1. IN TERMS OF METHODOLOGY

• Morgenthau has based Realist principles on human nature.

• However, scientific principles cannot be based on human nature.
1. IN TERMS OF METHODOLOGY

- He calls his approach as system level analysis.
- He calls Morgenthau approach as Bottom up and reductionist.
- (Reduces International Politics to the level of human Nature.)
2. He does not believe that in International politics, power is an end and power is a means.
• According to Kenneth Waltz, Power is not end, security is end. Thus power is the means and security is the end.
• It implies that states are security maximisers rather than power maximisers.
• Hence his school is called as school of defensive realism.
Structural realism

Offensive
- States should maximize power as much as possible for surviving under anarchy

Anarchy

Defensive
- States should do balance/bandwagoning for surviving against a threatening state
Offensive Realism

Mearsheimer (2001) distinguishes between defensive and offensive realism.

Defensive realism (e.g. Waltz): structure pushes states to obtain enough power to survive

Offensive realism: great powers strive to become the hegemon

States may emulate successful aggression & they prize military innovation.
KENNETH WALTZ
DESCRIPTION OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS
Kenneth Waltz - International Politics

1. International Politics
2. Differentiation
3. Capabilities
1. INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

- International politics is a system of sovereign state.
- Since states are sovereign.
- There is no common authority over and above the state and hence the structure of international politics is anarchical.
1. INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

- He shows that the difference between International politics and domestic. In domestic politics corporation is possible and self help is not essential.
- Why- If anarchy is the organisational principle of International politics. Hierarchy is the organisational principle of domestic politics.
1. INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

• Hierarchy symbolises the presence of state which has Supreme Power.
2. DIFFERENTIATION

- There is a functional differentiation among the different units of the government in the domestic sphere.

- There is no functional differentiation among the state in International sphere.
2. DIFFERENTIATION

- All states perform similar functions whatever is their ideology thus all actors are symmetrical actors.
3. CAPABILITIES

- Capabilities denote determinants of power. State differs only in terms of capabilities. Some are more powerful than the others.

- On the basis of above description of the international politics, He suggest that the structure compels states for self help.
3. CAPABILITIES

• Till structure does not change International politics will not change.

• Hence He establishes realism as “timeless wisdom”.
ADVANTAGES OF STRUCTURAL APPROACH

• Structural Approach eliminates the role of human agencies. Structures constraint the choices.

• Hence, Who so ever be the foreign policy maker it will not make a difference.

• Structure of International politics does not give autonomy or choice.
CONTRIBUTION OF MEARSHEIMER
BOOK – “THE STORY OF GREAT POWER POLITICS”

- Book- “The story of great power politics”, year of publication - 2001

- He is known as post cold war realist.
CONTEXT OF WORK

- Mearsheimer re-establishes the timeless wisdom of realism. He does not agree that realist perceptions are not valid.

- He asserts that condition of anarchy (absence of world government) pressurizes state to go for acquiring power.
• After the end of cold war there has been a phenomenal growth in international law and international organization.
• Similarly there is a phenomenal growth of economic interdependence.
• Post cold war Era has been an era where liberalism has been at its strongest position.
COMPARISON WITH MORGANTOWN

• 1. Like K. Waltz, Mearsheimer also does not support unit level analysis.
• He goes for system level analysis.
• It is based on the structure of international politics.
• 2. However, the difference from K. Waltz view is that state or security maximizers.
• Like Morgenthau he believes that States are power maximizers.
• In international politics, power is both means and the end.
CONTEXT OF HIS THEORY

• His theory has been in context of the future prospects of USA and China relations and what approach USA should take towards rising China.

• As per Chinese officials, China is benign power, China does not have any hegemonic aspiration they have emphasized on "Peaceful Rise of China".
• China's rise is not a threat but an opportunity.

