplan (1984) summarizes the structure of cotntemporary international system into six structural characteristic, viz:

- i. Hierarchically-structured system with the concentration of power and influence in a single unit of authority. The super powers are found in the pyramid and they try to prevent other power that attempt to challenge their hegemony.
- ii. Diffuse or universal structure of international system where power and authority are widely distributed among the interacting states in accordance with the capability of each state.
- iii. A structure similar to the United Nations (UN), there exist diffuse power blocs as there are two opposing blocs interspaced between them. These are the aligned countries (super powers) and the non-aligned nations (the Third World).
- iv. The Bi-polar structure that emerged after the Second World War. the world was divided into two ideological military blocs, one representing the east and the other west.
- v. The multi-polar structure that leads to formation of alliance and coalitions. The UN is a semblance of a multi-polar system
- vi. The unipolar structure which was the emerging phenomenon after the end of Cold War where United States was seen to dominate international politics.

### 3.3 Actors in the International System

An actor in world politics has been defined as “any entity which plays an identifiable role in international relations.” In his seminal essay “The Actors in World Politics,” published in 1972, Oran Young defined an actor in world politics as “any organised entity that is composed, at least indirectly, of human beings, is not wholly subordinate to any other actor in the world system in effective terms, and participates in power relationships with other actors.” In general, actors are classified into two: **state** and **non-state** actors.

#### 3.3.1 State Actors

Traditionally, state actors considered the most powerful actors in the international system, have four characteristics:



1. Territory
2. A sovereign central government
3. A loyal population
4. Recognition by other states.

Historically, actors have been organised as city, states, empires and kingdoms, and in contemporary times as states or nation-states of varying sizes and configurations. In terms of political organisation, state actors are classified as totalitarian, democratic, militaristic, and ideologically as capitalist, socialist, welfarist, communist or an admixture. Each political unit is independent and sovereign and is ready to deploy all its power and capabilities in defence of its status.

Since the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, which ended the 30 years War and legitimised the state system, states or nation-states have been considered the primary actors in the international system. This is the central paradigm of the school of thought known as Realism or the Realist school. Realists base their position on three fundamental assumptions:

- The state-centric assumption whereby states are the primary and only important actors in world politics
- The rationality assumption whereby states are analysed as if they were rational and unitary actors
- The power assumption whereby states primarily seek power, most often, military power, both as a means and as an end in itself.

Although these assumptions do not establish a genuine scientific basis, they had a definite appeal because they were easily applicable to the practical problems of international relations. The key to understanding the assumptions of political Realism lies in the concept of power. As Hans Morgenthau asserts in his book, *Politics among Nations* (1949, p. 13), “international politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power.” He asserts further, “All political policy seeks either to keep power, to increase power, or to demonstrate power.” (1949, p. 21). As states alone have the necessary resources to exercise power, they are consequently the most important actors. In Morgenthau's view, the obvious measure of a nation's power is in the military strength. Such power is the main determinant for the place of state actors in the hierarchically arranged international system, the agenda of which is dominated by security concerns (Morgenthau, 1949, p. 54).

The state, acting through its government, is a unitary and rational actor, which pursues, above all, national interests and competes in this matter with other nation-states in an environment characterised by anarchy. Realists maintain that governments act rationally because they have ordered preferences. Governments calculate the costs and benefits of all alternative policies to choose those practices that maximise their interests.

It is thus, the structural constraints of the international system, which will explain the behaviour of the units, not the other way around. In contrast to behavioural and reductionist approaches which try to explain international politics in terms of its main actors, structural Realism accounts for the behaviour of the units as well as international outcomes in terms of the character of the system or changes in it (Waltz, 1979, pp. 69-72).

Waltz maintains that: States set the scene in which they, along with nonstate actors, stage their dramas or carry on their humdrum affairs. Though they may choose to interfere little in the affairs of non-state actors for long periods of time, states nevertheless set the terms of the intercourse, whether by passively permitting informal rules to develop or by actively intervening to change rules that no longer suit them. When the crunch comes, states remake the rules by which other actors operate (Waltz, 1979, p. 94).

According to Waltz (1979, p. 95), states are the units whose interactions form the structure of the international-political systems. They will long remain so. The death rate among states is remarkably low. Few states die; many firms do.

### 3.3.2 Non-State Actors

The growth of non-state actors, particularly multinational corporations (MNCs), international organisations such as the United Nations, and transnationally organised groups, in the post-World War II period, led to the abandonment of the traditional view which saw states as the only actors in the international system. Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye were among the first scholars to call for a revision of the state-centric paradigm, because it failed to recognise the importance of non-state actors. In their 1971 essay collection *Transnational Relations and World Politics*, they identify the phenomena of “transnational interaction” which they define as “the movement of tangible or intangible items across state boundaries when at least one actor is not an agent of a government” (Keohane and Nye, 1971, p. 332). The authors highlight the importance of non-governmental actors in a great number of international interactions. They present a number of case studies examining such varied transnational actors and behaviour as multinational cooperation, foundations, churches, revolutionary movements, labour unions and scientific networks. They conclude that the state is no longer the only important actor in world politics.

In “Analysing Non-State Actors in World Politics,” Gustaaf Geeraerts described the phenomenal growth of non-state actors as follows: One of the most prominent features of the global political system in the second half of the 20th century is the significant surge in numbers and importance of non-state entities. With the growth of interdependence and communication between societies, a great variety of new organisational structures operating on a regional and global basis, was established. The rise of these transnationally organised non-state actors and their growing involvement in world politics challenge the assumptions of traditional approaches to international relations which assume that states are the only important units of the international system. While some authors recognise that these non-sovereign entities and their activities have led to fundamental changes in world politics, others maintain that the structure of the international system can still be treated, based on inter-state relations.

There are series of empirical studies conducted during the 1970s to test the assumption of the growing importance of non-state actors. Kjell Skjelsbaek, in his essay “The Growth of International Nongovernmental Organisations in the 20th Century” (1971), gathered a vast amount of empirical data showing the rapid growth of international nongovernmental organisations (INGOs) since 1900 and particularly after World War II. He found that the number of INGOs had grown from 1012 in 1954 to 1899 in 1968. While the number of INGOs increased on an average of 4.7 per cent per year from 1954 to 1968, the annual growth rate was 6.2 per cent between 1962 and 1968 (Skjelsbaek, 1971, p. 425). In his examination of the distribution of INGOs by field of

activity, he found that the categories of economic/financial organisations and commercial/industrial organisations constituted the greatest percentage of organisations established in the period 1945-54 (Skjelsbaek, 1971, p. 429).

Another empirical study was carried out by Richard Mansbach *et al.* in *The Web of World Politics: Non-state actors in the Global System* (1976). In this study, the authors contend that the state-centric model has become “obsolete” due to the growing involvement of non-state actors in world politics (Mansbach *et al.*, 1976, p. 273). Relying on the NonState Actor Project (NOSTAC), they use “events data” in three regions - Western Europe, the Middle East and Latin America - from 1948 to 1972 to investigate empirically the emergence and behaviour of nonstate actors (Mansbach *et al.*, 1976, pp. 14-15). Their findings indicate that half of the interactions in the regions involve nation-states as actors and targets simultaneously and that 11 per cent involves non-state actors exclusively. The authors conclude that only half of the dyads can be analysed from a state-centric point of view because the remaining half of the combinations includes non-state actors (Mansbach *et al.*, 1976, pp. 275-76).

Richard Mansbach and John A. Vasquez, in their 1981 explorative work *In Search of Theory: A New Paradigm for Global Politics* carried out a similar study to argue for an alternative paradigm based on non-state actors. In this study, they use a data set of event interactions between American-based and West German-based actors during the period 1949-1975 (Mansbach and Vasquez, 1981, p. 16). In the first part of their study, they rank order the number of actors that appear in their data according to the frequency of their behaviour. Of the 30 actors that appear in their study, nine are non-governmental actors, two of which (individual US congressmen and West German political parties) rank 11th and 12th in frequency of behaviour.

The authors then investigate the rank order of actors by per cent of conflict they initiate and receive to indicate that non-state actors are not only present but also significant in world politics. Nine of the 10 most conflict prone actors in their study are non-state actors and 18 of the 25 non-state actors are conflict-prone. Only eight of the 26 governments in the study are involved in any conflict at all (Mansbach and Vasquez, 1981, pp. 17-19). Their findings also suggest the importance of examining the role of bureaucratic agencies as individual actors because their results show that there are “significant deviations from the conflict score of specific agencies of a government and the aggregate score for the national government as a whole” (Mansbach and Vasquez, 1981, p.

21). Under conditions of complex interdependence, Keohane and Nye view non-state actors as possible direct participants in world politics. The existence of multiple channels of contacts among societies implies that transnational actors, trans-governmental relations and international organisations play an active role in world politics. The authors argue that transnational actors such as multinational firms, private banks and other organisations have become “a normal part of foreign as well as domestic relations” (Keohane and Nye, 1977; 1989, p. 26). These actors are important not only because of their activities in pursuit of their own interests, but also because they “act as transmission belts, making government policies in various countries more sensitive to one another” (Keohane and Nye, 1977; 1989, p. 26).

The recognition that states are not the only actors in the international system led to the introduction of what Oron Young described as the “Mixed-Actor Perspective.” In his 1972 article, “The Actors in World Politics” Young proposed a conceptual framework challenging the single-actor model of

the state-centric view of politics. According to Young (1972, p. 136), “the basic notion of a system of mixed actors requires a movement away from the assumption of homogeneity with respect to types of actor and, therefore, a retreat from the postulate of the state as the fundamental unit in world politics. Instead, the mixed-actor world view envisions a situation in which several quantitatively different types of actor interact in the absence of any settled pattern of dominance-submission or hierarchical relationships.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. Describe the nature and type of actors in the international system.

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Although all international systems have the same characteristics, they can be differentiated one from the other based on the extent to which power is distributed among the actors and components parts. Hence, systems can be hierarchical, unipolar, multipolar or bipolar. In essence, power symmetries determine the structure and character of the international system.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

In this unit, we have examined the arena for the conduct of IR and pointed out that global international system, actors both states and non-state, interaction process and resultant problem of interests constitute the arena of the IR. The extent to which power determines the structural relations among the various components and actors was also discussed.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. “Power determines the structure of the international system.” Discuss.

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

- Bull, H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of World Order*. London: Macmillan.
- Frankel, J. (1988). *International Relations in a Changing World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kaplan, M. (1984). *Theories and Approaches to International Politics: What are we to Think?* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed). London: Transaction Books P. 23.
- Morgenthau, H.J. (1949). *Politics among Nations*. New York: Knopf.
- Rosenau, J.N. (1990). *Turbulence in World Politics*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Young, O R. (1972). “The Actors in World Politics.” In: J. N. Rosenau & M. A. East (Eds). *The Analysis of International Politics*, pp. 125-144. New York: The Free Press.

## **MODULE 2: DIMENSIONS AND APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

In Module 1 you have learnt about the scope and subject areas of IR which covers: International politics, foreign policy analysis, diplomacy, global defense and strategic studies, international law and organizations and international economic relations. In this module, a brief explanation of some of the sub-fields of IR will follow. Particularly, the Module will examine dimensions of connections between IR and International Politics as well as international law. Level of analysis and approaches will also be discussed. The module comprises the following units:

Unit 1	International Relations and International Politics
Unit 2	International Relations and International Law
Unit 3	Sources and Legality of International Law
Unit 4	Level of Analysis in International Relations
Unit 5	Approaches to the Study of IR

### **UNIT 1 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS**

#### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 International Relations and International Politics
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 5.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

international politics is one of the special sub-fields of IR. In the past, some scholars used the terms, international relations and international politics interchangeably. However, modern students especially those who study political behaviour have come to question this usage. They postulate that a distinction ought to exist between the two terms. They believe that failure on the part of the earlier writers and practitioners of international affairs and diplomacy to make a distinction led to the semantic confusion in the study of IR today.

#### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the differences between IR and international politics
- identify the components of international politics.

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 International Relations and International Politics

International relations embrace the totality of the relations among peoples and groups in the world society. IR is wider for the fact that it includes all types of 'relations' or 'interactions' among the states including non-states actors. The implication of this view point is that the 'relations may be political and non-political (social, economic, humanitarian and philanthropic). Scholars who subscribe to this broader and more nebulous term differ in the role they assign to international politics in international relations. Whereas some assign international politics a major role, others subordinate it to various cultural, social and psychological forces in the world environment. In other words, while the term 'relations' suggests harmony and cooperation of diverse kinds among the states of the world, 'politics' is suggestive of the conflicting side of their behavior. Therefore, international politics is much more limited where we are concerned only with the 'game of power' in which states as sovereign entities are involved. Taking a brief glance at the world around us, we find that some of the principal actors in world politics, the agents of international relations that make up the political landscape of our subject area, are not nations at all.

The term 'politics,' within the concept of international politics, either explicit or by inference involves or consists of elements such as strife, struggle, conflict and alike that invariably implies the use of power. To say that politics is struggle for power is to conceive it terms not only of actions but also of purpose. Politics as relationships between nations makes international politics what Morgenthau confidently calls 'politics among nations.' With regards to international politics, groups are nations and their needs and wants called 'national interest.' Thus, three important things relevant to international politics are national interest, conflict and power; the first is the objective, the second is the conditions, the third is the means of international politics. Since every nation has its specific interest which, in most of the cases, is different from the interest of other states, disagreements and differences develop and become the source of conflict. These conflicts are resolved either in a peaceful way or by means of violent clashes. Obviously, cooperation and conflict, collaboration and discord, peace and war. make the stuff of international politics. On this basis, Frankel observes that war and peace represent the extremes of two current modes of social interaction, namely, conflict and harmony. And so study of international politics should include both. In that respect, international politics can be viewed as a process of adjustment of relationships among nations in favour of a nation or a group of nations by means of power.

Most students of international relations concur to the view that international politics should be used primarily to denote official political relations between governments acting on behalf of their states. The term, international relations is broader and less easily circumscribed. Indeed, international relations is synonymous with international affairs. To study IR is to become a generalist. It is to find a way of engaging with a hugely complex, but fascinating and politically urgent, aspect of our lives. Politics and IR share this multidisciplinary feature. Those aspects of our world that we describe as political form the framework of the world within which we live. International politics impacts on us from the price we pay for our shopping, to the laws our government imposes. IR embraces all kinds of relations traversing state boundaries, be they cultural, economic, legal, political, or any other character, whether they be private or official and all human behaviour originating on one side of a state boundary and affecting human behaviour on

the other side of the boundary.

International relations is a broader term than international politics as its study is constantly improved by the wider and more versatile approaches and methods of study. New insights and techniques to enhance the understanding of the “core” and the “peripheral” aspects of IR are constantly used. It is interesting to work fruitfully on the peripheries of a field without neglecting its central focus. Padelford & Lincoln (1954) succinctly explain the distinction between IR and international politics in the following words: “in its broadest sense the field of international relations comprises a myriad of contacts among individuals, business organizations, cultural institutions and political personalities of different countries. When people speak of IR, however, they are usually thinking of the relationships between states as such. This is to be expected view of the fact that states are the one making vital decisions affecting peace and war and that it is the governments which have the authority to regulate business, travel, commerce, use of resources, political ideas, territorial jurisdictions, nationality, communications, employment of armed forces and other aspects of international affairs. This relationship between states is described as international politics that is the interaction of state policies. This is the core of contemporary international relations. Finally, the use of "international relations" to mean essentially "international politics" is by no means a deliberate effort to exclude the non-political.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

What is international politics?

- i. What are the components of international politics?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In this unit, we learnt about the distinction between international relations and international politics. Whereas IR is a broader concept which embraces the totality of the relations among peoples and groups in the world society, international politics is used primarily to describe official political relations between governments acting on behalf of their states.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

International politics is about politics of groups which consisted nations and their needs and wants called ‘national interest.’ Thus, three important things relevant to international politics are national interest, conflict and power; the first is the objective, the second is the conditions, the third is the means of international politics. Indeed, International politics is part of international relations that deals with the political aspects of the relationships.

### **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Examine the view that IR encompasses international politics.

### **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Bull, H. (1995). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. (3rd ed.). New York: Palgrave Books.

Holsti, K. J. (1967). *International Politics: A framework for Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.

Morgenthau, H. J.(1948). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Padelford, N.J. & Lincoln, G.A. (1954). *International Politics: Foundation of International Relations*. New York: Macmillan pp.3 – 5.

Zawodny, J.K. (1967). *Guide to the Study of International Relations*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

## **UNIT 2 INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 International Relations and International Law



- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

International law is common to all states. It is the moral code of states in the international system. If all states in the international system obey international law, there will be no recourse to war. However, some writers are not comfortable with the term, “international law” saying that it implies the existence of a law over states. They argue that in reality, international law is a law among states not over them. International law is an aspect of international relations that moderates, regulates and controls the relationships between states in the international system.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the meaning, nature and content of international law
- explain the relationships between international law and IR

## **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

### **3.1 International Relations and International Law**

Scholars have various definitions of International law. To some scholars, international law is just an aspect of the municipal law. Others regard it as superior to the municipal laws. For example, in 1905, Oppenheim referred to international law as the name for the body of customary and conventional rules considered legally binding by civilised states in their intercourse with each other. In his words, it is a law for the intercourse of states with one another not a law for individuals; it is a law between, not above, the single states.

Undoubtedly, states are the subjects of international law, which means that they control access to dispute resolution tribunals or courts. They typically designate the adjudicators of such tribunals. States also implement, or fail to implement, the decisions of international tribunals or courts. Therefore, in interstate dispute resolution, states act as gatekeepers both to the international legal process and from that process back to the domestic level. Indeed, the tradition in international law has long been that only sovereign states have full international legal personality, this accords states an exclusive right to conclude international agreements and to bring claims regarding treaty violations. According to Ellery Stowell (1931), international law embodies certain rules relating to human relations throughout the world, which are generally observed by humankind and enforced primarily through the agency of the governments of the independent communities into which humanity is divided. The fundamental international legal principle of *pacta sunt servanda* means that the rules and commitments contained in legalised international agreements are regarded as obligatory, subject to various defences or exceptions, and not to be disregarded as preferences change. They must be performed in good faith, regardless of inconsistent provisions of domestic

law.

There is a strong connection between international relations and international law. Clearly, the power and preferences of states influence the behaviour of both governments and of dispute resolution tribunals. In fact, international law operates in the shadow of power. Essentially, international law provides the framework for political discourse among members of the international system. The framework does not guarantee consensus, but it does foster the discourse and participation needed to provide conceptual clarity in developing legal obligations and gaining their acceptance. In playing this role, international law performs two different functions. One is to provide mechanisms for cross-border interactions, and the other is to shape the values and goals these interactions are pursuing. The first set of functions are called the “operating system” of international law, and the second set of functions are the “normative system.”

Similarly, international law provides principles for the interpretation of agreements and a variety of technical rules on such matters as formation, reservation, and amendments. Breach of a legal obligation creates legal responsibility, which does not require a showing of intent on the part of specific state organs. Establishing a commitment as a legal rule invokes a particular form of discourse. Although actors may disagree about the interpretation or applicability of a set of rules, discussion of issues purely in terms of interests or power is no longer legitimate. In transnational dispute resolution, by contrast, access to courts and tribunals and the subsequent enforcement of their decisions are legally insulated from the will of individual national governments. In the pure ideal type, states lose their gate keeping capacities though in practice, these capacities are exaggerated. This loss of state control, whether voluntarily or unwittingly surrendered, creates a range of opportunities for courts and their constituencies to set the agenda. Yet within that political context, institutions for selecting judges, controlling access to dispute resolution, and legally enforcing the judgments of international courts and tribunals have a major impact on state behaviour.

Today, participants in the international legal process include more than 190 states and governments, international institutions created by states, and elements of the private sector - multinational corporations and financial institutions, networks of individuals, and NGOs.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What is the relationship between international law and international relations?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

International law remains principally a body of rules and practices to regulate state behaviour in the conduct of interstate relations. Much of international law also regulates the conduct of governments and the behaviour of individuals within states, and may address issues that require transnational cooperation. Human rights law is an example of the normative system regulating behaviour within states.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have studied the basic components of the operating and normative systems as a conceptual framework for analysing and understanding international law. In a preliminary fashion, the interaction of these two systems are explored, specifically the conditions under which operating system changes occur in response to normative changes. It also discusses the steps taken by states to change international legal rules so that this norm could influence state behaviour.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

1. Explain the nexus between international law and IR.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Brierly, J. L. (1963). *The Law of Nations*. (6th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Corbert, P. E. (1951). *Law and Society in the Relations of States*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Goldstein, J.S. & Pevehouse, J.C. (2011). *International Relations* (9th ed.). San Francisco: Longman, Pearson Education.

Kaplan, M. & Nicholas De B. Katzenbach (1946). *Making International Law Work*. (2nd ed.). London.

Palmer, N.D. & Perkins, H. C. (2004). *International Relations: The World Community in Transition*. (3rd ed.). Krishan Nagar, Delhi: A.I.T.B.S.

Schwarzenberger, G. (1952). *Manual of International Law*. (3rd ed.). London.

Wright, Q. (1955). *Contemporary International Law: A Balance Sheet*. Garden City N.Y.: Doubleday & Company.

## UNIT 3 SOURCES AND LEGALITY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Sources of International Law
  - 3.2 Legality of International Law
- 4.0 Conclusion

- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Definitions of international Law hold that law is a rule of conduct issued by a superior authority to persons over whom it has jurisdiction. From this view point it can be argued that international law is not true law since neither the UN nor any other international organisation has jurisdiction over states. However, this unit will address questions such as who are the authorised decision makers in international law? What constitute sources of the international law? which actions can bind not only the parties involved, but also others?

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- identify and explain the various sources of international law
- explain the legality of international law

## **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

### **3.1 Sources of International Law**

Municipal laws come from central authorities- legislators or dictators. However, states are sovereign and recognise no central authority, thus international law rests on different basis. The declarations of the UN General Assembly are not laws, and most do not bind the members. Four sources of international law are identifiable- treaties, customs, general principles of law and legal scholarship (including past judicial decisions). Treaties and other written conventions signed by states are the most important source. A principle in international law states that treaties, once signed and ratified must be observed (*pacta sunt servanda*). States violate the terms of treaties they have signed only if the matter is very important or the penalties for such a violation seem very small. Treaties and other international obligations such as debts are binding on successor governments whether the new government takes power through election, a coup or a revolution.

The second major source of international law is Custom. When states behave towards each other in a certain way for a long time, their behaviour becomes generally accepted practice with the status of law. Thirdly, general principles of law serve as a source of international law. Actions such as theft and assault recognised in most national municipal laws as crimes have the same meaning in international arena. For instance, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was illegal under treaties signed by Iraq (including the UN Charter and that of the Arab League) and under Custom, both countries had established living in peace as sovereign states.

The fourth source of international law is legal scholarship. These are the written arguments of judges and lawyers around the world on issues in question. Only the writings of the most highly qualified and respected legal figures could be recognised, and then only to resolve points not resolved by the first three sources of international law.

### 3.2 The Legality of International Law

The dual character of international law results from its Westphalian legacy in which law functions among, rather than above, states and in which the state carries out the legislative, judicial, and executive functions that in domestic legal systems are performed by separate institutions. The operating system of international law therefore functions in some ways as a constitution does in a domestic legal system- by setting out the consensus of its constituent actors on distribution of authority and responsibilities for governance within the system. Legal capacity can be expressed and recognised in terms of rights and duties, and is a major portion of constitutions. Nevertheless, constitutions also provide more. Dahl identified a number of items that the constitutions generally specify, several of which are also specified by international law. These include competent decisions, accountability, and ensuring stability, to name a few. In order for the operating system to maintain vibrancy and resiliency, and to ensure the stability necessary for orderly behaviour, the operating system must provide for dynamic normative systems that facilitate the competition of values, views, and actors. It does so by applying the constitutional functions as described above when including new actors, new issues, new structures, and new norms.

The operating system has a number of dimensions or components, typically covered in international law textbooks, but largely unconnected with one another. Some of the primary components include the following:

- **Sources of Law:** These include the system rules for defining the process through which law is formed, the criteria for determining when legal obligations exist, and which actors are bound (or not) by that law. This element of the operating system also specifies a hierarchy of different legal sources. For example, the operating system defines whether United Nations (UN) resolutions are legally binding and what role they play in the legal process.
- **Actors:** This dimension includes determining which actors are eligible to have rights and obligations under the law. The operating system also determines how, and the degree to which, those actors might exercise those rights internationally. For example, individuals and multinational corporations may enjoy certain international legal protections, but those rights might only be asserted in international forums by their home states.
- **Jurisdiction:** These rules define the rights of actors and institutions to deal with legal problems and violations. An important element is defining what problems or situations will be handled through national legal systems as opposed to international forums. For example, the Convention on Torture (1985) allows states to prosecute perpetrators in their custody, regardless of the location of the offense and the nationality of the perpetrator or victim, affirming the “universal jurisdiction” principle.
- **Courts or Institutions:** These elements create forums and accompanying rules under which international legal disputes might be heard or decisions might be enforced. Thus for example, the Statute of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) provides for the creation of the institution, sets general rules of decision making, identifies the processes and scope under which cases are heard, specifies the composition of the court, and details decision-making procedures to name a few.

### SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

- i. What are the sources and operating system of the international law?

#### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

International law provides the framework for political discourse among members of the international system. The framework does not guarantee consensus, but it does foster the discourse and participation needed to provide conceptual clarity in developing legal obligations and gaining their acceptance. In playing this role, international law source out its functions from treaties, customs, general principles of law and legal scholarship (including past judicial decisions).

#### **5.0 SUMMARY**

In this unit, we have studied the sources and the operating system of the international. In particular, the operating system which constitute legality of the international law functions in some ways as a constitution does in a domestic legal system- by setting out the consensus of its constituent actors on distribution of authority and responsibilities for governance within the international system. Indeed, states are the subjects of international law, which means that they control access to dispute resolution tribunals or courts. States therefore implement, or fail to implement, the decisions of international tribunals or courts. The tradition in international law has long been that only sovereign states have full international legal personality, this accords states an exclusive right to conclude international agreements and to bring claims regarding treaty violations.

#### **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Explain the sources and legality of international law.

#### **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

- Kaplan, M. & Nicholas De B. Katzenbach (1946). *Making International Law Work*. (2nd ed.). London.
- Palmer, N.D. & Perkins, H. C. (2004). *International Relations: The World Community in Transition*. (3rd ed.). Krishan Nagar, Delhi: A.I.T.B.S.
- Schwarzenberger, G. (1952). *Manual of International Law*. (3rd ed.). London.
- Wright, Q. (1955). *Contemporary International Law: A Balance Sheet*. Garden City N.Y.: Doubleday & Company.

## **UNIT 4 LEVEL OF ANALYSIS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Levels of Analysis
    - 3.1.1 Individual Level of Analysis
    - 3.1.2 State Level of Analysis
    - 3.1.3 System Level of Analysis
    - 3.1.4 Other Level of Analysis
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary

- 6. 0Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7. 0References/Further Reading

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The unit discusses the importance of using level of analysis in the study of international relations. It argues that international relations can be analytically structured and explained into different levels such as individual, state and international system levels. These represent a dimension in the study and analysis of IR which enables us to understand the working of the international relations and the global system.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- Identify and discuss levels of analysis in the study of international relations

## **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

### **3.1 Levels of Analysis**

One of the important aspects to the study of international relations revolves around the “level of analysis” construct. International relations is such a broad field that scholars have devised major units or levels for analytical discourse of the global system. These are the individual, the state, and the system levels of analysis. Each level focuses on different aspects of international relations. The global system is a complex whole that can be broken into smaller units for better understanding or to be studied and analyzed as a whole to understand its content. The analysis becomes necessary so as to obtain not just a mere knowledge of the system and its dynamic but as well as to achieve deep insight into its complexity to enable us solve some difficult problems facing humanity and global society. Problems such as poverty, pandemic like covid-19, lack of peace, terrorism, war, and the like need thorough study.

#### **3.1.1 Individual Level of Analysis**

The Individual level of analysis focuses on the actions, behaviour, attitudes, idiosyncrasies or psychology of individual policymakers. It examines leaders’ personalities, perceptions and misperceptions. Immanuel Kant and Woodrow Wilson have argued that moral principles of individual’s behavior are capable of influencing the state to bring about ideals that ensure peace and cooperation in the society. This can further be expanded to the international system to become ideals for IR. For instance, in a discussion of the Nigerian civil war, the individual level of analysis approach will consider the personality of the key players - Ojukwu and Gowon - as causal factors in the war. Did Ojukwu miscalculate dreadfully and provoked a war the Igbo could not win? Did Gowon underestimate the resolve and the resilience of the Igbo and thereby adopted strategies that prolonged the war unnecessarily? The level’s focus on the actions and behaviour of individual statesmen and is based on the reasonable proposition that when we refer to the way states behave, we really mean that policymakers define purposes choosing among courses of action and utilising



national capabilities to achieve objectives in the name of the state. Balance of power and System theory are examples of system level of analysis theories.

### **3.1.2 State Level of Analysis**

Analysis of IR can also focus on the state by looking at how its foreign policy becomes part of the laws that govern international system; or how its foreign policy influences policies and actions of other states in the global system. The State level of analysis assumes that all policymakers act essentially the same way once confronted with similar situations. It therefore concentrates on the behaviour of states. Many analysts consider the state level to be the most important. They treat the state as the basic unit of international relations. For instance, on the issue of international conflict, a pervasive and permanent feature of international relations, analysts will want to know whether it arises from such attributes of the state as sovereignty, territoriality, nationalism, power, economic structure, etc. Questions such as the following are germane to the state level of analysis: What are the characteristics and peculiarities of states in a given issue area? What are the domestic conditions that affect policy formulation? Generally, the state level of analysis assumes that governmental actions express the needs and values of their own populations and political leaders. Domestic political pressures, national ideologies, public opinion, economic and social needs, all contribute to the way states interact with other actors in the international system. For instance, liberal democracy is an ideal system acceptable by the United States. The state has propagated this system of governance in such a way that it has become an order of governance in the international system. Decision-making theories such as Motivational Analysis, Rational or Unitary Actor model, Corporatist Synthesis, are examples of state level of analysis theories.

### **3.1.3 System Level of Analysis**

The System level of analysis looks at the international system holistically. It considers the structure of the system and the distribution of power and influence within the system, the form of superior and subordinate relationships, etc. The notion that a system has behavioural influence on its component parts informed neorealists like Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Kenneth Waltz and Robert Gilpin to argue that international relations should be analysed based on international system as a level of focus. For instance, do anarchy and the power symmetries within the system explain the form, and the intensity of conflict? The classic theory of the balance of power, to pick one of the system level theories, explains the behaviour of many states over a period. It proposes that states will form coalitions and counter-coalitions to fend off hegemonic drives and that a “balancer” will intervene on behalf of the weaker side to redress the balance or restore the equilibrium. The system level explains the actions of individual actors in terms of the state of the whole system. It makes no reference to personalities, domestic pressures, or ideologies within states. To pick another example, the system level will explain the outbreak of World War I as a consequence of the breakdown of the balance of power system.

### **3.1.4 Other Levels of Analysis**

In addition to the above levels of analysis, there are other levels that can be used to explain decisions and actions of state’s actors or certain pattern of outcomes in international relations and diplomacy. Explanation of three additional levels of analysis will follow below; these are class level of analysis, bureaucratic level of analysis and multi-centric level of analysis:

**Class Level of Analysis:** This is a level of analysis perceived by Marxist scholars in their attempt to use class differences and antagonism as means of understanding international relations. According to Karl Marx and Engels, capitalism has classified the society into two antagonist classes in the process of social production. These classes are the Bourgeois and proletariat representing the owners of means of production and the owners of labour respectively and the former exploits the latter in an attempt to maximize surplus for further expansion of production. The Marxists therefore argued that for us to understand international relations we have to start from analyzing the relationship which exists between these two classes in the process of social production. They see international relations as an extension of the struggle between these two classes. That is to say, IR should be seen and analyzed from the standpoint of the struggle over global wealth by these two classes.

**Bureaucratic Level of Analysis:** Foreign policy decisions and actions are not ultimately the affairs of individuals or personalities alone. However, small organizational groups and some foreign policy bodies are frequently involved as well as competing to influence national decisions. Some of these groups are members of cabinet, executive office of the president, senate committee on foreign affairs, ministry of external affairs, state departments, national security councils and other key bureaucrats, whose activities have directly or indirectly affect international relations.

**Multi-Centric Level of Analysis:** This focuses on certain goals and objectives of state as dominant actor that involve cooperate, collaborative and integral interests of state with others. This includes analysis of regional, economic or political grouping, military alliances, ideological blocs, voting blocs in the United Nations. It also relates to activities of non-state actors whose pattern of relations and influence is multi-centric. These are inter-governmental actors such as the UN, the African Union (AU), the European Economic Community (EEC) and other similar bodies in economic, political, cultural and military spheres. Included are the non-governmental actors such as the Amnesty International, the Red Cross Society, Multi-National Corporations (MNCs), the Vatican, Terrorist bodies and liberation movements.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What are levels of analysis? Illustrate how these levels constitute analytical constructs to the study of IR.?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Generally, each level of analysis contributes to our understanding of international relations, although, each on its own might not account for certain aspects of the situation in inter-state relations under consideration. Thus for a thorough understanding and explanation of international relations phenomena, it is important to consider all three levels of analysis at relevant points depending on the type of problem to be analysed.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

In the unit, we learnt about different levels of analysis to the study of international relations and the formulated theories and analytical models suitable to each level. International relations studies can analytically be structured and explained by focusing on three levels: individual, state and international system levels of analysis

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- i. Identify and explain different levels of analysis you know to the study of IR.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Alozie, C. C. & Nwadike, J. (2014). *Fundamentals of International Relations in a New World Order*. Enugu: Rhyce Kerex Publishers.

Bull, H. (1995). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (3rd ed.). New York: Palgrave Books.

Frank-Collins, N. O. & Peter, A. C. (2012). (Eds.) *Thoughts on International Relations*. Lagos: Absolute Media Production.

Holsti, K. J. (1967)...*International Politics: A framework for Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.

Johari, J. C. (2014). *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Delhi: Sterling

## UNIT 5 APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Approaches to the Study of International Relations
  - 3.2 Classical or Traditional Approach
  - 3.3 Modern or Scientific Approach
  - 3.4 The Realist and Idealist Approaches
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Scholars have adopted different approaches to the study of international relations. An approach consists of a criterion of selection, i. e. criteria employed in selecting the problems or questions to consider and selecting the data to bring to bear in the course of analysis. As different scholars have adopted different criteria of selecting problems and data and adopted different standpoints, this resulted in different approaches for the study of international relations. In this unit, attempt is made to identify and discuss some of the essential approaches to the study of IR

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the meaning of approach in IR
- Identify and explain the kinds of approach to the study of IR

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Approaches to the Study of International Relations

In simple terms, an approach may be defined as a way of looking at and then explaining a particular phenomenon. The perspective may be broad enough to cover a vast area like world as a whole, or it may be way small, embracing an aspect of local, regional, national or international politics. Besides, it may cover within its fold every other thing related to the collection and selection of evidence followed by an investigation and analysis of a particular hypotheses for an academic purpose. An approach consists of a criterion of selection, i. e. criteria employed in selecting the problems or questions to consider and selecting the data to bring to bear in the course of analysis. It consists of standards governing inclusion and exclusion of questions and data. Approach is closely related to a theory in view of the fact that its very character determinesthe way of generalization, explanation, prediction and prescription in all of which are among the functions of a theory. A theory can be distinguish with approach, because it may be identified with anything like thought, idea, trend, hypothesis, explanation, even interpretation of some kind different from this, an approach may be defined as creator or precursor of a theory. An approach may be transformed into a theory, if and when its functions extends beyond selection of problems and data about the subject under study.

Scholars have adopted different approaches to the study of international relations..Hedley Bull has divided the various approaches for the study of international policy into two categories: (1) classical or traditional approach, wich includes descriptive, historical, philosophical, legal, institutional, analytical and normative forms; and (2) scientific or modern or behavioural approach predicting human behavior as system, equilibrium, decision-making and other forms.

### 3.2 Classical or Traditional Approach

The classical approach is also known as traditional approach. This approach was mainly in vogue until the middle of the last century, even though until now certain writers continue to subscribe to this approach. These writers mainly made descriptive analysis of international relations. The main

objective of the scholars adopting traditional approach was to report and analyse current international problems and to speculate on these sources and outcomes of various policy alternatives for specific states or for international organisation. According to Hedley Bull, the traditional approach is “the approach to theorising that derives from philosophy, history and law. In his view, it is characterised by explicit reliance upon the exercise of judgement and by the assumptions that if we confine ourselves to strict standards to verification and proof, there is little that can be said about international relations. Therefore, general propositions about IR must derive from a scientifically imperfect process of perception or institution, and that these general propositions cannot be accorded anything more than the tentative inconclusive status appropriate to their doubtful origin. In other words, the traditional approach is normative, qualitative and value judgement approach.

Most scholars adopted the traditional approach until the scientific approach made its appearance. It nourished two dominant schools of international political thought; “Idealism and Realism” and greatly contributed to the sophisticated understanding of the nature and determinants of international relations. The traditional approach mainly concerns itself with the historical tensions and lays emphasis on diplomatic, historical and institutional studies. This explains why the classical approach had variants, such as historical approach, philosophical approach, legal approach and institutional approach. The historical approach focussed on the past or on a selected period of history to find out an explanation of what institutions are, how they came into being and makes an analysis of these institutions as they stand. This approach helped in illuminating the present by drawing on the wisdom of the past.

The philosophical approach regarded the state as an agent of moral improvement of international relations, and stood for attainment of perpetual peace. However, this approach was defective as far as it was abstract, speculative, and far removed from reality. The legal approach laid emphasis on the need of having a system of world law to regulate the behaviour of nation states and insisted on a code of international law to ensure world peace and security. It insisted on evolving some legal machinery for resolving state conflicts through mediation, arbitration or judicial settlement.

Finally, the institutional approach focused on the formal structure for the maintenance of peace and enforcement of principles of international law. It lays special emphasis on the study of the organisation and structure of the League of Nations, the United Nations, and other specialised agencies like WHO, UNESCO, etc.

### **3.3 Scientific Approach**

The scientific or behavioural approach to the study of international politics became popular in the wake of World War II. The devotees of the scientific approach aspire to a theory of international relations. The propositions rest either upon logical or mathematical proof, or upon strict empirical evidences. It lays more emphasis on the methods of study rather than the subject matter. This approach relies on the simple proposition that international politics like any other social activity involves people and hence can be explain by analysing and explaining the behaviour of people as reflected in their activities in the field of international relations. The scientific approach applies scientific methods and ignores the boundaries of orthodox disciplines. It insists that the central aim of the research should be to study the behaviour of men. A notable feature of this approach is that it is interdisciplinary and draws from various social sciences like sociology, psychology and

anthropology. The scientific approach differs from the traditional approach as far as there is a definite trend away from description, legal analysis and policy advice. Its objective has not been to assess the main issues in the cold war or describe current international developments, but to create explanatory theories about international phenomena, and in some cases, even to propose the development of a general and predictive science of international relations.