• China is increasing its power not for offensive purpose but for security.
MEARSHEIMER (OFFENSIVE REALISM)

- Theme- States are not status quoist, they acquire power not for security but for domination.
- Hence countries should aim at more and more power to protect its security.
- Mearsheimer has challenged k Waltz arguments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the basic point of difference between the two scholars?</td>
<td>• The basic point of difference is the amount of power state should acquire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K. WALTZ'S ARGUMENT

- State should acquire over which is enough for security.
- There is no need to go for endless power.
K. WALTZ'S ARGUMENT

1) Why - When country acquires power, it compels the formation of counter coalition which ultimately results into situation that there are no relative gains.
2) Balance of power in a common sense and any country would go for balancing the rising power to protect its interest.
3) K. Waltz suggests that defence is better than offence. Offence is not rational because even victory in war comes at a huge cost.
MEARSHEIMER'S AGREEMENT

- 1. State should seek hegemony.
- Why- Only hegemony provides security for National interest.
- So long that it is maintained between the powers, security is assured.
MEARSHEIMER’S AGREEMENT

• 2. Between offence and defence, offence is preferable.

• Why?
According to Mearsheimer, If we look into the history those who have been first to start war have won war more than those who have been defensive.
MEARSHEIMER'S AGREEMENT

• War is an inevitable, either we start war or somebody else will start war. Offence is the best defence.
MEARSHEIMER'S AGREEMENT

3. It is not necessary that other countries will go for balancing.

Countries can also opt for bandwagoning.
• 4. Victor can make up for the losses in the war from the territories of the vanquished by different means.
However, Mearsheimer suggests, that country should adopt policy according to the situation.
Mearsheimer gives two types of measures

1. Direct
2. Indirect
1. Direct Measures
   - 1. War
     - War is efficient but costly.
   - 2. Blackmailing
     - Cost-effective but may not work in all cases.
2. Indirect Measures

1. Buck Passing
2. Bait and bleed
3. Blood letting
1. BUCK PASSING

- It means transfer the buck to the other country.
- For example between US and China conflict, USA has passed the buck on India.
2. BAIT AND BLEED

- Bait and bleed give support to the one rival and keep them engaged in war and remain on sidelines.
3. BLOOD LETTING

- If fight is going on between the countries ensure that the duration of the conflict gets prolonged.
Thus Mearsheimer suggests,
That there will always be a struggle for power and domination and this is the tragedy of great power politics.
NEOCLASSICAL REALISM

NEO CLASSICAL REALISM
SCHOLAR- FAREED ZAKARIA

- Nature of theory - methodological.
- Purpose - Methodology of studying International politics (Neo Plus Classical).
According to them, we should study both the structure of international politics (Neorealism) but we should also study the foreign policy makers (Classical Approach).
It is true that structure constraints the choice but it is also true that persons occupying foreign policy making structure also make differences.

Just for the sake of making study scientific, we should not sacrifice the practical wisdom found in classical realism.
According to them, both structure as well as persons influencing foreign policy and that is the reason that we have both continuity as well as change in foreign policy.
CRITICS OF REALISM

1. English School
2. Social Constructivism
3. Postmodernism
4. Feminism
5. Liberalism
6. Marxism
7. Post Colonialism
BOOK- “THE ANARCHICAL SOCIETY”

- **Context:** They challenge the structural realism.

- **According to them,** structural realism takes the static view and is far from being scientific.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the approach of the school?</td>
<td>• What all comes in traditional approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. HISTORICAL APPROACH

- They suggest to take the historical or evolutionary view of the international politics.
2. LEGAL INSTITUTIONAL

• This approach focuses on the role of International organizations and International law.
3. NORMATIVE APPROACH

- This approach is prescriptive and is concerned with order and Justice.
Source of influence

1. Hugo Grotius
2. Immanuel Kant
1. HUGO GROTIOUS

- Hugo Grotius known as Father of International Law.
2. IMMANUEL KANT

• 1. Kant gives importance to reason.
WHAT IS THE THEME OF THE SCHOOL?

• Though there is anarchy in international politics, yet there is order and Justice.
WHAT DOES IT IMPLY?

- We cannot say that International politics is just struggle for power, we can also find the elements of cooperation among the state.

- Thus conflict and cooperation, anarchy and order, power and justice coexist.
MAIN IDEAS

MAIN IDEA

TOPIC

MAIN IDEAS
1. According to realists, international politics is just a system of states. According to English School, it is not just a system of states but also society of state.

The basis of any society is shared norms, value laws.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why we have to recognise the existence of society among sovereign States?</td>
<td>Though states are sovereign yet they have shared norms, values, Institutions and law. We cannot Deny the existence of the above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Why States follow norms or International Law?
They take historical view, initially state didn't follow norms and laws but with the growth of reason, state have realized that observing norms and laws are good for security and prosperity.
Question

- What is the specific feature of international society?
It is neither a complete anarchy nor complete society (as found in domestic sphere).