Generally, there are many varieties and combination of these two approaches variously applied by scholars. Scholars who are more concerned with substance rather than method, particularly those of the older generation tend to favour the first approach while those who are particularly absorbed with method and techniques, including large proportion of younger generation prefer the latter. However, the two approaches are compatible and many scholars manage to combine them with fruitful results. Morton Kaplan is a leading proponent of the scientific approach.

### **3.4 The Realist and Idealist Approach**

The two variants of the classical approach are; the realist approach and the idealist approach.

**The Realist Approach:** The basic assumption underlying the realist theory is the perpetual existence of conflict among nations in one form or the other. This is a fixed doctrine. Therefore, it is evident that a contest for power is going on in the world that cannot be controlled nor regulated by international law, world government or an international organisation. Thus, realism unequivocally accepts as its guiding principle, the permanence of the struggle for power. The prominent realists include the classical theorists Thomas Hobbes and Niccolo Machiavelli. In the 20th century, George Kennan, Hans J. Morgenthau, Henry Kissinger etc. were the leading exponents of the realist theory. Indeed, Morgenthau has offered the best exposition of the realist theory of international relations. In his view, international politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power. Whatever the ultimate aim of international politics, power is always the immediate aim. Political leaders and People may ultimately seek freedom, security, prosperity or power itself. They may define their goals in terms of a religious, philosophic, economic or social ideal. They may hope that this ideal will materialise through its own inner force, divine intervention, or the natural development of human affairs. They may also try to further its realisation through non-political means, such as technical cooperation with other nations or international organisations. Nevertheless, whenever they strive to realise their goal by means of international politics, they do so by striving for power.

**The Idealist Approach:** The other aspect of the classic approach is the Utopian or the idealist approach. It regards the power politics as the passing phase of history and presents the picture of a future international society based on the notion reformed international system free from power politics, immorality and violence. It aims at bringing about a better world with the help of education and internal organisation. This approach is quite old and found its faint echoes in the Declarations of the American War of independence of 1776 and French revolution of 1789. The greatest advocate of the idealist approach was President Wilson of USA who gave a concrete shape to his idealism through the text of the Treaty of Versailles. He made a strong plea for world peace and international organisation. He visualised a future system free from power politics, immorality and violence. Because of their optimism, the idealists regard power struggle as nothing but the passing phase of history. The theory proceeds with the assumption that the interests of various groups or nations are likely adjusted in the larger interest of humanity as a whole. The difficulty with this approach is that such a system could emerge only by following moral principles in mutual relations in place of power, which is not possible in practice.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. Mention and explain two major approaches to the study of IR.

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

At present, most of the scholars are of the view that traditional and the scientific methods can be use for fruitful study of international relations. David Singer realised this and made his observation, “science is not a substitute for insight and methodological rigour is not a substitute for wisdom -both imagination and rigour are necessary but neither is sufficient.” Thus, Both scientific and the classical approaches are useful in the study of international relations.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

An approach consists of a criterion of selection, i. e. criteria employed in selecting the problems or questions to consider and selecting the data to bring to bear in the course of analysis. The classical

approach is also known as traditional approach. The two variants of the classical approach are; the realist approach and the idealist approach. The scientific or behavioural approach to the study of international politics became popular in the wake of World War II. It lays more emphasis on the methods of study rather than the subject matter. This approach relies on the simple proposition that international politics like any other social activity involves people and hence can be explain by analysing and explaining the behaviour of people as it reflected in their activities in the field of international relations.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- i. Explain clearly the traditional approach to the study of IR.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Bull, H. (1995). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (3rd ed.). New York: Palgrave Books.

Johari, J. C. (2014). *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Delhi: Sterling.

Morgenthau, H.J. (1948). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: McGraw Hill 1.

Palmer, N.D. & Perkins, H. C. (2004). *International Relations: The World Community in Transition*, (3rd ed.). Krishan Nagar, Delhi: A.I.T.B.S.

Wright, Q. (1965). *The Study of International Relations*. New York: Appleton- Century-crofts.



## MODULE 3: MEANING, NATURE AND PRINCIPLES OF DIPLOMACY

This module will examine the concept and evolution of Diplomacy. The module will also discuss elements, principles and types of Diplomacy as well as nature and level of participation in international diplomacy the module comprises the following units:

Unit 1	Concept and Evolution of Diplomacy
Unit 2	Elements of Diplomacy
Unit 3	Principles of Diplomacy
Unit 4	Types of Diplomacy
Unit 5	Nature and Level of Participations in International Diplomacy

### UNIT 1 CONCEPT AND EVOLUTION OF DIPLOMACY

#### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Concept and Evolution of Diplomacy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The endemic nature of conflict in the international system makes it imperative for states and other international actors to devise ways of ameliorating its consequences, reducing its intensity and finding ways to bring the belligerents to a state of peace. These measures come under the rubric, *conflict resolution mechanisms*. Outside the use of force, diplomacy offers the best mechanism for ameliorating conflict in the international system. Diplomacy is a very important concept in the study of international relations. It consists of the techniques and procedures for conducting relations among states. Certainly, diplomacy remains the only normal means for conducting international relations and the opposite is war. In this unit, you will learn about the meaning and evolution of diplomacy as a technique for the conduct of IR.

#### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- trace the origin and development of modern diplomacy
- explain the concept diplomacy

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 Concept and Evolution of Diplomacy

Indeed, diplomacy is that great engine used by civilised states for maintaining peace. Diplomacy has no universally acceptable definition. However, the following will suffice. The *Oxford English Dictionary* conceives diplomacy as (i) the management of international relations by negotiation; (ii) the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys; (iii) the business or art of the diplomatist; (iv) skill or address in the conduct of international intercourse or negotiations. Sir Ernest Satow defines diplomacy as the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states. It is the conduct of business between states by peaceful means; it embraces a multitude of interests, from the simplest matter of details in the relations between two states to vital issues of war and peace. When it breaks down, the danger of war or at least a major crisis is looming.

To be sure, diplomacy in one form or the other has been in practice ever since human beings organised themselves into separate and distinct socio-political units. These social units had to interact, establish contact, seek or exchange information, collaborate or resolve disputes among themselves. They had to employ messengers to facilitate communication. In recognition of the strategic nature of their functions, messengers became accredited and were treated as sacred and inviolate. They carried emblems of authority from their sovereigns or communities and were received and treated with elaborate ceremonial.

These processes led to the evolution of diplomacy, which refers to the practices and institutions through which interacting actors conduct their relations. As a paradigm, diplomacy operates within the realm of international relations and foreign policy. Diplomacy lubricates the international system and can be used to advance the interest of all actors, state and non-state. Although diplomacy often seeks to preserve the peace and employs negotiation as its chief instrument; sometimes, actors find it necessary and expedient to employ coercion, threats and intimidatory tactics to compel their adversaries to follow a particular line of action. However, irrespective of the method employed— negotiation or coercion— diplomacy's success and effectiveness depends on a number of variables, the most important being the relative power of the actors involved.

Historically, the earliest records of interstate diplomacy date from 2850 BCE. These are records of treaties between Mesopotamian city-states. For much of this period, Akkadian, the Babylonian language, served as the language of international diplomacy in the Middle East until Aramaic replaced it much later. Ancient Egyptian diplomatic records date back to the 14th century BCE. In Biblical lore, the Apostle Paul described himself as an ambassador in the second letter to the Church of Corinth. The term *ambassador* is derived from Medieval Latin, *ambactiare*, meaning, "to go on a mission." The word gained currency in Italy in the late 14th century and by the 15th century had become the common title for the envoys of secular rulers. The papacy continued to use the term *legates* and *nuncios* for its own diplomatic emissaries.

In 1796, Edmund Burke used the word diplomacy to signify skill or success in the conduct of international intercourse and negotiation. He also spoke of the 'diplomatic body'. Thus in the course of time the word diplomacy came to be related with the conduct and management of international relations and those who were engaged in this work came to be known as diplomat. However, some scholars traced the origin of modern diplomacy to the Renaissance Italy. Commercial success made it imperative for the Italian city-states to devote attention to establishing and maintaining diplomatic contact with other states in order to minimise risk and

enhance prosperity. Venice pioneered the process of giving written instructions to envoys and maintaining an archive of diplomatic correspondence. Other Italian city-states copied the practice, and by the late 15th century, resident embassies had become the norm throughout Italy. From there the practice spread to France and Spain until it covered Europe. From Europe, the practice spread throughout the world.

Undoubtedly, the diplomacy of the courts entered its golden age in the 18th century. The game came to be played according to well-understood rules, with a great deal of glitter on the surface but with much incompetence and intrigue beneath. Diplomats represented their sovereigns, and often were merely the willing tools in the great contests for empire and for European supremacy, which dominated that century. Strong rulers like Peter the Great of Russia and Frederick the Great of Prussia used diplomacy and force, as the occasion seemed to demand, to achieve their ends.

As diplomacy became less formal and restricted, its rules became more standardised and more generally accepted. The Congress of Vienna made particularly important contributions in this respect. To place diplomacy on a more systematic and formal basis, the Congress laid down certain rules of procedure that regulate diplomatic practices until date. These rules were embodied in the Reglement of March 19, 1815, and in regulations of the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818. The diplomatic hierarchy thus established consisted of four ranks or classes of representatives: (1) ambassadors, papal legates, and papal nuncios; (2) envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary; (3) ministers resident, later merged with the second rank; and (4) charges d'affaires. The question of precedence in a particular country was resolved by providing that the order of priority within each rank should be based on the length of service in that country rather than on the more subjective basis of the relative importance of the sovereign or country, the diplomat represented. The ambassador who was senior in terms of length of service in a country should be *doyen* or dean of the diplomatic corps in that country. Since the papacy, as a general practice, changed its representatives less frequently than most states, many of the deans at foreign capitals were papal representatives. The Vienna conventions of 1961 and 1963, constituted an effort to state the commonly accepted rules regarding the status of diplomatic officials.

## **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What was the origin of modern diplomacy?

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Diplomacy is the great engine employed by civilised states for maintaining international peace and stability. Although diplomacy often seeks to preserve the peace and employs negotiation as its chief instrument, sometimes actors find it necessary and expedient to employ coercion, threats and intimidatory tactics to compel their adversaries to follow a particular line of action.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

The focus of this unit is on meaning and origin of diplomacy. The endemic nature of conflict in the international system makes it imperative for states and other international actors to devise ways of ameliorating its consequences. Diplomacy lubricates the international system and is used to advance the interest of all actors, state and non-state. Modern diplomacy began in Renaissance Italy. Commercial success made it imperative for the Italian city-states to devote attention to establishing and maintaining diplomatic contact with other states in order to minimise risk and enhance prosperity.

**6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Explain the origins of modern diplomacy.

**7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Gordon Craig & Alexander George (1995). *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of our Times*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Johari, J. C. (2014). *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Delhi: Sterling.

Morgenthau, H.J. (1985). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

Orngu, C. S. (2013). *The Evolution of Diplomatic Practice: A Historical Perspective* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.

## UNIT 2 ELEMENTS OF DIPLOMACY

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
- 3.1 Elements of Diplomacy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

In unit 1 we come to understand that the diplomacy is meant to avoid a condition of conflict or war to the last possible extent, but if war breaks out, diplomacy assumes a different form for the sake of protecting and promoting the national interest of a state. In this unit, we are to focus our attention to the elements of diplomacy serving as instruments for formulation, implementation, and monitoring of foreign policy practiced by both state and non-state diplomat.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the major elements of diplomacy
- Mention the essential tasks of diplomacy

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 Elements of Diplomacy

According to Quincy Wright elements of diplomacy can be viewed in two senses - popular and special. The popular sense implies the employment of tact, shrewdness and skill in any negotiation or transactions. The special sense involves the art of negotiation in order to achieve the maximum of group objective with a minimum of cost, within a system of politics in which war is a possibility. This view covers the situation of agreement and disagreement among nation-states. It should be noted that diplomacy has no role to play in the areas of agreement; rather it has an important role to play in the areas of disagreement or misunderstanding, whether real or not real. Indeed, the purpose of diplomacy is to change the situation from bad to good, as far as possible. It has been observed that diplomacy is irrelevant in the areas of complete agreement and ineffective in the areas of complete disagreement. However, agreement and disagreement are not static phenomena in international relations; it is possible that agreement in a particular issue may have inherent germs of agreement.

In the light of development in the study of IR and diplomacy, description of elements of diplomacy requires an explanation that covers case of state and non-state actors conduct of diplomacy. So far our explanation of the nature, purpose and evolution has mostly centered on the role of diplomacy as practice in an official form by rulers of the states. But the elements of diplomacy practiced by non-state agencies as a parallel force should be taken into account here. This element of

diplomacy is popularly known by the name of 'track-two diplomacy; it involves the role of non-official agencies and organizations at the transnational level so as to influence the rulers of a country or some countries to have a particular type of inter-state relations or to adopt and implement a particular scheme for the welfare of the people. For instance, the role of numerous human rights organizations in coercing a recalcitrant state to observe the norms as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), international Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) and international Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) are parts of this element. In essence, there are two elements of diplomacy to deduce from the foregoing explanations; namely, the one-track and two-track elements. The one-track elements of diplomacy involves formal contacts among diplomats of the states at the international level; while the two-track diplomacy involves informal contacts among private bodies at the international level.

Alozie & Nwadike (2014) pointed out that elements of diplomacy comprise an instrument for the formulation, implementation and monitoring of foreign policy, which promotes pacific settlement of disputes, differences or conflicts through lobbying, negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, treaty making, information gathering and reporting. The whole tasks of diplomacy can be summarized as that of:

- Building and rebuilding relationship
- Defining and redefining relationship
- Promoting and not undermining mutual interest
- Healing and hurting feelings in relations

Similarly, in terms of strategy, modern diplomacy employs the following means of exercising influence – persuasion, isolation and militant (destructive and confrontation). Strategy of persuasion is verbal explanatory element that is preventive and pacific in orientation. It seeks to condemn, makes promises and threats and promotes government to government dialogue. Isolation element takes the form of ostracization, severance of diplomatic ties, sanction and economic assistance. The militant element of diplomacy has to do with the actual threat and engagement of force.

In general, elements of diplomatic strategies of exercising influence are designed to signal and convey the interests, intentions, perceptions and aspirations of states, for this reason states have over times developed vested interests in diplomatic art and science.

## **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

What constitute the essential elements of modern diplomacy?

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Elements of diplomacy embrace a multitude of interests, from the simplest matter of details in the relations between two states to vital issues of war and peace. Diplomacy is the great engine employed by civilised states for maintaining international peace and stability. Although diplomacy often seeks to preserve the peace and employs negotiation as its chief instrument, sometimes actors find it necessary and expedient to employ coercion, threats and intimidatory tactics to compel their adversaries to follow a particular line of action.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

The focus of this unit is elements of diplomacy. In terms of strategy, modern diplomacy employs elements of exercising influence such as persuasion, isolation and militant (destructive and

confrontation). However, irrespective of the method employed—negotiation or coercion—diplomacy's success and effectiveness depends on a number of variables, the most important being the relative power of the actors involved. Indeed, nations go to war only when diplomacy fails. Similarly, when war fails to win total annihilation, it takes diplomacy to negotiate a truce.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Discuss the major elements of diplomacy

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Alozie, C. & Nwadike, J (2014). *Fundamentals of International Relations in a New World Order*. Enugu-Nigeria: Rhyce Kerex Publishers, Pp. 104 – 106.

Cable James (1980). *Gunboat Diplomacy*. London: Macmillan.

Gordon Craig & Alexander George (1995). *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of our Times*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Quincy Wright (1955). *The Study of International Relations*. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts P. 158.

## UNIT 3 PRINCIPLES OF DIPLOMACY

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Principles of Diplomacy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Diplomacy is a very important concept in the study of international relations. It consists of the techniques and procedures for conducting relations among states. Certainly, contemporary diplomacy is dynamic and fascinating game; it deploys pragmatic and intriguing strategies that have never been regulated by a rigid set of operational principles. This unit will discuss the principles for effective conduct of diplomacy and identify some of the good qualities of a diplomat.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss principles for conduct of effective diplomacy
- Identify qualities of good diplomat

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 Principles of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is a communication process that involves sharing information with one or more countries or actors about one's or country's goals, demands and other objectives that includes persuasion of other actors to support or comply with those objectives, the compelling need of communication in diplomacy in contemporary diplomatic practice is undoubtedly reinforced by the desire to open up channels of interaction for an interactive engagement to facilitate negotiation between parties in multilevel and multifaceted diplomatic circumstances. These circumstances are more often product of specific principles that regulate the success of effective diplomatic practice. Therefore for diplomacy to be effective and result-driven it must consider the following principles of operation:

- Diplomat and other players of the diplomatic exercise must be realistic in approach: this entails setting realizable goals and having realistic understanding of the intervening variables that bear direct implications for pursuit and realization of the set goals and targets.
- The language of an effective diplomacy should be context-specific and must not be ambiguous and loquacious. Words represent the strength and weaknesses of diplomatic plan. Therefore, when actors project their positions in a carefully and strongly articulated language, they stand better chance of extracting concessions in diplomacy.
- The need to seek common grounds in diplomacy is very important. Seeking common grounds eliminates the hard-line disposition of virtuousness that places the opponent on the



platter of epitomizing the negative. Sustained peace can be easily achieved and maintained when common grounds are sought by parties in a dispute.

- Flexibility is another important principle that makes for effective diplomacy. This principle entails the willingness and ability to engage in a bargaining process in diplomatic relations. It emphasizes that the diplomat should maintain the core values of their principles and at the same time requires that diplomat should shift grounds where necessary and logical to do so.
- Diplomats must understand the perspective of their opponents. For any meaningful result to be derived from a diplomatic relations, diplomats are expected to understand the exact needs of their counterparts. This will give a ground for harmonizing position in diplomatic relations
- Finally, patience is a key principle to effective diplomacy. Impatience and anxiety are negative attitudes in diplomatic exercise. The sure way of avoiding any frustrating experience in diplomatic relations is to exhibit some reasonable degree of patience by avoiding for example setting of rigid timelines.

In addition, a diplomat should carefully make clear distinction between what he preaches and what he does. Stalin frankly stated that “an ambassador is sent abroad to speak lies on behalf of his country. Stanlin maintained that a diplomat’s words must have no relation to actions.” Meaning words are one thing, actions are another. Good words are concealment of bad deeds. According to Henry Kissinger of the United States, diplomats must be cunning and patient. They must be able to manipulate events and people. They must play the power game in total secrecy, unconstrained by parliaments, which lack the temperament for diplomacy. They must connive with the largest possible number of allies. They must not be afraid to use force, when necessary, to maintain order. They must avoid iron-clad rules of conduct; an occasional show of credible irrationality may be instructive. They must not shy away from duplicity, cynicism and unscrupulousness, all of which are acceptable tools for statecraft. They must never burn their bridges behind them. And if possible, they must always be charming, clever and visible.

#### **4.0 SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What are the principles of effective diplomacy?

#### **5.0 CONCLUSION**

Diplomacy embraces a multitude of interests, from the simplest matter of details in the relations between two states to vital issues of war and peace. When it breaks down, the danger of war or at least a major crisis is looming. Diplomacy is the great engine employed by civilised states for maintaining international peace and stability. Although diplomacy often seeks to preserve the peace and employs negotiation as its chief instrument, sometimes actors find it necessary and expedient to employ coercion, threats and intimidatory tactics to compel their adversaries to follow a particular line of action.

#### **5.0SUMMARY**

The focus of this unit has been on the principles of effective diplomacy and good qualities of diplomats. However, irrespective of the methods employed—negotiation or coercion—diplomacy's success and effectiveness depends on a number of principles, the most important being realistic goals, context-specific language, common grounds, and patience, as well as understanding the relative power of other actors involved. Indeed, nations go to war only when diplomacy fails. Similarly, when war fails to win total annihilation, it takes diplomats with cunning, cleverness and

visibility to negotiate a truce.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Outline the fundamental principles of effective diplomacy.
2. Enumerate some of the qualities of good diplomats.

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Gordon Craig & Alexander George (1995). *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of our Times*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Johari, J. C. (2014). *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. New Delhi: Sterling.

Marvin Kalb & Bernard Kalb (1974). *Kissinger*. Boston: Little Brown, P. 47

Orngu, C.S (2013). *The Evolution of Diplomatic Practice: A Historical Perspective (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.

## **UNIT 4 TYPES OF DIPLOMACY**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Types of Diplomacy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Today, the complex and dynamic nature of international system has necessitated existence of various forms or types of diplomacy. Scholars have categorized diplomacy according to methods, agenda, definite goals and practice of diplomat as well as the level or extent of participation of parties in the process of diplomatic practice and conduct. This unit mentions and discusses some of the popularly recognized and practiced types of diplomacy in today's international relations conduct.

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- i. Identify and discuss the types of diplomacy
- ii. Distinguish between different types of Diplomacy

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

### 3.1 Types of Diplomacy

Studies and practice of diplomacy has led to the identification and use of different forms or types of diplomacy such as Democratic diplomacy, Coercive diplomacy, Gunboat diplomacy, conference diplomacy, Shuttle diplomacy, Preventive diplomacy, Secret diplomacy, Summit diplomacy, Parliamentary diplomacy, Dollar diplomacy and E- diplomacy as well as totalitarian diplomacy. Below is a brief explanation of these identified types of diplomacy:

**Democratic Diplomacy:** By the early 20th century, the term democratic diplomacy had become part of the diplomatic vocabulary. It seemed to symbolise a new order in international affairs - one in which governments were fast losing their aristocratic leanings and their aloofness, and peoples were speaking to peoples through democratic representatives and informal channels. In effect, the new order was not as different from the old as it seemed in the atmosphere of hope that ushered in the 20th century. While diplomacy remained a rather esoteric profession, carried on by men of wealth and influence and power, it was conducted with the assistance of a growing number of career officers, the elite guard of diplomacy, whose standards of competence and training were being steadily raised..

**Coercive Diplomacy:** Coercive diplomacy employs threat or limited force to persuade an opponent to call off or undo an encroachment. It emphasises the use of threats and the exemplary use of limited force to persuade an opponent to back down. In fact, the strategy of coercive diplomacy calls for using just enough force to demonstrate resolution to protect one's interests and to emphasise the credibility of one's determination to use more force if necessary. In coercive diplomacy, one gives the opponent an opportunity to stop or back off before employing force or escalating its use, as the British did in the early stages of the Falklands dispute in 1982. Essentially, there are three conditions necessary for successful employment of this type of diplomacy:

- The coercing power must create in the opponent's mind a sense of urgency for compliance with its demand.
- A belief that the coercing power is more highly motivated to achieve its stated demand than the opponent is to oppose it.
- The threat to escalate conflict if the opponent fails to meet the demand.

**Gunboat Diplomacy:** The use of gunboat diplomacy in IR has become a common phenomenon since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The era of gunboat diplomacy, speaking softly and carrying a big stick, seems decidedly outdated and increasingly inconceivable in the practical relations of the international system in the 21st century. Gunboat diplomacy has been used as an instrument of national policy, but in doing so, they degraded its language and its practice. Diplomats became agents of conquest, double-dealing, and espionage, whose business was not to work for peaceful international relations but to provoke dissension rather than understanding - to make the leaders and peoples of other nations weak, blind, and divided in the face of the growing colonial menace. In summary, gunboat diplomacy involves military intimidation by one of the actors or actual unilateral application of force. This suggests the pursuit of foreign policy objectives with the aid of conspicuous display of military power. It also implies a direct threat of warfare.

**Shuttle Diplomacy:** This type of diplomacy involves action of an outside party in serving as an intermediary between or among principal actors in a dispute without direct principal to principal contact. Essentially, the process of shuttle diplomacy entails successive travels (shuttle) by the intermediary from the working location of one principal to that of other. The term shuttle diplomacy was first applied to describe the efforts of the United States Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, beginning in November 5<sup>th</sup> 1973 which facilitated the cessation of hostilities following the Yom Kippur war.

**Conference Diplomacy:** Under conference diplomacy, the proliferation of international conferences, seminars and workshops have greatly influenced the management and conduct of diplomacy. Delegates are sent from a number of countries to debate on issues of international concern and significance. This type of diplomacy is much more tricky, more complex and held in public glare as well is remarkably different from negotiations between governments.

**Preventive Diplomacy:** this is when a serious step is taken and like gunboat diplomacy it may involve taking a unilateral action on the pretext of intending to preempt a more devastating possibility.

**Secret Diplomacy:** This is diplomacy conducted by rulers such as kings or presidents without the knowledge or consent of any person for the purpose of pursuing the goal of foreign policy through effective means of compromise, persuasion or threat of force or war.

**Summit Diplomacy:** This is diplomacy that used meetings of heads of states or governments usually with diplomats to interact and address matters that concern the welfare of their countries.

**Parliamentary Diplomacy:** This is about debates and voting in international organizations to settle diplomatic issues. It is also a means of negotiations and discussions conducted according to rules of diplomatic procedure in international organizations.

**Dollar Diplomacy:** This is the use of a country's financial power to extend its international influence. It is also a means of furthering a state's interests through the use of economic power by giving out loans, financial aids to foreign countries.

**E-Diplomacy:** this is a new diplomacy highly affected by the internet revolution and global communication technology in which citizens play a great role in impacting international relations. It usually addresses issues of human rights, labour rights, climate and environmental issues and etc.

**Totalitarian Diplomacy:** This is diplomacy done according to the dictates of a particular ideology and any consideration of international peace and security is set aside as may be seen in the Munich Pact of 1938 and the Soviet-German non-aggression Pact of 1939.

## SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

- i. Mention and briefly explain the types of diplomacy you know.

### 4.0 CONCLUSION

The complex and dynamic nature of international system has called for the emergence of different forms or types of diplomacy. Scholars have categorized diplomacy according to methods, agenda, definite goals and practice of diplomat as well as the level or extent of participation of parties in the process of diplomatic practice and conduct.

### 5.0 SUMMARY

The focus of this unit is on the identification and brief explanation of diplomacy. At least twelve (12) types of diplomacy were identified and explained; they include Democratic, **Coercive**, **Gunboat** conference, Shuttle, Preventive, Secret, Summit, Parliamentary, **Dollar** diplomacy and E- diplomacyas well as totalitarian diplomacy.

### 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

1. Identify and Explain five (5) types of diplomacy you know.

### 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Alozie, C. & Nwadike, J (2014). *Fundamentals of International Relations in a New World Order*. Enugu-Nigeria: Rhyce Kerex Publishers, Pp. 104 – 106.
- Cable James (1980). *Gunboat Diplomacy*. London: Macmillan.
- Gordon Craig & Alexander George (1995). *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of our Times*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Orngu, C.S (2013). *The Evolution of Diplomatic Practice: A Historical Perspective (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.

## UNIT 4 NATURE AND LEVEL OF PARTICIPATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Nature and Level of Participation in International Diplomacy
  - 3.2 Globalization and International Diplomacy
- 3.2.1 Covid-19 and International Diplomacy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Given the complex and intricate nature of contemporary diplomatic art, diplomats are expected to learn more about the nature and levels of participation in international diplomacy, this will make them to operate within the parameters of available options for effective diplomacy. This unit is about the nature of participation in international diplomacy. It particularly identify levels or options for diplomat to settle one or a combination of any as the circumstance may provide as well examine the impact of globalization, especially global health challenge of Covid-19 to international diplomacy.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss the nature of participation in International Diplomacy
- identify the levels of participation in International Diplomacy
- Outline the challenges of Globalization to international diplomacy
- Examine the impact of Covid-19 to international diplomacy

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 Nature and Level of Participation in International Diplomacy

In participation at international diplomatic negotiations, diplomats are at liberty to choose among available levels or options of diplomacy such as high or low level of diplomacy, direct or indirect negotiation, coercive or reward approach, proactive or reactive approach, and words or action communication choice. A detail of the nature of these levels of participation in international diplomacy will follow below:

**High level or Low-Level Diplomatic Participation:** A high level diplomacy implies more serious diplomatic relations facilitated by high level officials through a very formal statement that is taken more seriously by the recipient. High level diplomacy comes into play when heads of government issue verbal or written statements that make waves in other capitals. This kind of

diplomatic contact found expression, for example, when in 2003 the former United States (US) President, George Bush, took a calculated decision and attended an international conference in Asia to officially reassure North Korea that the US had no intention of invading it. This action made North Korea to shift its position from demanding formal treaty to a readiness to meet with the US and other countries to sign some documents of non-aggression.

Low level diplomacy operates with a low-level communication process in order to avoid overreaction and maintain flexibility. An example of this type of diplomacy can be illustrated by the Taiwan Crisis of 2000, when the principal leaders cautiously avoided military threats and abdicated the role to lesser officials who maintained a prominent position in the issuance of official statements in relation to the crisis.

**Direct or Indirect Negotiations:** In inter-state relations, direct negotiation engages the horizontal channels of communication involving the concerned parties without an intermediary. It facilitates instant feedback and eliminates misinterpretations and wrong perceptions in diplomatic relations. One of the important features of direct negotiation is that it symbolizes legitimacy through direct contact between parties in a diplomatic relation. On the other side, indirect negotiation involves a third party which plays the role of an intermediary between parties involved in a negotiation process. In a crisis situation, indirect negotiation option is recommended because it eliminates face-offs and garners the chances of conciliation between parties.

**Coercive or Reward Approaches:** In the conduct of international relations, diplomats are liberty to choose either the coercive or the reward approach in their diplomatic relations depending on the situations and other circumstances. The coercive approach is aimed at subduing the opponent and extracting concessions without necessarily negotiating positions. Threats are freely advanced to humble the weaker side into accepting the position of the stronger side. Thus, for coercive approach to diplomacy to be effective, the stronger party must clearly possess the elements of power, will and credibility to subdue the weaker party in order to drive the needed degree of coercion. On the other hand, reward approach to diplomacy is aimed at inducing one party to accept the position of the other party in a diplomatic relation. The approach makes for a fantastic offer of rewards available to the opponents as a strong inducement should the opponent compromise. However, the reward approach of diplomacy to be effective, the party that flaunts the carrots should possess the needed capability and goodwill to dispense the anticipated favours otherwise incapacity to live up to expectation can negate the credibility of the diplomatic relations.

**Proactive and Reactive Approaches:** Proactive approach to diplomatic participation implies the deliberate steps to apprehend situations before they arise. The approach places emphasis on the need for the diplomat to project and predict the possible actions of the opponents. It forecasts and generates strategies in addressing expected responses and outcomes in diplomatic relations. One of the major weaknesses of the proactive approach is that it is trailed by uncertainty and, in most cases, can be misleading. While the reactive approach to diplomacy entails that diplomats respond to situations as they arise. In simple terms, reactive actions are usually responses to the prevailing circumstances within the precinct of diplomatic relations. It is a kind of reciprocal approach that guides the steps of actors in the conduct of diplomacy.

**Words or Actions:** The use of words by oral or written communication in diplomacy is a very common feature of contemporary diplomatic relations. Option of words in diplomatic relations provides open-ended opportunities for negotiation through either direct or public diplomacy and formalizes diplomatic engagements. Words are exact in their contents, contexts and intents so much so that when they are used in negotiations, the problem of uncertainty becomes reasonably



eliminated in diplomatic relations. In the other side, actions of parties in a diplomatic relation can readily influence diplomatic outcomes. For example, actions such as cooperation or lack of cooperation, the unwillingness to be considerate and uncompromising attitudes can clearly demonstrate the feelings and positions of parties in diplomatic relations. There is a popular cliché that ‘actions speak louder than words;’ indeed, this applies in the conduct and participation in international diplomacy.

### **3.2 Globalization and International Diplomacy**

The term ‘Globalization’ is commonly used often fairly and precisely to denote a widespread and far-reaching economic, cultural, and social change in the contemporary world. Until the fifteenth century, most civilizations remained relatively isolated from one another and international diplomacy tended to occur within self-contained regions of the world. Contemporary diplomacy, particularly the post-cold war era has reinforced the ever-growing expansionist drive of globalization phenomenon, which has almost completely integrated countries of the world into a global political stage and a global marketplace without minding the peculiar histories and the developmental differentials of the various societies in the global arena. The situation has no doubt some fundamental challenges to the study and practice of diplomacy. The demise of the Cold War introduced a heightened optimism in the direction of changing the world system for better and equitable world order. However, it is apparent that the envisaged equitable world order has consistently remained far from realistic. The growing inequality between the two development ends of the world system has continued unabated into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The scenario has placed the developing world in a precarious situation that throws up daunting challenges with far-reaching implications for the international diplomacy of the peripheral states (Consist of countries of Africa (some countries in Asia and Latin America). Some of the implications of globalization to diplomacy are identified by Orngu (2013) and they include:

1. The peripheral status of the developing nations in the international capitalist system makes them handicapped and powerless and therefore incapacitated in effectively influencing international actors to their benefit. Thus, the states of the developing world are confronted with low level of income, relative low military strength, backward technological levels and weak Gross Domestic Products, among others, it is to be expected that they can scarcely effectively influence other actors on the other divide of the international system in terms of propagating or articulating their national interests for favourable benefit.
2. The death of visionary political leadership with capacity to deploy capabilities to effectively and strategically influence the international system is instructive. For instance, while the developing countries in Africa have continued to wallow in their incapacity against the backdrop of leadership, the advanced capitalist countries have to demonstrate both the tangible and intangible power capabilities under visionary leadership with the needed political will to exert more influence in international diplomacy.
3. The developing world is confronted with the problem of underdeveloped diplomatic machines. The functions of diplomatic machines include information gathering, policy advice, representation, negotiation and consular service. The developed world enjoys a lot of advantages over the developing world here as a result of their advances in information technology, which enables the developed nations to monitor developments and information across the globe in support for their diplomatic calculations.
4. In comparison with countries of the North, the developing countries of the South have restricted range of policy instruments, and this worrisome situation has continued to hamstring their drives towards achieving economic and political goals in international diplomacy. Just as the developing countries of the south are noted for their patchy system of representation abroad and limited resources for policy analysis, they are equally reputed for their limited range of policy instruments for negotiation and bargaining with other

actors and for the implementation of decisions made.

5. Lack of real influential public multilateral organization through which to influence the broad international system in the fashion that European countries have done through the instrumentality of the European union become a daunting challenge to the developing.

### **3.2.1 Covid-19 and International Diplomacy**

Above all, the impact of the borderless world (globalization) has not only manifested in technological advances in communication and transportation over the few decades and fueled series of far-reaching economic changes but also expanded global production and the torrent of cross-border financial flows that have swept across the world. This has raised the question of whether it is still meaningful to think of the nation-state as a basis for international diplomacy. As globalization has ruptured one national frontier after the next, questions have also been asked as to whether the nation-state is the most effective problem-solving unit for addressing other challenges that face international diplomacy today. Today, the most important impact of globalization can be seen with the problem on global public health, in which one part of the world have had consequences for the people living elsewhere.

Recently, global health has become a great concern to the international system. Humankind and the threat of infectious disease have always coexisted uneasily' population growth in the Global south has led many people to move into previously inhabited regions, exposing them to new sources of disease. Similarly, their ability to travel from one continent to another makes it difficult to contain outbreaks to a single locale. Millions of airline travelers have been banned and cities have been lockdown for several weeks or months. As the 2020 outbreak of Covid-19 (corona virus) showed, a mobile world population has made the spread of disease across borders of over two hundred countries and regions of the world, so rapid, frequent and difficult to control. Covid-19 was initially discovered in Wuhan, China in early 2020 and but was soon spread by air travelers across the globe. By end of April 2020, over 3 million people were infected and death toll rose to above two hundred thousand people with the United States (US) having the highest infected and death tolls, almost recording one-over-three of the entire world or global infections and death respectively.

## **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What are the approaches or levels of participation will you choose in diplomatic relations?
- ii. examine the impact of globalization to the international diplomacy?

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Diplomacy embraces a multitude of approaches and options, from high level to low level, from coercive and proactive to rewards and reactive approaches. Although diplomacy often seeks to preserve the peace and employs negotiation as its chief instrument, sometimes actors find it necessary and expedient to employ coercion, threats and intimidatory tactics to compel their adversaries to follow a particular line of action.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

The focus of this unit is the nature and levels or options of participation in international diplomacy. There are different options, levels and approaches of diplomatic relations - coercive, rewards, high

and low levels, proactive and reactive approaches and etc. However, irrespective of the method employed in negotiation, success of diplomacy and its effectiveness depends on a number of variables and circumstances.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Identify and explain options or approaches five (5) for effective diplomatic relations

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Charles, W. Kegley Jr. & Gregory, A. Raymond (2012). *The Global Future: A Brief Introduction to World Politics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Canada: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Gordon Craig & Alexander George (1995). *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of our Times*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Orngu, C.S (2013). *The Evolution of Diplomatic Practice: A Historical Perspective* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.

## **MODULE 4 PARADIGMS AND THEORIES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

It is evident that studies of international relations of our contemporary era must consider the paramount position of theories. Most of these theories convey or help in the understanding of the actions of actors in national, international and transnational arena, while some other theories compliment the work of interpreting or ascribing meaning to activities in our global scene. It is because of these glaring positions that theories occupied in international relations and diplomacy that scholars and researchers of the field of IR maintain that it is incomprehensive to study and understand IR in isolation of theories. This Module will discuss the major traditional and modern paradigms and theories in the study of International Relations and Diplomacy and it comprises the following units:

- Unit 1 Nature and Importance of Theories of International Relations
- Unit 2 Realism
- Unit 3 Idealism
- Unit 4 Power Theory
- Unit 5 Some Modern Theories of IR

### **UNIT 1 NATURE AND IMPORTANCE OF THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

#### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Nature and Importance of Theories of International Relations
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Although the study of international relations must account for the unique, new, and non-recurring phenomenon, it is also concerned with recurring processes and patterns of behaviour. These patterns occur with much regularity and often transcend specific historical episodes. They provide opportunities for scholars to draw generalisations and conceptualisations that cut across historical events. The generalisations provide a platform for the formulation of explanatory paradigms on such issues as the causes of war, imperialism, escalation, crises, alliance, deterrence, etc. without having to describe specific historical wars, alliances, crisis and other issues. It is the possibility of drawing such generalisations and concepts, building explanatory models and paradigms, which underlines the importance of the theoretical study of international relations. In this unit, you learn about nature and importance of theories of IR.