It is in the intermediate state, it is a Anarchical society.
ANSWER

- It implies that there is no common authority over and above the state as found in domestic context but at the same time states do follow certain norms and have built institutions.
In the words of Hedley Bull, International society comes into existence when groups of state having common interest and values come together and agree to be bound by set of rules in their relations with one another.
According to Hedley Bull there is more order in international sphere in comparison to the domestic sphere of many states, primarily in the third world countries.
Hedley Bull, believes that to maintain order, it is necessary to develop consensus on Justice.
Hedley Bull also gives the concept of Neo-medievalism.

Neo Medievalism denotes the present world order, which comes near to the medieval Europe when neither Church nor state or any other territorial power exercised complete sovereignty.

Sovereignty at present has become the complex and overlapping concept.
2. SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVISM
TYPE OF THEORY - REFLECTIVISM

• Theory is of recent origin become prominent after the end of cold war, they give explanation to why we see what we see.

• Social constructivism is influenced by the ideas of Italian scholar Vico.
According to him, natural world is made by God but the social world is made by humans.

Immanuel Kant - our knowledge get filtered through our subjective consciousness.
TYPE OF THEORY- REFLECTIVISM

• Thus for social constructivists, social world is not independent of our thoughts, we do not look at the world through naked eye, we look at the world through the glass which is made up of culture, values, norms and identities.

• Like postmodernist, they also believe that we construct the truth rather than discover the truth.
Nicholas Onuf in his Book “The World of Our Making” written in the context of the end of cold war has used the term social constructivism for the first time.

The sudden end of the Cold War questions some of our assumptions about the great power rivalry.
According to social constructivists, the world is not constituted by material structures (military power, economic power) world is constructed by ideas norms and identities.
Alexander Wendt suggest that anarchy is what state make of it, He is critical of the way K. Waltz explains anarchy, giving rise to the security dilemma.
ALEXANDER WENDT GIVES THE EXAMPLE OF TWO CONCEPT OF ANARCHY-

1. The Hobbesian interpretation which creates security dilemma.
ALEXANDER WENDT GIVES THE EXAMPLE OF TWO CONCEPT OF ANARCHY-

2. Lockean interpretation, there was peace, goodwill and mutual assistance in the state of nature even in the absence of government.
Social constructivist are also influenced by the concept of structuration given by Anthony Giddens.

According to structuration, structures do not constraint the actor in a mechanical way, actors can also transform structures by thinking about them in a different way.
SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST

- The social constructivist believe in the power of ideas.
- Ideas shape reality.
- They suggest that by regular communication and dialogue, Nation can overcome their apprehension against each other can develop better understanding of each other.
SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST

• There is no need to be fixated in an age old structure of Anarchy, we can think differently.

• To conclude, social constructivist believe that reality does not exist outside our consciousness it only exist as intersubjective awareness among people.
3. POSTMODERNISM
WHAT IS POSTMODERNISM?

• To quote Lyotard, postmodernism is incredulity towards meta-narratives.

• Postmodernists draw their inspiration from Nietzsche who held that god is dead.
WHAT IS POSTMODERNISM?

• Foucault has developed the idea of discourse, Derrida has developed the method of deconstruction and double reading.

• Postmodernism is very recent in international politics which has been dominated by the realist school of thought.
WHAT IS POSTMODERNISM?

• The prominent postmodernist scholars in international politics are Der Derian, R. B. J. Walker, Richard Ashley.

• These followers have applied the approach of the construction and double reading given by Derrida.
According to Der Derain, international politics can be understood as a text and can be interpreted from different perspective. He has analyzed diplomacy from postmodernist perspective.
Richard Ashley, has been critical of the concept of anarchy given by structural-realist.

He has given the concept of Anarchy-problematique.
According to Richard Ashley,

The concept of anarchy used by realist scholars has many objectionable aspect, both theoretical and practical.
Theoretically it is based on number of objectionable exclusions, for example they purposefully exclude the role of International Organization.

Similarly their perception of anarchy has negative consequences.
• Anarchy is interpreted in a way that leads to war.