## 2.1 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- discuss importance of the theoretical study of international relations
- identify the recurring processes or phases in the theoretical study of IR.

## 3.2 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.3 Nature and Importance of Theories of International Relations

Theories of IR have been described as a set of images or perspectives that are used as mechanical tools in describing, explaining, analyzing and predicting the dynamic of world events and possible outcomes. Events, in their side, are a wide range of issues that touches on life of individuals across the globe and frequently taking place on daily basis. Issues here include: International politics, law, strategy, economic cooperation, trade and finance, military affairs, disarmament and environmental matters. Theories of IR therefore help scholars, diplomats and students of IR to have better understanding of a whole gamut of events that take place across national boundaries as well as providing adequate tools of analysis and predictions.

Thus, in the period before the World War I, Study of IR was generally characterized by description and analysis of events like war, invasion, conflicts, military power, strategy and diplomacy. Attempts were made to understand the events and the causes of their reoccurrences as a way to finding solutions to problems associated with them and as a result secure better condition of the society. Failure of the attempts or theories to achieve the targeted goal and incessant occurrence of Conflict and wars in the growing international system called for further theoretical enquiries. To this end, scholars of idealist theoretical orientation wedged in, believing that the achievement of the ideal situation within the international arena was only possible by the establishment of the legal framework and structures to regulate the behaviours of nations in the global system. For them, the world was a community of nations that has the potential to overcome collective problems. Thus, the idealist theorists placed their hopes for peace in the League of Nations, an international organization that existed from 1920 to 1946 to promote world peace and cooperation. This theoretical orientation of IR reigned during the 1920s and 1930s.

Breakdown of the League of Nations and failure of the idealist theory to prevent World War II and aftermath Cold War between the east and western blocs caused the emergence of yet another theoretical approach emphasizing on power politics of nations in understanding IR in name of realist theory. Since World War II, international relations scholarship has moved from mere description of events, the analysis of international treaties with a legalistic and moral tone, to the development of explanatory theories and paradigms on international phenomena. The process evolved towards the development of a “predictive science’ of international relations. The logic of international relations as a predictive science is based on the claim that when enough basic propositions about the behaviour of policy makers, states, and international systems have been tested and verified through rigorous research methods, predictive statements, i.e., theories, can be advanced with sufficient clarity. Thus, the behavioural or scientific and post-behavioural theoretical category; the theoretical paradigms shifted from the traditional perception of the

idealist to the study of behavioural patterns of the individual persons and systems involved in IR to the understanding of the workings of relations among nations. In addition, the post-behavioural scholars are concerned with the relevance of a theory to the problem which the policy maker is trying to solve. They, therefore, feel that the relevance of a theory or a paradigm is dependent upon its usefulness in solving the problem of the society.

It is important to stress that each generation of scholars has responded to the peculiar problems that faced their specific era. The dynamics of human nature has continued to change the nature and character of events, relations and international environment where these relations operated. As such, paradigms and theories to the study of IR have accordingly continued to change in the course of time. For our purpose, nature and relevance of theories of IR, paradigms and theories can be broadly be viewed from the perspective of two different but exclusive categories namely the traditional or classical like Idealist, Realist and the Power theorists and modern or behavioural or the scientific orientations such as the system, the game, decision-making and functionalist. Each contains gamut of paradigmatic shift in theories and perception whose formulations were largely influenced by problems and issues that emanated during their times.

## **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. Explain the dynamic nature in the study of IR theories

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

International relations accounts for the unique, new, and non-recurring phenomenon. It is also concerned with recurring processes and patterns of behaviour. These patterns occur with much regularity and often transcend specific historical episodes. They provide opportunities for scholars to draw generalisations and conceptualisations that cut across historical events. The generalisations provide a platform for the formulation of explanatory paradigms and theories of IR. The paradigms and theories can be broadly be viewed from the perspective of two different but exclusive categories namely the traditional like Idealist and Realist; and modern or behavioural such as the system and the game theories.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

The unit has reviewed the nature and importance of the theoretical study of international relations. It has explored the dynamics nature of paradigms and theories in the study of IR that have accordingly continued to change in the course of time with the nature and character of events, relations and international environment where these relations operated..

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Assess the importance of the theoretical study of international relations.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Bertalanffy, L.V. & Laszlo, E. (1972). *The Relevance of General Systems Theory*. Paper presented to Ludwig von Bertalanffy on his seventieth birthday. The International Library of Systems Theory and Philosophy. New York.

Frank-Collins, N. O. & Peter, A. C. (2012). (Eds.) *Thoughts on International Relations*. Lagos: Absolute Media Production.

## UNIT 2 IDEALISM

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Idealism
- 3.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

**Idealism** emphasises international law, morality, and international organisations, rather than power alone as key influences on international events. Idealists think that human nature is good. They see the international system as one based on a community of states that have the potential to work together to overcome mutual problems. For idealists, the principles of IR must flow from **morality**. Idealists were particularly active between World War I and World War II, following the painful experience of World War I, The United States President Woodrow Wilson and other idealists placed their hopes for peace in the League of Nations as a formal structure for the community of nations.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the origins of idealism
- identify basic assumptions of idealism
- outline the inadequacies of idealism.

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 Idealism

**Idealism** in international relations theory has its intellectual roots in the older political philosophy of scholars like Immanuel Kant. It tries to explain how peace and cooperation are possible. Indeed, from the beginning of the 20th century up to 1939, there was academic hegemony in the West. The most renowned scholars were the **idealists**. They believe that states could develop organisations and rules to facilitate cooperation by forming a world federation.



Idealism is a metaphysical term; however, we are concerned here with moral and political idealism. In international relations theory, **idealists** are often contrasted with **realists**. Generally, Idealists see international relations in terms of moral precepts, justice, trust and obligation.

The approach of this theory of international relations was **law**, so it was both legalistic and historical. It merely describes international events at the time under review. It lacks the capacity to explain. For example, it describes a phenomenon thus, “England breached a treaty with France and then there was war.”

Essentially, the idealists became very worried with the events that led to World War I. They preferred a more peaceful international system and a just system.

They perceived the post-world-War I, international system as unjust and turbulent; therefore, they sought a change in the system through a gradual approach. It regards the power politics as the passing phase of history and presents the picture of a future international society based on the notion reformed international system free from power politics, immorality and violence. It aims at bringing about a better world with the help of **education** and **internal organisation**.

To effect a change in the international system, this moralistic approach arrived at the following conclusions: “Wars are not good, so they are not wanted.”

The aim is to achieve a just system:

- Spread democracy all over the world to get peace.
- States should observe international law.
- States should use their power for peaceful purposes. States should not use power (war) with weaker states - military, economic, diplomatic.
- People should be educated and reforms made.
- A world government was necessary - the idealist looked at international organisation as a nucleus for a world government.

One of the chief advocates of the idealist school was Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States during the First World War. An important development in realist thinking was the formation of the **League of Nations** at the end of World War I. The above stated Wilsonian ideals (famously called the fourteen points) were embodied in Article 18 of the League of Nations’ Covenant and later in Article 102 of the United Nations (UN) Charter. They provided a means for registering international agreements and, in the case of the UN, an incentive to do so. Only registered agreements could be accorded legal status before any UN affiliate, including the International Court of Justice. This mixture of legalism and idealism could never abolish private understandings, but it did virtually eliminate secret treaties among democratic states. In fact, Woodrow Wilson’s attempt to build a stable international order in the wake of World War I, failed spectacularly.

Generally, the values sought by idealism are different from those sought by realism. Whereas, the idealists can best support the value of power cherished by realists, empirically, the realists can only uphold the value of morality cherished by idealists on philosophical grounds. The idealists maintain that there is a fundamental problem of ethics, which exists at all levels of politics, international politics inclusive. To idealists, politics is an art of good government rather than art of

the possible. The idealist view of international relations cannot stand the test of reality on the ground in 21st century international relations. It is a dream, a sermon from the height, utopianism!

With the abysmal failure of the League of Nations and the outbreak of World War II, in 1939, it became obvious that the theoretical foundations of idealism were collapsing. This created a vacuum for the emergence of political realists who see international relations in power perspectives. The post-1945 changes in the nature of international politics have necessitated a reappraisal of the divergences between idealism and realism. The advance of science and technology has led to the shrinkage of the world, and has totally changed the character of war, thereby reminding us of the urgency of peace.

Finally, if the realists recognise the futility of unlimited war and the idealists recognise the reality of conflict, then they should work together for improving and strengthening the international system.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What is idealism in the study of theories of IR?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Idealism see the international system as one based on a community of states that have the potential to work together to overcome mutual problems. For idealists, the principles of IR must flow from **morality**. Idealists were particularly active between World War I and World War II, following the painful experience of World War I, the idealists placed their hopes for peace in the League of Nations as a formal structure for the community of nations. However, those hopes were ruined, when that structure proved helpless to stop German, Italian, and Japanese aggression in the 1930s.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

In this unit, we learnt that Idealism in international relations theory, that has its intellectual roots in the older political philosophy of scholars like Immanuel Kant. It tries to explain how peace and cooperation are possible. Beginning from the early 20th century, idealism dominated the study of international relations up to 1939. The approach to the study of international relations was both legalistic and historical.

### **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Discuss the origins and basic assumptions of idealist theory of international relations.

### **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Chandra, P. (2004). *Theories of International Relations*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

Goldstein, J.S. & Pevehouse, J. C. (2011). *International Relations*. (9th ed.). San Francisco: Longman, Pearson Education.

Kant, Immanuel (1957). *Perpetual Peace*. Lewis White Beck. New York: Bobs Merrill.

## UNIT 2 REALISM

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Realism
  - 3.2 Morgenthau's Six Principles of Political Realism
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

There is no single theory that has entirely explained the wide range of international interactions both conflictual and cooperative. However, one theoretical framework has historically held a central position in the study of IR. This approach is called **realism**. Whereas, some IR scholars favour it, others vigorously contest it, yet almost all consider it.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the meaning of realism
- explain the realist approach to the study of IR
- explain the concept of offensive realism.

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 Realism

Realism is a school of thought that explains international relations in terms of power. Some scholars refer to the exercise of power by states toward each other as **realpolitik** or power politics. Like utopianism in international relations theory, realism has its intellectual roots in the older political philosophy of the West and in the writings of non-western ancient authors such as Sun Tzu in China, Kautilya in India, as well as Thucydides in ancient Greece.

Indeed, modern realist theory developed in reaction to a liberal tradition that realists call **idealism**. As an approach, idealism emphasises international law, morality, and international organisations, rather than power alone as key influences on international relations. Idealists think that human nature is good. They see the international system as one based on a community of states that have the potential to work together to overcome mutual problems. Indeed, for idealists, the principles of IR must flow from **morality**.

However, from the realists' paradigm, states are rational actors whose decisions to maximise power derive from rational calculations of risks and gains, and of the shifts in the power balance in the international system. The nature of the international system reflects this emphasis on power. To be sure, a hand full of "great powers" and their military alliances define the world order. For instance, two superpowers with their allies defined the system during the Cold War, from 1945 to 1990.

Against this background, realists ground themselves in a long tradition. Indeed, realists believe that power politics is timeless and cross-cultural. For instance, the Chinese strategist Sun Tzu, who lived 2,000 years ago, advised the rulers of states on how to survive in an era when war has become a systematic instrument of power. According to Sun Tzu, moral reasoning is not very useful to the state rulers who are surrounded with armed and dangerous neighbours. He showed rulers how to use power to advance their interests and protect their survival.

Similarly, the Greek historian, Thucydides captures the essence of relative power among the Greek-City-States. In his book, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, he describes the causes of the war in power terms, "What made the war inevitable was the growth in Athenian power and the fear this caused in Sparta." Today, statesmen like the leaders of Sparta, employ war as an instrument of state strategy and policy on calculations of power. Indeed, today's international relations operate on the famous dictum by Thucydides, "the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept. Indeed, his conception of the importance of power, together with the propensity of states to form competing alliances places Thucydides well within the **realist school**.

Niccolo Machiavelli, like Thucydides, who developed an understanding of state behaviour from his observation of relations between Athens and Sparta, Machiavelli, analysed interstate relations in the Italian system of the 16th century. His emphasis on the ruler's need to adopt moral standards different from those of the individual in order to ensure the state's survival, his concern with power, his assumption that politics is characterised by a clash of interests, and his pessimistic view of humannature clearly puts him within the **realist paradigm or school** of international relations.

In the 17th century, Thomas Hobbes discussed the free-for-all that exists when government is absent and people seek their own selfish interests. He called it the "state of nature" or "state of war", what we would call in today's parlance the law of the jungle in contrast to the rule of law. Like other modern realists, Hobbes concerned himself with the underlying forces of politics and with the nature of power in political relationships.

The realist theory has furnished an abundant basis for the formation of what is termed a neorealist approach to international relations theory. It explains patterns of international events in terms of the system structure- the international distribution of power rather than in terms of the internal make up of individual states. Waltz argues for a neorealist approach based on patterned relationships among actors in an international system that is anarchical.

.After the Cold War, in his theory of offensive realism, Mearsheimer took realism to a higher level when he argues that international politics has always been a ruthless and dangerous business, and it is likely to remain that way. That, even though the intensity of the competition waxes and wanes, great powers fear each other and always compete with each other for power. In his view, the overriding goal of each state is to maximise its share of world power, which means gaining

power at the expense of other states. Offensive realism assumes that the international system strongly shapes the behaviour of states. Structural factors such as anarchy and the distribution of power are what matter most for explaining international politics.

### 3.2 Morgenthau's Six Principles of Political Realism

In his celebrated work, *Politics among Nations*, (1948), Hans Morgenthau sets forth the following six principles of realist theory:

Firstly, certain objective laws that have their roots in human nature govern politics. It maintains that human nature has not changed since classical times. Therefore, in order to improve society, it is first necessary to understand the laws by which society lives. The operations of these laws being impervious to our performances, men will change them only at the risk of failure. For realism, theory consists in ascertaining facts and giving them meaning through reason. It assumes that the character of a foreign policy can be ascertained only through the examination of the political acts performed and of the foreseeable consequences of these acts.

Secondly, Morgenthau posits that statesmen think and act in terms of interest defined as power and that historical evidence proves this assumption. This concept, central to Morgenthau's realism, gives continuity and unity to the seemingly diverse foreign policies of the widely separated nation-states. Moreover, the concept interest defined as power makes it possible to evaluate actions of political leaders at different points in history.

Thirdly, realism assumes that its key concept of interest defined as power is an objective category, which is universally valid, but it does not endow the concept with a meaning that is final. However, in a world in which sovereign nations vie for power, the foreign policies of all nations must consider survival the minimum goal of foreign policy. Accordingly, all nations are compelled to protect their physical, political, and cultural identity against encroachments by other nations. Thus, national interest is identified with national survival.

Fourthly, political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action, it is also aware of the ineluctable tension between the moral command and the requirement of successful political action. Indeed, Morgenthau states that universal moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of states in their abstract, universal formulation, but that they must be filtered through the concrete circumstances of time and place.

Fifthly, political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe. As it distinguishes between truth and opinion, so it distinguishes between truth and idolatry. The knowledge that interest is defined in terms of power saves from moral excesses and political folly. Indeed, knowing that international politics is placed within a framework of defining interests in terms of power makes us able to judge other nations as we judge our own.

Lastly, the difference between political realism and other schools of thought is not only real but also profound. In Morgenthau's view, the political realist maintains the autonomy of political sphere just as the economists, the lawyer, and the moralist maintain theirs. In fact, he stresses the autonomy of the political sphere. In his view, Political actions must be judged by political criteria.

The theory pays little attention to individuals or domestic political considerations such as ideology. It tends to treat states like black boxes or billiard balls. For example, it does not matter for the theory whether Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm, or Adolf Hitler led Germany in 1905, or whether Germany was democratic or autocratic. What matters for the theory is how much relative power Germany possessed at the time. These omitted factors, however, occasionally dominate a state's decision-making process; under these circumstances, offensive realism

## SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

- i. What is realism?
- ii. Mention six (6) principles of realism sets forth by Hans Morgenthau.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

In a world of sovereign states with no central government, how can each state achieve its interests, indeed its survival? Traditionally, the theory of realism, based on the dominance principle, holds that each state must rely on its own power and, less reliably, on its alliances to influence the behaviour of other states. Forms of power vary, but the threat and use of military force traditionally rank high in realists thinking. For all realists, calculations about power lie at the heart of how states think about the world around them.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we discussed realism. The realist paradigm explains international relations in power terms. Realism has its intellectual roots in the older political philosophy of the West and in the writings of non-western ancient authors such as Sun Tzu in China, Kautilya in India, as well as Thucydides in ancient Greece. Hans Morgenthau, who is the chief priest of the school of modern realism, authored his famous book, *Politics among Nations*, (1948), shortly after the World War II. In the book, Morgenthau sets forth six principles of realist theory and provocatively argued that international politics is governed by objective, universal laws based on national interests defined in terms of power not psychological motives of decision makers. Taking realism to a higher level of refinement, Kenneth Waltz developed the concept of Neorealism. Similarly, John Mearsheimer has taken realism further by developing what he calls offensive realism.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- 1 Explain the six principles of realism as postulated by Morgenthau.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Goldstein, J.S. & Pevehouse, J. C. (2011). *International Relations*. (9th ed.). San Francisco: Longman, Pearson Education.

James, E. Dougherty & Robert, L Pfaltzgraff Jr. (1990). *Contending Theories of International Relations*. (3th ed.). New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

John, Mearsheimer (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton and Company.

Morgenthau, H. J.(1985). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. (4th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

Sun, Tzu (2005). *The Art of War*. Translated by Thomas Cleary, London: Shambhala.

Thucydides (1954). *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Translated by Rex Warner, London: Penguin Books.



## **UNIT 4 POWER THEORY**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Power Theory
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This unit analyses power theory, which provides a realist perspective to the analysis of war causation. Power is the central organising principle of war causation. Since states wage war, and power is so central to the existence, indeed, the very survival of states, it is simply logical that the causes of war should be located in the correlation of power between them.

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define power theory
- explain the assumptions of power theory
- explain the fundamental causes of war in line with power theorists argument.

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

#### **3.1 Power Theory**

Power theory offers a theoretical framework to explain the incidence of wars in the international system. Throughout history, war has been a normal way of conducting disputes between political groups. These wars do not start accidentally; they usually result from deliberate and calculated acts of decision-makers in the belligerent states. As Clausewitz noted so graphically, reciprocity and force are the two most important characteristics of war; “war is thus an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will” (Clausewitz, 1976: 75). State agents make a conscious decision to go to war based on their calculations or miscalculations of risks and benefits. They choose war rather than dialogue because they believe that it offers greater rewards at acceptable risk levels. War, as Michael Howard (1970: 41) asserts, “is simply the use of violence by states for the enforcement, the protection or the extension of their political power.”

Power is the central organising principle of war causation. Since states wage war, and power is so central to the existence, indeed, the very survival of states, it is simply logical that the causes of war should be located on the correlation of power between them. States employ or threaten physical force as the simplest means of asserting power or effecting desired control or changes in

the international system. In *The Causes of War*, Geoffrey Blainey (1977: 149-50) writes: All war “aims are simply varieties of power.” Whether the war is driven by nationalism, the desire to spread an ideology or religion, ethnic irredentism, the desire for territory, conflicting claims of interest, etc; all these are in the main manifestations of power relationships.

Similarly, Quincy Wright (1941: 144) describes power as being essentially “a function of state politics.” Michael Howard and indeed most historians who have studied the subject agree with Blainey that power theory provides the most adequate explanatory paradigm on the causes of wars. From Thucydides to Machiavelli to Morgenthau; from Realpolitik statesmen like Frederick the Great to Bismarck to Kissinger, the causes of war are at bottom conflicts of power.

The power model can well be illustrated by the work of Thucydides in his book, *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Here, the Greek historian describes the cause of war in power terms: “What made war inevitable was the growth in Athenian power and the fear this caused in Sparta.” Like the leaders of Sparta, statesmen employ war as an instrument of state policy on calculations of power. Their decisions, their attitudes, their perceptions, and their calculations are based on the fundamental issues of power. In essence, the power model argues that states go to war “in order to acquire, to enhance or to preserve their capacity to function as independent actors in the international system” (Howard, 1983: 1314).

Since states are rational actors whose decisions to go to war are based on rational calculations of risks and gains and of the shifts in the power equation in the international system, the power model rejects the individual level of analysis theories that attribute war to man’s innate aggressiveness. In place of such sublime causes as aggression and animalistic instincts, power theory focuses on analytical rationality, on perception and misperception, on calculations and miscalculations. For instance, it was the mutual perception of threat induced by the exponential growth in the military capabilities of the great powers that turned Europe by 1907 into an armed camp of two hostile coalitions. It was the calculation by German political leaders of the configuration of power within this framework that compelled them to embark on a course that led to World War I. Similarly, it was Saddam Hussein’s calculations and miscalculations of power that precipitated the Gulf War.

Michael Howard (1983: 18) captures power theory very succinctly: “the causes of war remain... rooted in perceptions by statesmen of the growth of hostile power and the fears for the restriction, if not the extinction, of their own.” Irrespective of the underlying causes of international conflict, power theory holds as sacrosanct the fact that wars result from reasoned and rational calculations by both parties that they stand to gain more by going to war than by remaining at peace (Howard, 1983: 22). If this proposition holds true, the nuclear weapons rational calculations of risk will demonstrate that any war likely to involve nuclear exchange and mutual annihilation will not benefit the states in question. Consequently, this will promote cooperation rather than conflict in the international system.

However, are all statesmen rational in their calculations? The model assumes so and does not account for the likelihood of such irrational leaders as Saddam Hussein of Iraq. In general, however, power theory provides the most convincing explanatory paradigm on the causes of war. The historical record provides ample justification for power theory.

## **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What are the basic assumptions of power theory?

#### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

The unit has analysed the basic assumptions of power theory and equally the most convincing explanatory paradigm on the fundamental causes of war in the international system offered by the power theorists.

#### **5.0 SUMMARY**

Power is the central organising principle of war causation. Since states wage war, and power is so central to the existence, indeed, the very survival of states, it is simply logical that the causes of war should be located in the correlation of power between them.

#### **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Critically examine the arguments of power theory.

#### **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Blanning, T.C.W. (1986). *The Origins of the French Revolutionary Wars*. London: Longman.

Geoffrey Blainey (1977). *The Causes of War*. Sun Books.

Michael Howard (1983). *The Causes of War*. London: Temple Smith. Peter Paret & Michael

Howard (1976). *Clausewitz on War*. Princeton.

## **UNIT 5 SOME MODERN THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 System Theory
  - 3.2 Functional Theory
  - 3.3 Game Theory
  - 3.4 Decision Making Theories
- 5.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The unit discusses the relevance of some behavioural theories to the study of international relations. It briefly explains origin, basic assumptions and major weaknesses of Systems theory, Game theory and Functionalism as well as the three models of decision-making theory, namely, the Rational Actor, the Bureaucratic Politics and the Hero-in-History Models.

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the basic assumptions of system theory
- explain the core assumptions of functional theory
- explain the basic assumptions of game theory
- explain the decision-making theories
- state how you will apply the various theories in their analysis of issues in international relations.

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

#### **3.1 Systems Theory**

General System Theory(GST) was first formulated byLudwig von Bertalanfy as an explanatory paradigm in Biology. It has since been applied in other sciences such as physics, chemistry, ecological studies, and subsequently, to the behavioural and social sciences.GST approaches a subject holistically, i.e. as a totality, a whole entity, or, to use international relations terminology, a world view. It views its subject as an organism, an integrated unit rather than the sum of its constituent parts. Various scholars using different theoretical formulations have succinctly evaluated the systems theory as a tool of analysis. The scholars who have developed the systems theory in international relations include Karl Deutsch, Morton Kaplan, David Singer, Charles McClelland and Kenneth Boulding, others that have contributed immensely to the theoretical development of systems analysis include a renowned political scientist, David Easton, and a foremost Sociologist Talcott Parsons.

The systems theory also involves the study of relationships between variables. For instance, in studying the state of an international system or of its subsystems variables such as the essential rules of system, the transformation rules, the actor classificatory variables, the capability variables, and the information variables were found to be useful. The essential rules of the system variables describe general relationships between the actors. They also assign role functions to actors independent of the labelling of the actors. The transformation rules of a system are those rules, which relate given sets of essential rules to given parameter values, depending upon the previous state of the system. The actor classificatory variables specify the structural characteristics of actors. These characteristics modify behaviour. For instance, “nation-state” “alliance” and “international organisation” are actor categories whose behaviour will differ as a consequence of structural characteristics. Similarly, a classification of nation-states as democratic or authoritarian will have consequences for their behaviour. The capability variables specify the physical capability of an actor to carry out given classes of actions in specified settings. Various factors are used in determining capability: territory, population, industrial capacity, skills, military forces, transport and communication facilities, political will, ability to draw on the aid of others. Information Variables include knowledge of long-range aspirations as well as immediate needs. Information also involves perception and misperception.

The international system is the most inclusive system analysed by system theorists. National and supranational systems are subsystems of the international system. They may however be treated separately as systems. The system has no absolute status and as indicated earlier consists of variables employed for the investigation of the subject matter.

### 3.2 Functional Theory

The theory of functionalism is one of the three categories of the grade integration ideas other categories are the Federalist and pluralist integration approaches. Functionalist theory was elaborated by David Mitrany in a series of books and articles among which are: *The Progress of International Government* published in 1933; the article “Functional Federalism” in the *Journal Common Cause* of November 1950 and particularly the book *A Working Peace System* published in 1946. The theory asserts and justifies the proposition that the development of international economic and social cooperation is a major prerequisite for the ultimate solution of political conflicts and elimination of war. As Mitrany puts it, “the problem of our time is not how to keep the nations peacefully apart but how to bring them actively together”. In other words, peace can be maintained, not by addressing the issues of conflict but by promoting cooperation in areas of mutual interest. According to Mitrany, functional development of special-purpose organisations will evolve their own distinctive structural patterns, procedures, and areas of competence in accordance with inherent requirements of their functional missions.

In general, the theory seeks to shift attention away from the vertical divisions of human society into sovereign states towards the horizontal strata of social needs, which cut across the national divide. Rather than reconciling conflicting interests as emphasised in power theory, functionalism promotes efforts to solve common problems. Mitrany sees functionalism as a method “which would... overlay political divisions with a spreading web of international activities and agencies, in which and through which the interests and life of all the nations would be gradually integrated.” International peace can be maintained by solving economic and social problems through agencies covering the problem areas. The problems which are crucial to maintaining international peace are

bigger in scope than nation states. Hence, the mission of functionalism is to make peace possible by organising the particular layers of human social life in accordance with their particular requirements.

### 3.3 Game Theory

Game theory was developed by mathematicians and economists who were particularly concerned with political phenomena. It is a general system theory, like power theory, designed to deal with a wide range of situations and problems in terms of repetitive patterns of behaviour, common aspects of phenomena, and types of actions and factors. Some of the founders of the game theory include John Von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern; others scholars that contributed to the development of game theory are Martin Shubik and T.C Schelling. Game theorists are interested in decisions, decision-making and conflict. It offers a way of thinking about conflict and decision-making as well as a device for discovering optimum strategies to illuminate problems of decision. This involves a prediction of consequences based on assessed possibilities. The theory focuses on the “reasonable” or rational policymaker who weighs values or options with probabilities and maximises choice. Most policymakers must consider the choice of policies or actions by others at home and abroad who may interfere substantially with desired success.

Game theory employs as its basic model, the game of strategy as distinct from games of chance. It offers the most important theoretical tool in the area of strategy. Strategy is concerned with choices from among alternative actions rather than with alternative end states. Game theory employs games as an analytical device. The theory has developed a number of game parameters among which are zero-sum-game and Non-zero-sum-game involving two-person game, the winning and losses cancel each other out; a characteristic of bilateral international relations, and the Nth-person non-zero-sum game and Nth-Zero-Sum Game involving more than two players in a game in which the winning and losses do not cancel out; a more complicated and common in international relations.

Game theory is a method of analysis and a method of selecting the best courses of action. It focuses on situations that call for rational behaviour, i.e., behaviour designed to produce decisions and courses of action involving the least costly way to achieve goals or to keep losses to a minimum given particular operating conditions. These situations are marked by conflict, competition, and often cooperation. The theory is considered useful decision-making tool in all aspect of human life, so long as there exists a situation of conflict that requires bargaining, deterrence and diplomacy. However, game theory has been criticized based on placing much interest on situation ethics there by placing little interest on the ethics of man. Meaning the motives and attitudes of rivals in conflict are not given cognizance.

### 3.4 Decision Making Theory

Scholars have devised various paradigms for analysing decision making in foreign policy. Decision-Making Theory was first developed by scholars such as H.A. Simon, Harold Lasswell, Harold Sprout, Richard Snyder and others. The theory seeks to analyse political processes in terms of decisions. Its major ingredient lies in the fact that every political act reflect a decision and so tacitly does inaction. Every actor is a decision-maker. Decision-making theory was popularized in

international relations by Richard Snyder, H.W. Bruck and Burton Sapin Snyder and Colleagues proceed with the assumption that the key to political action lies in the way in which decision-makers as actors define their situations and that their image of the situation is built around the protected action as well as reasons for their action. State action is regarded as the action taken by those acting in the name of the state.

Decision-making theorists have set in three models for the explanation and understanding of the theory, namely the Rational or Unitary Actor model, the Bureaucratic Politics model, and the Hero-in-History model. The Rational or Unitary Actor Model is an analytical construct derived from political realism otherwise known as the realist perspective or *realpolitik*. The model asserts that the primary task that decision makers face is the formulation of foreign policies to ensure their state's independence and, ultimate survival. The choices they make are shaped by strategic calculations of power, not by domestic politics or the process of decision-making itself. The model maintains that all policymakers follow the same routines and calculations to define their country's national interest. The Bureaucratic Politics Model maintain that heads of governments need information and advice to make decisions; they also need and, in fact, depend on a machinery to implement their decisions and policies. These functions are performed by organisations or bureaucracies that manage foreign affairs. They have become indispensable to a state's capacity to cope with changing global circumstances in a complex world. Bureaucracies have thus become a necessary component of modern governments. The model equates national action with the preferences and initiatives of the highest officials in national governments. It argues that the course of world history is determined by the decisions of political elites. Leaders shape the way foreign policies are made and the consequent behaviour of nation-states in world politics.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. Identify and explain some of the important modern theories of IR you know.
- ii. List and explain three models of decision-making theory in international relations.

### **4-0 CONCLUSION**

International relations accounts for the unique, new, and non-recurring phenomenon. It is also concerned with recurring processes and patterns of behaviour. These patterns occur with much regularity and often transcend specific historical episodes. They provide opportunities for scholars to draw generalisations and conceptualisations that cut across historical events. The generalisations provide a platform for the formulation of explanatory paradigms on such issues as the causes of war, imperialism, escalation, crises, alliance, deterrence, etc. without having to describe specific historical wars, alliances, crisis and other issues. Some of the most important analytical theories include Systems theory, Game theory and Functionalism as well as decision-making theory.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

The unit has examined the importance of the theoretical study of international relations. It has discussed the assumptions of Systems theory, Functionalism and Game theory. It has also explored three models of decision-making theory, namely, the Rational or Unitary Actor model, the Bureaucratic Politics Model and the Hero-in-History Model.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

1. Outline the origin and basic assumptions of any three of the following:
  - a. Decision-Making Theory.
  - b. the Systems theory.
  - c. Game theory.
  - d. Functional theory.

## 7. REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Akinboye, S. & Ottoh. F. (2007). *A Systematic Approach to International Relations*. Lagos: Concept Publications.
- Bacharach, M. (2006). *Beyond Individual Choice: Teams and Frames in Game Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Baird, D., Gertner, R., & Picker, R. (1994). *Game Theory and the Law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bertalanffy, L.V. & Laszlo, E. (1972). *The Relevance of General Systems Theory*. Paper presented to Ludwig von Bertalanffy on his seventieth birthday. The International Library of Systems Theory and Philosophy. New York.
- Binmore, K. (1987). Modeling Rational Players I. *Economics and Philosophy*, 3: 179-214.
- Binmore, K. (1994). *Game Theory and the Social Contract* (vol. 1): Playing Fair. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Binmore, K. (1998). *Game Theory and the Social Contract* (vol. 2): Just Playing. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Binmore, K. (2007). *Does Game Theory Work? The Bargaining Challenge*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Binmore, K. (2009). *Rational Decisions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- David, Mitrany (1933). *The Progress of International Government*.
- David, Mitrany (1950). "Functional Federalism" *Common Cause*.
- David, Mitrany (1966). *A Working Peace System*.
- David, Mitrany (1984). "The Prospect of Integration: Federal or Functional." In Inis Claude, *Swords into Plowshares* pp. 378-406.
- Director, S.W. & Rohrer, R.A. (1971). *Introduction to Systems Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.



Ernst, B. Haas (1964). *Beyond the Nation-State*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Groom, A.J.R. & Paul Taylor (1975). *Functionalism: Theory and Practice in International Relations*.

Johari, J. C. (2014). *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New Delhi: Sterling.

James P. Sewell (1966). *Functionalism and World Politics*.

Martens, H R. & Allen, D.R. (1969). *Introduction to Systems Theory*. Columbus.

Richard, Snyder, Henry, Bruck, & Burton, Sapin (1954). *Decision Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics*.

.

## **MODULE 5 BASIC CONCEPTS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

Students of International Relations and Diplomacy are most of the times confronted with issues and questions regarding the happenings in the international arena. They face discussions on issues relating to North Korea, China, Iran, the Palestinians and the State of Israel as well as United States' relations with these countries. Included in the discussions are issues regarding terrorist organizations and global health like covid-19 (Coronavirus) pandemic. To be able to provide answers to the questions and engaged in professional discussion on these events and happenings that came up from time-to-time, as student of IR and Diplomacy you need the mastery of some key and basic concepts that are indispensable in the study or the discourse of IR. Therefore, this module will provide explanation about the meaning, nature, features and implications of the key concepts relevant to the study of IR. Thus, the Module is divided into the following units:

- Unit 1 Foreign Policy
- Unit 2 National Interest
- Unit 3 Power
- Unit 4 Balance of Power
- Unit 5 Non-Alignment

### **UNIT 1 FOREIGN POLICY**

#### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Definition and Nature of Foreign Policy
  - 3.2 Foreign Policy Objectives
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This unit introduces you to the meaning and nature foreign policy. It traces the objectives and influences to the formulation and implementation of foreign policy.

#### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define foreign policy
- analyse the nature of foreign policy
- describe and distinguish between foreign policy inputs and outputs
- identify the sources foreign policy of objectives
- explain and distinguish among core objectives, middle range objectives and long range

objectives.

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 Meaning and Nature of Foreign Policy

George Modelski defines 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.” Foreign policy also refers to the goals that the state officials seek to obtain abroad, the values that give rise to those objectives, and the means or instruments through which they are pursued. The foreign policies of governments are reflected in the external behaviour of nation-states. In general, the objectives and actions of others set an agenda of foreign policy problems between two or more governments. The type of response will largely be similar to the stimulus, hence the notion that foreign policy actions are often reciprocal. The advent of an interdependent world has had a tremendous impact on the nature of foreign policy in two major ways:

- It has raised economic issues to the level of high politics. This is particularly so because of the nuclear stalemate and the emergence of the Third World with its stringent demand for a greater share of the world’s wealth. The issues of political economy now occupy a central place in the global agenda.
- It has blurred the distinction between domestic **and** foreign issues, between the socio-political and economic processes within the country and those that transpire abroad.

Foreign policy studies cannot ignore the extent to which the international political economy shapes the domestic economy and politics. For instance, domestic interest rates, inflation, employment, foreign exchange, to mention only a few, are no longer exclusive issues of domestic policy. They respond to influences from the external environment and can be subjected to tremendous pressures by the international political economy. The same can be said of such issues as labour, immigration, foreign investment trade flows, capital flows, prices of commodities and a host of other economic indices. Interdependence has greatly obfuscated, and possibly even erased in some respects, the distinction between domestic and foreign issues.

In spite of the effect of interdependence, however, foreign issues still has an identifiable nature and focus. It is concerned with the plans, policies, and actions of national governments oriented towards the external world. Foreign policy analysis conceives of all foreign policy behaviour as having a common structure. Irrespective of their content and purposes, behaviour is seen to consist of a discrete action initiated by one state and directed towards one or more targets in the world arena.

#### 3.2 Foreign Policy Objectives

Foreign policy objectives can be defined as an “image” of future state of affairs and future set of conditions that governments through individual policy makers aspire to bring about by wielding influence abroad and by changing or sustaining the behaviour of other states. The future state of affairs may refer to, for instance:

- Concrete conditions such as passing a UN resolution or annexing territory.
- Values, such as the promotion of democracy abroad, achievement of prestige, popularity.
- A combination of the two.

Some objectives remain constant over centuries and directly involve the life and welfare of all citizens. Other objectives are transient and change regularly. They concern only a handful of government officials and citizens. Such a transient objective could be protecting a small industry from foreign competition. Generally, the objectives of states fall into three distinct categories:

**Core Objectives:** These are the values and interests to which nations and governments commit their very existence. Core values must be preserved or extended at all times. They are the kind of goals for which most people are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice. They are usually stated in the form of basic principles of foreign policy and become articles of faith that societies accept uncritically. Core values relate to the self-preservation of a political unit. They are short-range objectives because other goals cannot be achieved unless the political unit maintains its existence. The following issues are usually treated as core values by all nation states: ensuring sovereignty and independence of the home territory and perpetuating a particular political, social, economic system in that territory; controlling and defending neighbouring or contiguous territories that could serve as channels of invasion or threat to the homeland; and ensuring ethnic unity.

**Middle-Range Objectives:** There are numerous varieties of middle-range foreign policy objectives. In fact, virtually all policy thrusts in pursuit of social and economic development fall within this category. These objectives cannot be achieved by dependence on internal sources only. These sources are in any case limited. Consequently, states formulate foreign policies on trade, foreign aid, access to foreign markets as a means to promoting social and economic development.

**Long-Range Goals:** Long-range goals deal with plans, visions, and dreams concerning the ultimate political or ideological organisation of the international system or subsystem. States make universal demands in order to realise their long-range goals. For instance, under Lenin the Soviet Union pursued world communism. The United States and its western allies pursue a long-range objective aimed at making the world safe for democracy.