• When war happens they claim the truth of realism.
• For postmodernists, there is no time-less truth, production of knowledge is not just cognitive but it is normative and political.
• Neither there is any absolute truth nor there can be objectivity.
• It is all a matter of perception
5. LIBERAL SCHOOL
TYPE OF THEORIES - PERSPECTIVE

- The main objective is to give ideas on peace or how to establish peace.
- The study of International Relations as an academic discipline started as peace studies based on the views of Woodrow Wilson.
Intellectual Precursors of Liberalism

1. John Locke
2. Immanuel Kant
1. JOHN LOCKE

- Unlike Hobbes, who takes the Pessimistic view of human nature.
- Locke takes the balanced view.
- There is a reason which helps him to leave in the peace with others.
2. IMMANUEL KANT

- Immanuel Kant wrote pamphlet Titled “Perpetual Peace”.
- He wanted that there should be permanent peace among European Nations.
HE GIVE TWO SUGGESTIONS

1) Promotion of Free Trade and Commerce.
HE GIVE TWO SUGGESTIONS

2) Promotion of Republican Form of Government.
HE GIVE TWO SUGGESTIONS

3. Richard Cobden - He suggested to throw the politicians out.
HE GIVE TWO SUGGESTIONS

4. Norman Angell - Book “The Great Illusion”, he held that it is an illusion that wars are beneficial to anyone, even victors suffer huge losses.
HE GIVE TWO SUGGESTIONS

5. **Woodrow Wilson** - He gave 14 point speech which led to the emergence of different school in liberalism.
1. Liberal Institutionalism
2. Sociological Liberalism
3. Functionalism
4. Democratic Peace Theory
5. Interdependence
6. Complex interdependence
1. Liberal Institutionalism

Woodrow Wilson

Joseph Nye
2. Sociological Liberalism

- Karl Deutsch
- Rosenau
- John Burdon
3. Functionalism

David Mitrany

Ernst B. Haas
4. DEMOCRATIC PEACE THEORY

• Michael Doyle
5. Interdependence

Richard Rosecrance

Thomas Friedman
6. Complex interdependence

R. Keohane

Joseph Nye
Question

• Q. Write short note on concept of fast power and who has given this concept. (Scholar Joseph Chapman).
• Q. Concept of soft power (Joseph Nye Lectures).
1. LIBERAL INSTITUTIONALISM
1. LIBERAL INSTITUTIONALISM

• Origin of Idea- 14 point speech of Wilson, where he purposed International Organization (League of nations) to contain Anarchy of International politics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What was the assumption?</td>
<td>• There is a struggle for power in the International politics because there is no common authority as found in domestic sphere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of International Institutions according to Wilson?</td>
<td>(At least they can convert Jungle into zoo.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOSEPH NYE HAS GIVEN FOLLOWING ADVANTAGES.

1. It provides platform for the resolution of disputes through dialogue otherwise the only option available will be battlefield.
JOSEPH NYE HAS GIVEN FOLLOWING ADVANTAGES.

2. When any country takes a commitment at international level, there is a pressure of world, public opinion and there will be less chances of defection.
JOSEPH NYE HAS GIVEN FOLLOWING ADVANTAGES.

3. Institutions provide a platform for regular interactions, communication. Which can help in overcoming the trust deficit.
What is the actual scenario?
There are three school of thoughts.

1. English School
2. Realist School
3. Game Theorists
1. ENGLISH SCHOOL

- According to them international law and organisations have established some level of order and international politics looks like “anarchical society”.
- Nations observe laws because they find these laws beneficial to them.
2. REALIST SCHOOL

A. Even when International organizations exist, collective security exist. Nations continue to acquire arms. Arms race has not ended. This shows limited faith in the Institution.
B. Behavior of major powers like USA shows that they do not observe International norms, laws. Whenever it is in their national interest to do so. Thus, National interest rather than order is a Priority.
3. GAME THEORISTS

• Like Joseph Nye had suggested that Nations have no real interest in negotiations.

• He has developed a model of Quasi negotiation.

• He suggested that nation pretend that they are participating just to avoid blame but in reality they are hardly serious.
3. GAME THEORISTS

• It is generally observed that countries have used International organisations as a means to pursue their National interests rather than achieving common interest.

• It is also observed that International Institutions lack sufficient resources and mandate.
3. GAME THEORISTS

- For Example - IAEA lacks sources as well as mandate hence, it could not detect the clandestine development of nuclear weapon capability by North Korea and Iran.
Joseph Stiglitz mentions about the democratic deficit found in the Institutions of global governance.
Thus, there is a lack of political will and commitment among nations in general but major powers in particular towards strengthening institutions.
2. SOCIOLOGICAL
LIBERALISM
2. SOCIOLOGICAL LIBERALISM

• Unlike liberal institutionalism, sociological liberalism is society centric.
Question

• What is the relevance of Sociological Liberalism.
As suggested by Rosenau,
We have moved away from state centric world to society centric world.
As suggested by John Burton, Billiard Ball model is hardly adequate to explain the nature of international politics.
John Burton has proposed, Cobweb Model which is a society centric view of the International Politics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What does sociological Liberal propose to Achieve Peace?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The propose the concept of security community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOURCE OF INFLUENCE FOR IDEA OF SECURITY COMMUNITY

- Domestic Politics.
WHAT IS SECURITY COMMUNITY?

- Security community in the group of people or set of territorial units which have developed the level of trust to an extent that they do not feel as if they are threat to each other rather they feel that they have common threat coming from outside the Periphery of community.
WHAT IS SECURITY COMMUNITY?

• Examples -
  • European Union,
  • ASEAN,
  • European Union and
  • North America (Transatlantic Security Community).
HOW SECURITY COMMUNITY DEVELOP?

• Regular interactions or communications.

• There is no other way to address the trust deficit.
Karl Deutsch has actually measured the amount of communication between societies.

Higher is the communication, higher is the trust.

He measured communications by counting number of international travel visa issued, letters exchanged and phone call made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What does communication theories purpose?</td>
<td>• Visa liberalization or greater interaction between society as a solution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. FUNCTIONALISM
3. FUNCTIONALISM.

- Functionalism is a theory based on experience of European Union.

- It is also an approach to address the security dilemma and to create security community. Functionalism is also known as peace by pieces.
3. FUNCTIONALISM.

- Peace by pieces imply segregating the issues. Differentiate less conflictual (doable issue) and more conflictual issues (not doable issue) at present.

- It reminds to first start cooperation in issues of law and politics.
3. FUNCTIONALISM.

- Once countries realise the benefits of cooperation in one sector, they will have incentive for cooperation in other sectors.

- It is called as spillover effect and spin off effect.
3. FUNCTIONALISM.

- Over a period of time interdependence develop known as functional inter linkage.

- Interdependence develop to such an extent that war becomes irrelevant.
Source of Influence

1) Richard Cobden
2) GDH Cole
RICHARD COBDEN

- He suggested to keep the politicians out.
- Hence, in European Union experiment initially politicians have been excluded.
- Integration progress was led by technicians, scientists and economists.
- Cooperation first started in non-political issues. (European coal and steel community).
GDH COLE

- He has given the concept of functional sovereignty. Out of which the term functionalism has emerged.

- It means shifting of the return from state to the authorities for following specific functions.
• For Example-
The decision on Monetary Policy in European Union has been shifted from state into the hands of European Central Bank.

• According to functionalist, excessive reliance on the territorial concept of sovereignty may not be efficient and may not be good for peace.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Difference between functionalism and Neo functionalism?</td>
<td>• Functionalism is the supported by David Mitrany who believes in Cobden's idea of keeping the politicians out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEO FUNCTIONALISM (ERNST HAAS)

- It is based on the experience of European Union, there have been long periods in the evolution of European Union without movement on integration progress.

- It was realised that without political will, we cannot take integration progress forward.
NEO FUNCTIONALISM (ERNST HAAS)

• Hence, politicians cannot be kept out for long.

• Thus, Neofunctionalism will use the involvement of the politicians.
CONCLUSION

- So far the most effective alternative to the realist view of international politics.

- However, Functionalism requires a lot of patience because it is a very gradual process and it also requires lot of political will.
INTERDEPENDENCE
SOURCE OF INFLUENCE

- Immanuel Kant
Immanuel Kant suggested promotion of free trade between countries.
WHAT DOES IT IMPLY

• It implies Growth of Economic Interdependence.
HOW- BY FREE TRADE

• Once interdependence develops wars can be avoided because countries develop stakes in each others Economics.