Foreign policy objectives are derived from both internal and external sources. Some of the most fundamental internal sources of foreign policy objectives include: the universally shared desire to insure the survival and territorial integrity of the community or state; universal need for the preservation of the state's economy. These are usually purely defensive goals but under extraneous circumstances; the political needs of a state and its leaders. If for instance, the political system is unstable or lacks legitimacy, decision makers are likely to emphasise foreign policy objectives preventing foreign intervention on the side of the dissident group; and the cultural, psychological, and ideological needs of the state for prestige and status in the world. This foreign policy objective may be aimed at projecting a particular identity or world view, fulfilling religious or sacred ideological imperatives, pursue moral principles or fulfill obligations such as coming to the aid of victims of aggression. Another important source is the capability requirement of the state. Although most capability needs are met in domestic policy, other capability requirements can only be met through foreign policy decisions and actions. For instance, diplomacy is required to create alliances, acquire foreign air, naval and other installations, strategic assets, strategic minerals, and sophisticated military weapons. In fact, realist like Morgenthau have argued that capability considerations (or what he calls power) are the most important sources of foreign policy and that states above all seek to increase their capabilities (power). On the other hand, the External Sources to the formulation of foreign policy objectives, is that states cannot ignore the realities of the

external environment, which include: external threats of military intervention and economic ruin; opportunities created by events outside one's state may provide sources of foreign policy objectives; for instance, two neighbouring states at war with one another; the disintegration of a neighbouring empire; and the discovery of new mineral resources.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. Identify and explain types and sources of foreign policy objectives.

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In an anarchic international system with finite resources, state actors have to interact with each other in order to advance their national interests. This interactive process compels actors to formulate foreign policies. In doing this, decision-makers have to take various domestic, external and international factors into consideration to determine the inputs and outputs of their foreign policies. To maximise the attainment of their foreign policy goals, state actors have to categorise their objectives into core, middle-range and long-range and measure their resources accordingly. Finally, even when actors have measured their means to their foreign policy ends, unforeseen circumstances, misperceptions and miscalculations can affect the outcome of their foreign policies, which may lead them into war with other actors.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

Foreign policy refers to the goals that the state officials seek to obtain abroad, the values that give rise to those objectives, and the means or instruments through which they are pursued. Foreign policy is formulated to attain or solve a particular problem. Objectives, decisions and actions in foreign policy are often determined by a plethora of factors, which are domestic, external or international in scope. In general, foreign policy objectives are in three categories, namely, core objectives, middle-range objectives and long-range objectives. The amount of resources, which a state brings to bear in the pursuit of a particular objective is determined by its position in this category and sources of the formulation of foreign policy objectives.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

“Unitary actors are rational actors.” Discuss this aphorism within the context of International Relations.

1. Discuss the categories and sources of foreign policy objectives?

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Charles, F. H., Charles, W. K. Jr., & Rosenau, J.N. (Eds). (1987). *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Christopher, Thorne (1973). *The Limits of Foreign Policy*. New York: G. P. Putman's Sons.

Holsti, K. J. (1983). *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.

Richard, Snyder, Henry, Bruck, & Burton, Sapin (1954). *Decision Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics*.

Rosenau, J.N. (1966). "Pre-theories and Theories of Foreign Policy." In: R. B. Farrell. (Ed.). *Approaches in Comparative and International Politics*.

## UNIT 2 NATIONAL INTEREST

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 National Interest
  - 3.2 Types of National Interest
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The foreign policy of every country is designed to promote national interest. Many contradictory perspectives surround the concept of national interest in international relations. For instance, the use of terms like common interest and conflicting interest, primary and secondary interest, inchoate interest, community of interests, identical and complementary interests, vital interests, material interests, etc. by Morgenthau in his writings further adds to the confusion.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- state the meaning of national interest
- explain the differences between the concept of national interest and other related concepts
- list and explain the kinds of national interest.

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 National Interest

The concept of national interest is very vague and carries a meaning according to the context in which it is used. As a result, it is not possible to give any universally acceptable interpretation of this concept. Hans Morgenthau who has dealt with the concept in his various writings also used the term ‘national interest’ in different ways and assigned variety of meanings. The use of terms like common interest and conflicting interest, primary and secondary interest, inchoate interest, community of interests, identical and complementary interests, vital interests, material interests, etc. by Morgenthau in his writings further adds to the confusion. The problem of defining the concept is also complicated by the fact that researchers have tended to give the definitions of national interest according to the particular approach adopted by them. Frankel divides the various approaches adopted to define the concept of national interests into two broad categories—objectivist and subjectivist.

In the first category, he includes all those approaches that view national interest as a concept that

can be defined or examined with the help of some definable criteria. In the second one, he includes those definitions, which seek to interpret national interest as a “constantly changing pluralistic set of subjective references.

However, the most important reason that has added to the confusion regarding the meaning of the concept of national interest is the disagreement between those who view it in broad sense and those who conceive it in terms of a number of concrete single interests. Generally, the decisions at the operational level are conceived in a narrow context and only few dimensions are taken into account. At this level, the process of reasoning is inductive while at other levels it becomes more deductive.

Again, the people with theoretical inclination take greater interest in the aggregate, while those with scientific bias lay more emphasis on the single dimension of the concept. Because of all these difficulties, various meanings have been assigned to it. In view of the vagueness of the concept, some scholars like Raymond Aron have gone to the extent of suggesting that it is a meaningless or a pseudo-theory. However, some of the definitions given below will help in clarifying the concept of national interest. Brooking’s Institute defined national interest as “the general and continuing ends for which a nation acts.” Charles Lerche and Abul Said defined it as “the general long-term and continuing purpose which the state, the nation, and the government all see themselves as serving. Dyke describes national interest as an interest that the states seek to protect or achieve in relation to each other. Analysing the above definitions will highlight the differences of approach. While the first two definitions interpret national interest in terms of permanent guide to the action of the state, the definition of Dyke refers to national interest as an action. Obviously, the first two definitions seem to be more logical.

The concept of national interest is comparatively a new concept. In the ancient and the medieval times, the states pursued certain substantial interests based on their relations. In the early middle ages, the laws of Christianity formed the basis of these relations and the states were expected to ensure that their laws conformed to these principles. However, with the emergence of the secular state, the Church began to be looked upon as the enemy of national interest and the national interests were equated with the interests of the prince of the ruling dynasty. At that time, the national interest meant the interest of a particular monarch in holding fast to the territories he already possessed, in extending his domains and in aggrandisement of his house. Nevertheless, in the course of time, the popular bodies challenged the authority of the monarchs and asserted themselves. This resulted in the growth of democracy and the ‘honour of the Prince was replaced by the honour of the nation’. Thus, the concept passed from the feudal and monarchical system to the republic and democratic system and soon gained a common usage in the political and diplomatic literature. In short, the term ‘national interest’ gained currency only with the emergence of the national state system, increase in popular political control and the great expansion of economic relations.

### **3.2 Types of National Interest**

An examination of the various kinds of national interests will further help in clarifying the concept itself. According to Thomas W. Robinson, national interest can be broadly classified into six categories, viz., primary interest, secondary interest, permanent interest, variable interest, general interest, and specific interest. Let us examine the various kinds of interests in some details.



*The Primary interests* of a nation include the preservation of physical, political, and cultural identity of the state against possible encroachments from outside powers. These interests are permanent and the state must defend them at all costs. No compromise of these interests is possible.

*The Secondary interests* though less important than the first one are quite vital to the existence of the state. These include the protection of the citizens abroad and ensuring of diplomatic immunities for the diplomatic staff.

Thirdly, *Permanent interests* refer to the relatively constant and longterm interests of the state. The change in the permanent interests, if any, is rather slow. An example of this type of national interest is provided by the determination of Britain to maintain freedom of navigation during the colonial era for the protection of her overseas colonies and growing trade.

Fourthly, *the Variable interests* refer to those interests of a nation, which a nation considers vital for national good in a given set of circumstances. In this sense, the variable interests of a state are largely determined by the cross currents of personalities, public opinion, sectional interests, partisan politics, and political and moral folkways. Fifthly, *the General interests* of a nation refer to those positive conditions, which apply to a large number of nations in several specified fields such as economics, trade, diplomatic intercourse etc. For example, it was the general national interest of Britain to maintain balance of power on the European continent.

Finally, *Specific interests* through the logical outgrowth of the general interests are defined in terms of time or space. For example, Britain has considered it a specific national interest to maintain the independence of the Low Countries for the sake of preservation of balance of power in Europe.

In addition to the above six types of national interests, Prof. Robinson refers to three other interests which he describes as “international interests.” These include the identical interests, complementary interests and conflicting interests. The identical interests refer to interests that are held in common by a number of states. For example, both the U.S.A. and Britain have been interested that Europe should not be dominated by any single power. The complementary interests of the nations refer to those interests, which though not identical, can form the basis of agreement on some specific issues. For instance, Britain was interested in the independence of Portugal against Spain because she wanted to control the reign of the Atlantic Ocean.

Similarly, Portugal was interested in the British maritime hegemony because this was a safe means of defence against Spain. The interests other than the identical and the complementary interests fall in the category of conflicting interests. Conflicting interests are therefore not fixed; and can undergo a change due to the force of events and diplomacy. Thus, the present time conflicting interests may become complementary interests. Likewise, the complementary and identical interests can also be transformed into conflicting interests.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What is national interest?

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

This unit discussed the concept of National interest. The concept of national interest is very vague and carries a meaning according to the context in which it is used. As a result, it is not possible to give any universally acceptable interpretation of this concept. Brookings's Institute defined national interest as "the general and continuing ends for which a nation acts.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

The concept of national interest is somewhat confusing. In the unit, explanations of categories like common interest and conflicting interest, primary and secondary interest, inchoate interest, community of interests, identical and complementary interests, vital interests, material interests, has been in clearing the confusion. It was also learnt that, at a time, the term national interest signifies the interest of a particular monarch in holding fast to the territories he already possessed, in extending his domains and in aggrandisement of his house..

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

1. Critically evaluate the nature and scope of national interest?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Goldstein, J.S. & Pevehouse, J. C. (2011). *International Relations*. (9th ed.). San Francisco: Longman, Pearson Education.
- Morgenthau, H. J.(1948). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Knopf.
- Palmer, N.D. & Perkins, H. C. (2004). *International Relations: The World Community in Transition*. (3rd ed.). Krishan Nagar, Delhi: A.I.T.B.S.
- Raymond, Aron (1966). *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday & Company.

## UNIT 3 POWER

### CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Power
  - 3.2 Indices of Power
  - 3.3 Types Power
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The unit discusses power as a key concept in the study of International Relations and Diplomacy. Power is to international relations just as money is to economics and commerce. Power is the central ingredient of international politics. Power determines the relative influence of state actors in the international system, just as it shapes the structure of the system itself. International relations is therefore in essence power relations.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define power in its various forms
- explain why power is important in the study of International Relations and Diplomacy
- explain the indices of power
- define and explain the differences between soft power, hard power and smart power.

### 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

#### 3.1 Power

Hans Morgenthau, the archetypal realist, asserts in his book *Politics among Nations*: "International politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power." Power is without doubt the most crucial of all concepts in the study of International Politics. Power is like the weather. Everyone depends on it and talks about it, but few understand it. Just as farmers and meteorologists try to forecast the weather, political leaders and analysts try to describe and predict changes in power relationships. Power is also like love, easier to experience than to define or measure, but no less real for that. The dictionary tells us that power is the capacity to do things. At this most general level, power means, the ability to get the outcomes one wants. The dictionary also tells us that power means having the capabilities to affect the behaviour of others to make those things happen. So more specifically, power is the ability to influence the behaviour of others to get the outcomes one wants. However, there are several ways to affect the behaviour of others. You can coerce them

with threats; you can induce them with payments; or you can attract and co-opt them to want what you want. Power here, has been defined in relational, material and psychological terms.

The **relational** definition formulated by Robert Dahl sees power as “An ability to get B to do something it would not otherwise do.” The **relational** nature of power is hence, demonstrated with this example. Take for instance two states (the United States and the Soviet Union) which have balanced capabilities. As long as this condition existed, the power of either nation vis-a-vis the other was almost zero, even though with their capabilities, they could mutually annihilate each other. In a stalemate where capabilities are equal, power tends to disappear completely. However, a small increase in the capabilities of one of the two nations could translate into a major advantage in terms of its power. With the demise of the Soviet Union, the power balance between its successor state, Russia and the United States, is no longer zero. The United States is clearly now more powerful than Russia, and can in consequence exercise power over Russia.

The **material** definition sees power as capabilities or resources, mainly military with which states can influence one another. Power in material terms equates capabilities. Using the materialist paradigm, John Stoessinger defines power as “the capacity of a nation to use its tangible and intangible resources in such a way as to affect the behaviour of other nations.” It is often suggested that a nation's power is the sum total of its capabilities. Yet power is not limited to capabilities; there are other dimensions to it. Whereas capabilities are measurable, there are certain qualities to power that are more psychological and relational. The **psychological** aspect of power is crucial. Since a nation's power may depend in considerable measure on what other nations think it is or even on what it thinks other nations think it is. This relates to **perception**. State A might perceive state B as being more powerful although in reality this may not be so. However, as long as this perception persists, A dares not go to war with B, yet this is the only way its perception can be proved wrong. Similarly, state A might consider itself more powerful than state B and might wage war against B only, to suffer defeat and humiliation. This was the situation, which made Hitler suffered, when he launched Operation Babarossa against the Soviet Union in June 1941.

### 3.2 Indices of Power

The following are the indices of power:

**Geography:** According to Morgenthau, the most stable factor upon which the power of a nation depends is geography. As an indication of the strategic importance of a state's geographic location to its aggregate power, he gives the example of the continental United States that is separated from other continents by 3000 miles of the Atlantic Ocean to the east and over 6000 miles of the Pacific to the west.

**Natural Resources:** Possession of natural resources is a major factor in a nation's international power. This factor is significant although not decisive. It is not the mere possession of raw materials that determines a nation's power, it is the ability to use the resources that counts. For instance, even though the Arab states have grown very rich from their oil resources, none of them can be described as a powerful nation. A state's ability to use its resources is dependent on the level of its economic and industrial development. Japan has little raw materials yet its technology has transformed it into an economic giant and thus a powerful nation.

**Population:** A nation's population is a major element of its power. Its significance is however

dependent on other considerations as well. In the 1950s, neither China nor India, both populous nations was considered a powerful nation. Population is in fact potential power. Hence, nations with large populations could be weak although it is impossible for nations without large populations to be powerful. China, whose population endowed it with potential power, was granted great power status in the UN Security Council in the late forties for that very reason even though it was at the time not a powerful state. What makes population a significant and decisive index of power is again industrialisation. Industrialisation leads to an increase in population, which in turn may generate further industrialisation. Thus, a highly industrialised China has the potential with its huge population to become one of the most powerful nations on earth.

**Governmental System:** The extent to which a nation's government contributes to its power is difficult to assess. To say that democracy provides greater national strength than dictatorship is not historically valid. In general, therefore a nation's power depends on the use that the government makes of such physical factors as geography, population, natural resources, etc. Both democratic and dictatorial governments can and have effectively harnessed these resources to increase their power.

**National Character and Morale:** National character is an elusive concept very difficult to define. Its relevance to the power equation is based on the persistence of stereotypes that one nation imputes or holds about another. For instance, in the late 1930s, the Japanese viewed the West and the United States in particular as a decadent, corrupt and spineless society, which would disintegrate in the face of a sustained military attack. This stereotype was of course a distorted and unrealistic perception of America and its power.

**Ideology:** Ideology's peculiar function is to justify power and transform it into authority. Ideology reduces the amount of power that a government needs to deploy to achieve compliance from and control over its citizens. As a source of power, ideology is largely a phenomenon of totalitarian states. Whereas democracy accommodates disagreements on substantive national goals and is therefore devoid of ideology, a totalitarian state like communist China promotes one ideology with all its associated fanaticism and uniformity to compel compliance among its citizens.

**Quality of Leadership:** This is an important source of power. A defective leadership will squander all other sources of power. The leadership harnesses and uses all the other resources with maximum effect to build national power. This has led to the axiom: the tangible or physical resources are the body of power; the national character its soul; and leadership its brains. For instance, Nigerian leaders have demonstrated the relevance of this factor by deploying the country's resources for peacekeeping in Liberia and Sierra Leone. National leadership is therefore a decisive index of a nation's international power.

### 3.3 Types of Power

Basically, power is categorized based on the analysis of Joseph Nye and Ernest J. Wilson, III into three types; namely, Hard Power, Soft Power and Smart Power. According to Professor Nye, Soft power is the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments. It arises from the attractiveness of a country's culture, political ideals, and policies. When our policies are seen as legitimate in the eyes of others, our soft power is enhanced. America has long had a great deal of soft power. Think of the impact of Franklin Roosevelt's Four Freedoms in

Europe at the end of World War II; of young people behind the Iron Curtain listening to American music and news on Radio Free Europe; of Chinese students symbolising their protests in Tiananmen Square by creating a replica of the Statue of Liberty; of newly liberated Afghans in 2001 asking for a copy of the Bill of Rights; of young Iranians today surreptitiously watching banned American videos and satellite television broadcasts in the privacy of their homes. These are all examples of America's soft power.

Hard power is about military and economic might, which often get others change their positions. Hard power can rest on inducements ("carrots") or threats ("sticks"). Nevertheless, you can get the outcomes you want without tangible threats or payoffs. The indirect way to get what you want is sometimes, called "the second face of power." One way to think about the difference between hard and soft power is to consider the variety of ways you can obtain the outcomes you want. You can command me to change my preferences and do what you want by threatening me with force or economic sanctions. You can induce me to do what you want by using your economic power to pay me. You can restrict my preferences by setting the agenda in such a way that my more extravagant wishes seem too un-realistic to pursue. You can appeal to a sense of attraction, love, or duty in our relationship and appeal to our shared values about the justness of contributing to those shared values and purposes. When you are convinced to go along with your purposes without any explicit threat or exchange, or if your behaviour is determined by an observable but intangible attraction-soft power is at work. Soft power uses a different type of currency (not force, not money) to engender cooperation-an attraction to shared values and the justness and duty of contributing to the achievement of those values. Adam Smith observed that people led by an invisible hand when making decisions in a free market, often have their ideas shaped by soft power- an intangible attraction that persuades us to go along with others' purposes without any explicit threat or exchange taking place. Hard and soft powers are related because they are both aspects of the ability to achieve one's purpose by affecting the behaviour of others. The distinction between them is one of degree, both in the nature of the behaviour and in the tangibility of the resources.

Ernest J. Wilson, III defines smart power as "the capacity of an actor to combine elements of hard power and soft power in ways that are mutually reinforcing such that the actor's purposes are advanced effectively and efficiently... Smart power requires the wielder to know what his or her country or community seeks, as well as its will and capacity to achieve its goals; the broader regional and global context within which the action will be conducted; the tools to be employed, as well as how and when to deploy them individually and in combination. Genuinely sophisticated smart power approach comes with the awareness that hard and soft power constitute not simply neutral "instruments" to be wielded neutrally by an enlightened, all-knowing, and independent philosopher king; they themselves constitute separate and distinct institutions and institutional cultures that exert their own normative influences over their members, each with its own attitudes, incentives, and anticipated career paths." In the same article, he analyses smart power as follows: The growing interest in smart power reflects two contemporary trends, one structural and long-term, the other short-term and conjunctural, driven mainly by the policies of the current administration. The most obvious reason to reflect seriously on smart power is the widely perceived shortcomings of the policies of the U.S. administration over the past seven years. There is widespread belief in America and around the world that the Bush administration's national security and foreign policies have not been smart, even on their own terms, and, as a result, that

they have compromised the diplomatic and security interests of the United States, provoked unprecedented resentment around the world, and greatly diminished America's position in the world.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What is power?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Since power is the currency of international politics, it is the most important issue that dominates the interest of state actors. Actors pursue their interests to enhance their power while the extent of their influence in the international system is also determined by their aggregate power. However, with technological development, power can be segregated into three categories: hard power, soft power and smart power. The success of states in the pursuit of their foreign policy goals is contingent upon the use of a combination of any element of these three or in combination.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

We have studied in the unit the various definitions, categories, indices, and characteristics of power in its variegated forms. A state that seeks to deploy power successfully should measure its means to its ends and should know which of these categories of power or in combination to deploy to each situation.

### **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Define power and identify its various characteristics and categories?

### **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Ernest, J. & Wilson, III (2008). "Hard Power, Soft Power, Smart Power," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 616, Public Diplomacy in a Changing World (Mar.), pp. 110-124.

Joseph, S. & Nye, J. S.(2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* New York: Public Affairs.

Morgenthau, H. J.(1966). *Politics among Nations*. (4th ed.). New York: Alfred Knopf.

## **UNIT 4 BALANCE OF POWER**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Meaning and Nature of Balance of Power
  - 3.2 Alternative Models of Balance of Power
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The balance of power (BOP) is very crucial to the maintenance of peace and stability in international relations. BOP is as old as human society, and according to David Hume, the notion prevailed even in ancient Greece. Kissinger's discussion of the origin of the balance of power concept has traced it to the city-states of ancient Greece, renaissance Italy and European state system, which arose out of the peace treaty of Westphalia in 1648. Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff also argue that the concept was implicitly in ancient India and in ancient Greece even though it was not formalised. This unit will discuss the meaning and nature of balance of power as well as the alternative models of balance of power.

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- state the meaning of balance of power
- explain the relevance of balance of power to the international system
- identify and explain the alternative models of balance of power.

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

#### **3.1 Balance of Power**

In spite of the old nature of the concept of balance, the concept does not enjoy universally acceptable definition, as there are as many definitions as there are many scholars in the field. Hans Morgenthau, a well-known exponent of this theory refers to balance of power as the state of affairs in which power is distributed among several nations with approximate equality, (Dougherty and



Pfaltzgraff, 1990). In the words of Quincy Wright, “It is a system designed to maintain a continuous conviction in any state that if it attempts aggression, it would encounter an invincible combination of others”. In other words, it implies such a distribution of power in a multi-state system that no single state would be able, with impunity, to overrun the other states. Essentially, the balance of power is the maintenance of such a just equilibrium between the members of the family of nations as shall prevent anyone of them becoming sufficiently strong to impose its will upon the rest. Simply put, the concept can be seen as a power calculation mechanism in the international system. As a theory in international relations, balance of power tries to promote equality of power among members of the international community by discouraging a single power from dominating the system. For this reason, (Chandra,2004), sees balance of power as a policy sought by states because of fear that if one nation gains predominant power, such a nation may impose its will upon other states, either by the threat or actual use of violence. Chandra defines balance of power from a technical way to refer to a balance of power system in which any shift away from equilibrium in the state system leads to counter-shifts through mobilisation of counter-railing power.

Furthermore, balance of power is seen as equilibrium of forces between the great powers of the international system to discourage unilateral aggression on the part of any of them. Ernst B. Haas who had done an extensive study of international relations theories has attributed about eight meaning to the concept of balance of power. According to him, balance of power could mean:

- i. Any distribution of power
- ii. Equilibrium or balancing process
- iii. Hegemony or the search for hegemony
- iv. Stability and peace in a concert of power
- v. Power politics in general
- vi. Instability and war
- vii. A system and guide to policy-maker and
- viii. A universal law of history.

Similarly, Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff have put Haas’ definitions in the following perspective. According to them, balance of power should be seen as situation or condition, as a universal tendency or law of state behaviour, as a guide for diplomacy, and as a mode of system-maintenance, characteristic of certain types of international systems. They also provided an explanation for their conceptualisation of the concept of balance of power. They believe that as a situation or condition, balance of power implies an objective arrangement in which there is relatively widespread satisfaction with the distribution of power. As a universal tendency or law, the concept describes a probability and enables nations to predict the system. As a policy guide, the concept prescribes to statesmen when to net against the disruptor of equilibrium. Lastly, as a system, it refers to a multinational society. Moreover, the concept of balance of power is used in holistic stage; it covers military economic and political suspects of interstates relations. Therefore, balance of power cannot be dissociated from an elitist desire by great power to perpetuate any given international order or status quo that favours their interest so that such an order will remain undisturbed.

We should also stress that under the balance of power arrangement, there is normally a power balancer called the hegemonic, which holds that balance on behalf of the other powers. Britain

played this role in European international politics for a very long time following its emergence as the leading naval power in Europe. Another important thing to note about balance of power is the way nations have tried to ensure they achieve power equilibrium. Thus, nations have adopted the following methods or techniques to balance of power: formation of alliances, the policy of divide and rule, territorial compensation after war, diplomatic bargaining, legal or peaceful settlement of disputes, creation of a buffer states, sphere of influence and war.

Hedley Bull, (1995) classified balance of power into what he called simple balance of power, complex balance of power, general balance of power, level balance of power, objective balance of power, subjective balance of power, fortuitous balance of power and contrived balance of power. By simple balance of power, he meant balance between two powers such as the dish of France and Hapsburg, Spain and Austria in the 16th and 17th centuries. While by complex balance, he meant balance between these or more power, such as the balance between France, Austria, Russia, and England. General balance refers to the preponderant power in the international system as a whole, while level balance implies absence of preponderance of power to mention but a few. In the inter-war years, the Soviet-German pact of 1939 was a classic example of territorial compensation in maintaining the balance. Indeed, the concept of balance of power has played important role in relations of states and nation states in the international system. The practical application has been demonstrated in Europe, since the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 to the conclusion of the second war with its significance success.

Territorial compensation theorists of balance of power have argued that states within a region or system can redistribute territories and re-adjust boundaries to ensure that a measure of equilibrium is achieved within the system. States would also require territories from elsewhere to share up their power and compete favourably with their neighbours. This redistribution of territories and reorganisation of boundaries at the end of the Napoleonic wars in the post French revolution of 1789 was a prominent example of attaining balance of power through territorial compensation. In a related development, during the last quarter of the 18th century, this strategy was employed to maintain the classical balance of power system in Europe. At the end of World War II in 1945, balance of power quickly returned as a way of checking aggression among states. Although not consciously designed, the arms racing, alliance seeking and assertive interventionism of the rival camps during the Cold War that emergence after World War II between the U.S.A and the defunct U S S R, coupled with their allies ensured that balance of power became prominent from the late 1940s and 1989.

Indeed, during this period, balance of power became balance of terror in an international atmosphere of mutual assured destruction (MAD). The development of Thermo nuclear weapons and the intercontinental Ballistic missile in the late 1940s and during the 1950s with capacity to annihilate humanity, ensure that balance of power occupy the centre stage of global politics from the end of the Cold War to the 21st century. However, balance of power as a concept has the problem of maintaining equilibrium among countries in the international system as one of its greatest challenges. Nevertheless, the theory has developed its own techniques and devices of maintaining the balance used in the past. Some of these are; the international compensation arms racing, the alliance formation, creation of buffer states and divide and rule.

### **3.2 Alternative Models of Balance of Power**

The idea of balance of power has been in use since the ancient times and it has witnessed resuscitation in different forms in the post-war period of bipolar (and probably multipolar). Keeping this in view some scholars have offered their models of balance of power. Johari (2014) identified nine (9) models of balance of power as follows:

1. **Classical Model:** It covers the period from 1815-1914 when it operated in the best possible way on account of the role of the then five major powers (Britain, France, Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary) without the supervision of any international or regional organization. In this model, we find that wars were of limited nature, for no major power allowed a minor one to escalate; and alliances were made with major powers on the basis of pragmatic considerations. This model prevailed in the European world where the major powers tried to settle every international issue in the light of their own national interest. This model cannot operate in the present times when major powers have developed nuclear capabilities and the role of international organization like the United Nations (UN) and many regional organizations like North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is so obvious.
2. **Loose Bipolar Model:** It is also called the “Cold War Model” covering the period from 1947 to 1971. It operated when there were only two superpowers (the US and the USSR), each acting as an ally, protector, even a controller of a number of weaker and smaller nation-states by including them in their military blocs. The peculiarity of this model lay in the situation of ‘balance of terror.’ That is to say, neither of the two super powers desired to take risk of hot confrontation as it would be mutually destructive.
3. **Tight Bipolar Model:** This is a version of Loose Bipolar Model with no place for the non-aligned nation-states. It contemplates the absorption of all non-aligned nation-states with American or Russian bloc, each superpower agreeing to play down its ideological differences and instead cooperate in the management of its respective spheres so as to protect and promote its interest in the maintenance of the international system.
4. **Unit-Veto Model:** it may be called post-nuclear-proliferation model. It envisages an international system in which most of the nation-states of the world possess relative strength, enough to discourage other states from pursuing unfriendly policies towards them. This is a figment of contemplation having no history counterpart; however, it is based on fear psychosis, that is to say, each state has the veto power in its own hands by which it may threaten, even cause collective suicide.
5. **Collective Security Model:** this has its historical counterparts in many activities of the League of Nations and the UN. Here it is enjoined that there are no alliances, whether short-term or long-term and aggression by one state over another is punished by military and economic sanctions imposed collectively by a good number of peace-loving states.
6. **Multi-Bloc Model:** it envisages division of the world into some well-defined spheres of influence under some major powers of the world, without the interference of one into the domain of another. It also urges a successful economic and political integration of the world into some well-defined regions.

7. Nation-Fragmentation Model: Ethnic, tribal, racial and economic separatist movements offer serious challenges to the political cohesiveness of poly-ethnic, multilingual, multi-religious, multiracial, or unevenly developed states. It maybe substantiated with such movements going on in many countries of the world like Cyprus, Spain, Nigeria, Congo, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, etc. Therefore, it would be possible that a process of global political and economic integration would first undergo a phase of fragmentation of the existing nation-states, especially those with a disproportionately large amount of power and wealth.
8. Post-Nuclear War Model: It may be given the name of damage-control model. It is based on the fear psychosis. It is contemplated here that if another world war breaks out, it would entail an unprecedented loss of human life. After this war, a new horrible situation would prevail in which the most tyrannical regimes would be able to maintain enough order for the fair distribution of food, shelter and medical treatment.
9. Hierarchical Model: it envisages a pyramidal system of international regulation that could best be achieved through a world government on federal lines. This ideal set-up would stand on democratic principles and may evolve from the rudimentary institutions of the United Nations. It may also come up if any superpower of today manages to prevail upon the remaining super and great power.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What is Balance of Power?
- ii. Identify and briefly explain five (5) models of Balance of Power you know?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

The concept of BOP in human relations is as old as humanity itself. As a theory in international relations, balance of power tries to promote equality of power among members of the international community by discouraging a single power from dominating the system. Indeed, balance of power is a policy sought by states because of fear that if one nation gains predominant power, such a nation may impose its will upon other states, either by the threat or actual use of violence. The concept of balance of power has played important role in relations of states and nation states in the international system. The practical application has also been demonstrated in Europe, since the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 to the conclusion of the second war with its significance success. During the Cold War, balance of power became balance of terror in an international atmosphere where neither of the two super powers desired to take risk of hot confrontation as it would be mutually destructive.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

The concept of balance of power is very crucial to the maintenance of peace and stability in the international system. It enjoys a wide-ranging definition from scholars in the field. BOP is a regulator that creates equilibrium. Its operation requires great skill and finesse and possibly a ruthless disregard of moral concepts and human welfare. The idea of balance of power has been in use since the ancient times and it has witnessed resuscitation in different forms in the post-war period of bipolar (and probably multipolar). Keeping this in view, scholars have offered different

models of balance of power such as the classical, loose bipolar, tight bipolar, unit-veto, collective security, multi-bloc models and etc.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Discuss the nature and Models of balance of power?

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Bull, H. (1995). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. (3rd ed.). New York: Palgrave Books.

Chandra, P. (2004). *Theories of International Relations*. Delhi: Vikas publishing house.

Ernst, B. Haas (1953). "The Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept or Propaganda?" *World Politics*, 5:4, July, pp. 442-477.

Gordon, Craig & Alexander, George (1995). *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of our Times*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Henry Kissinger (1994). *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

James E. Dougherty & Robert L Pfaltzgraff Jr. (1990). *Contending Theories of International Relations*. (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Johari, J. C. (2014). *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. New Delhi: Sterling.

Morgenthau, H. J.(1948). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York: Alfred Knopf.

Palmer N. D. & Perkins H. C. (2004). *International Relations: The World Community in Transition*, (3rd ed.). Krishan Nagar, Delhi: A.I.T.B.S.

## **UNIT 5 NON-ALIGNMENT**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
  - 3.1 Non-alignment
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Non-alignment is a policy of keeping out of alliances in general and military pacts in particular. The term is very close to neutralism, since the basic objective of the two is non-involvement in the Cold War in particular and war in general. In fact, some scholars have used the two terms interchangeably. However, non-alignment has broader meanings. It means that a nation following such a policy needs not be neutral under all circumstances. A non-aligned state can participate actively in world affairs under certain circumstances.

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the origins and nature of the non-alignment.
- explain the criteria for joining non-alignment.
- discuss the contributions of the non-aligned countries

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENT**

#### **3.1 Non-Alignment**

Generally, the non-aligned movement traces its origins to the Bandung Conference of April 1955. This conference, which had in attendance 29 African and Asian countries, was to devise a means for combating colonialism. Jawaharlal Nehru, one of the moving spirits of the conference remarked that the coming together of the leaders of Asian and African states signifies the birth of a new era. Indeed, the policy of non-alignment remains Indian's contribution to international relations. Soon after taking office in 1947 as interim Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru announced a policy that eventually metamorphosed into non-alignment. As a policy, non-alignment is a direct response to the Cold War that commenced as soon as the World War II ended in 1945. Cold War describes the acute tension that developed between two erstwhile allies, the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

During the World War II, 1939-1945, the allies-United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union

and others won a decisive war against Germany, Italy and Japan. Despite this victory, the victors could not permanently forget their ideological differences; this led to the Cold War. It was a strange war, a war fought without weapons and armed forces, a war of nerves, diplomatically fought between two hostile camps. The two blocs that emerged: (i) The Capitalist or Western or Democratic bloc, led by the United States; and (ii) The Socialist or Eastern or Soviet bloc, led by the Soviet Union.

Against this background, the policy of non-alignment emerged to keep states away from bloc politics, maintain friendship with both, but military alliance with none and evolve an independent foreign policy. Undoubtedly, non-alignment as an international group emerged at the Belgrade Conference of September 1961. India was largely responsible for launching the Non-Align Movement (NAM) in 1961. In this Conference, 26 Afro-Asian nations and a European nation participated. Besides, three Latin American countries participated with observer status. Jawaharlal Nehru (India), Broz Tito (Yugoslavia) and Abdul Nasser (Egypt) initiated the Conference. Tito presided over the Conference. These triumvirate leaders sent out invitations to prospective participants after carefully scrutinising their foreign policy orientation.

The five criteria for joining NAM were:

- A country following independent foreign policy based on nonalignment and peaceful co-existence
- A country opposed to imperialism and colonialism
- A country that has no Cold War military pact with any bloc
- A country that has no bilateral treaty with any of the power bloc
- A country that has no foreign military base on its territory

The Conference adopted a 27-point Declaration. Some of the crucial features of this declaration were that it made an appeal to the world powers to preserve and protect international peace and condemned all manifestations of colonialism and imperialism. It demanded freedom for all colonial people and condemned the policy of racialism in any part of the world. It praised the freedom struggle by Algeria, Tunisia, Angola, Congo, etc., and called for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Africa. It called for just terms of trade for developing countries and laid emphasis on the economic, social and cultural progress of these countries. The Conference also appealed for complete disarmament. These principles strongly appealed to the newly independent countries of Africa and Asia and they joined the Movement.

Ever since its establishment, NAM has grown both quantitatively and qualitatively. This is evident in the ever-increasing membership from the original 27 states that participated in the Belgrade Conference of 1961 to 118 states, which participated in the Havana, Cuba Conference of 2006. Indeed, the non-alignment has consistently grown in popularity. Despite minor differences among members of non-aligned movement, it has played important role in favour of world peace, disarmament, development and decolonisation. In fact, the non-aligned countries have played an active role at the United Nations and have refused to deviate from their chosen path despite all pressures. The main contributions of the non-aligned countries are:

1. The enormous growth in the number of the non-aligned countries greatly contributed to the easing of Cold War and encouraged the newly independent countries to keep away from

power blocs. No wonder, this helped in resolving several problems posed by the power politics.

2. It greatly transformed the nature of the United Nations and acted as a check on the arbitrary powers of the permanent members of the Security Council because by virtue of their overwhelming strength in the General Assembly, the non-aligned countries were able to impose some moral check on the big powers.
3. Non-aligned countries promoted the ideology of coexistence or “live and let live” by keeping themselves away from the two blocs into which the world was divided in the Cold War era.
4. Non-aligned nations paid great attention to the problem of economic development and played a vital role in the formation of the UNCTAD. They were also instrumental in the formation of the Group of 77.
5. Finally, non-aligned movement contributed to the end of game of power politics by keeping aloof from power blocks. In fact, nonalignment represents a true blend of idealism and realism and had great relevance during the period of Cold War.

Indeed, many countries joined the NAM during the Cold War, international system to afford them a position of standing apart from the US-Soviet rivalry. At the end of the Cold War, this movement led by India and Yugoslavia agreed to still remain as a group in 1992 though most of its members now prefer to cooperate on security matters through regionally based institutions. Indeed, non-alignment remains a valid instrument for economic development and social change even in the 21st century.

## **SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE**

- i. What is non-alignment?

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

This unit focused on non-alignment, which is different from neutrality. The non-aligned movement that emerged from the Belgrade Conference of 1961 afforded its members the opportunity of pursuing independent foreign policy in a world divided into East/West blocs. Indeed, the policy of non-alignment remains Indian’s contribution to international relations. Soon after taking office in 1947 as interim Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru announced a policy that eventually metamorphosed into non-alignment. As a policy, non-alignment is a direct response to the Cold War that commenced as soon as the World War II ended in 1945.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

Non-alignment remains the focus of this unit. We discovered that nonalignment is different from neutrality. It emerged as a direct response to the US-Soviet rivalry in the Cold War international system. Indeed, the policy of non-alignment emerged to keep states away from bloc politics, maintain friendship with both, but military alliance with none and evolve an independent foreign policy. Since then it has grown in popularity and membership. Despite minor differences among members of NAM, it has played important role in favour of world peace, disarmament, development and decolonisation. In fact, the non-aligned countries have played an active role at the United Nations and have refused to deviate from their chosen path despite all pressures. At the



end of the Cold War, this Movement led by India and Yugoslavia agreed to still remain as a group in 1992 though most of its members now prefer to cooperate on security matters through regionally based institutions.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

1. Explain the concept and principles of non-alignment.

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Goldstein, J.S. & Pevehouse, J. C. (2011). *International Relations*. (9th ed.). San Francisco: Longman, Pearson Education.

Goldstein, J.S. (2008). *International Relations*. (6th ed.). Patparganj, Delhi: Longman, Pearson Education:

Palmer, N.D. & Perkins, H. C. (2004). *International Relations: The World Community in Transition*. (3rd ed.). Krishan Nagar, Delhi: A.I.T.B.S.

Ramamurthy, M. P. & Govind Narain Srivastava (1985). *NAM Today*. New Delhi: Indian Institute for Non-Aligned Studies