• It is believed that whatever qualitative change has happened in the relation between USA and China.

• India and China, it is because of inter-dependence.
FOR EXAMPLE-

- Once bilateral trade increase between India and China, the two countries have entered into strategic partnership in 2003, which led to the development of agreement on the guiding principles and political parameters with respect to the resolution of border dispute however it is also believed that if China does not address the trade imbalance, relations can deteriorate between the two Asian Giants.
1. Thomas Friedman- He has given “Golden Arches theory” the two countries having McDonald chain do not fight with each other.
WHY-

- People prefer to stand in the line of burgers, rather than going on borders.
2. Richard Rosecrance has given the concept of “trading states” and suggest that countries should go for trading states model rather than military state model.
EXAMPLE - TRADING STATE MODEL

- Japan and Germany after World War II they focus on developing economic power and neglected the military power.
EXAMPLE- MILITARISTIC STATES MODEL-

- Former USSR according to rosecrance USSR disintegrated because it overstretched itself military.
- Similarly there is decline of US hegemony since US has started greater reliance on military or hard power (Joseph nye).
2. Richard Rosecrance has given the concept of “trading states” and suggest that countries should go for trading states model rather than military state model.
4. DEMOCRATIC PEACE THEORY
SOURCE OF INFLUENCE

- Immanuel Kant
Immanuel Kant suggested supported Republican government for peace.
SCHOLARS

- Michael Doyle
• Theme - the two countries having democracy do not go for war with each other.

• Above idea can be verified because of mature democracy is have gone for war with each other.
WHY DEMOCRACIES DO NOT GO FOR WAR?

1. They form a zone of peace, it is not any formal agreement. It is just informal zone, democracy is promotes pacific and tolerant cultures.
WHY DEMOCRACIES DO NOT GO FOR WAR?

2. In democracies people enjoy rights and specially freedom of speech and expression. Hence critical examination of government policies can take place and hence there can be course correction. (Benefit of Open Society).
3. In democracies public opinion matter, people do not prefer war and governments are responsive to people.
1. If two democracies have not gone for war with each other, it can be just a coincidence.
2. Democracy alone cannot be the reason, there can be for the reasons.
EXAMPLE

- Common enemy, economic-interdependence.
- The idea can be misused by the countries for intervention in domestic spheres and can create more threat to peace.
As per theory, democracies are conducive for peace, it implies that chances for peace are greater, if more countries are democratic.

It can become a basis for democracy promotions by western countries even at gunpoint (Bush Doctrine).
6. COMPLEX INTERDEPENDENCE
NATURE OF THEORY - DESCRIPTIVE

• 1. It is considered as one of the best description of the post cold war World order.
NATURE OF THEORY - DESCRIPTIVE

2. It is a liberal theory which incorporates some of the features of realism (Realistic liberalism).
NOTE-

• International society theory incorporates some of the elements of liberalism in realism.

• Hence, it is called as **Liberal Realism**.
NOTE-

- The complex interdependence model can be used to explain current state of relations among Nations.
- For Example- the best way to describe US-China relations, India-China relations is through Complex interdependence.
WHAT IS COMPLEX INTERDEPENDENCE?

• It can be understood through the statements “Complex interdependence is a situation in where one is forced to love whom one you would love to hate”.
WHAT IS COMPLEX INTERDEPENDENCE?

- Complex interdependence is different from simple interdependence because in interdependence the two parties have no conflict between them, In Complex interdependence the two parties having conflicts and two parties are forced to cooperate.
WHAT IS COMPLEX INTERDEPENDENCE?

• It means conflict have not ended yet imperatives for cooperation have emerged.
Why – Consequence of Globalization

A. Economic Interdependence

B. Rise of global challenges like transnational terrorism, climate change Complex interdependence scholars have given following features of the present world order.
1. Unlike Realist who believe that the states are the only actors, complex interdependence suggest the emergence of multiple actors (Multiple Actors- TNC's, NGO's, IGO's, Terrorist Organizations.)
2. Unlike realists who believe in the Primacy of Military security. Complex interdependence suggests that the security has become multi dimensional concept. Economic, social, cultural, ecological security has got inter linked.
3. Unlike realists who do not believe in cooperation, Complex interdependence suggests that the vanity of state has become limited and state are forced to cooperate.
Thus, International politics is not anarchical but it is in the stage of complex interdependence. This model comes near to the cobweb model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the current state of</td>
<td>• What is liberal world order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal world order ?</td>
<td>• It is an alternative to Westphalian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>world order.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It’s components include

1. Growth of International Organization
2. Promotion of free trade
3. Promotion of democracy and Human Rights.
It is based on Woodrow Wilson's 14 points speech
John Kennedy has given the evolution of liberal world order in 3 phases:

1. Liberalism 1.0
2. Liberalism 2.0
3. Liberalism 3.0
LIBERALISM 1.0

• After World War I, it led to the establishment of league of nations however it collapsed within 20 years.

• Realists called liberals as Utopians.
LIBERALISM 2.0

- Started after World War II led to the establishment of IMF, World Bank, UN, EU.
- However, the liberal world order was limited to the Western world at that time.
- The challenge to liberal world order came from the idea of socialist world order led by USSR.
LIBERALISM 2.0

- World was divided into two blocks known as first world and second word through there was also a third world represented by NAM countries.

- There was a greater presence of liberal world order in 2nd Phase.
LIBERALISM 3.0

• Started after the end of cold war, described by Francis Fukuyama at the end of history.

• Realism was defensive and liberalism was as its strongest phase.
However, since Sept. 11, 2001, the liberal world order has been challenged by:

A. Rise of Islamic fundamentalism

B. Rise of China
LIBERALISM 3.0

• It is believed that the so-called liberal world order was never liberal in real sense.

• Western countries have always been reluctant to accommodate others.
LIBERALISM 3.0

- They have not been tolerant, they have not taken steps to Reform the Institutions which was a necessity for evolution of liberal world order.
PRESENT STATUS

• Leaders at World Economic forum at Munich security conference 2017 accepted that liberal world order is facing the existentialist threat.

• Why- Earlier challenge was coming from outside but now it is challenge from the core regions.
PRESENT STATUS

• Example-
  • 1. Brexit
  • 2. USA’s America First Policy
According to Robert Kagan, Liberal world order is crumbling under the pressure of tribalism, economics depression, populist political parties.
1. It is in the interest of the developing countries that liberal order continues.
2. It is also in the interest of world peace.
Marxist theory of International politics

1. World System Theory
2. Gramscian Tradition
3. Critical School
1. WORLD SYSTEM THEORY
TYPE OF SCHOOL- INSTRUMENTALIST

- **Background** - In Marxism politics is epiphenomenal (part of structure).
- **Hence**, Marxist theory of International politics is actually the Marxist theory of International political economy.

- **Area of analysis** - operation of capitalism in international context.
IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN

- Major exponent to Marxist School of International politics and economics.
Source of influence

1. Karl Marx
2. Lenin
1. KARL MARX

- Marx has not discussed the operation of capitalism in international context.

- However, Marx has shown the expansionist nature of capitalism.
1. KARL MARX

• In the world of Karl Marx, “the imperatives of capitalist mode of production - compels bourgeois class to nestle everywhere and settle everywhere.
2. LENIN
BOOK “IMPERIALISM THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM”

• The credit for developing the Marxist perspective on International political economy goes to Lenin in his Book “Imperialism the highest stage of capitalism”
2. LENIN

- He has analyzed the process of capitalist accumulation of profits and how the competition of colonies laid to the first world war.
2. LENIN

- He called World War I as the capitalistic war.

- In the works of Lenin we see the emergence of basic concept of Marxian political economy i.e, the concept of dependency, unequal exchange and uneven development.
2. LENIN

• Lenin’s work led to the emergence of the instrumentalist school and dependency school.

• The prominent exponents are AG Frank, Samir Amin, Immanuel Wallerstein.
Beside Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, a contemporary of Lenin, has also given the theory of imperialism, from a Marxist point of view.
According to Rosa Luxemburg, capitalism, nationalism, militarism and imperialism are interlinked phenomena.
I. Wallerstein was also influenced by the French annales school of social history and prominent scholar of the school Fernand Braudel.
CONTRIBUTION OF I. WALLERSTEIN

- His theory is called as a “grand sociological theory”.
- It is a qualitative analysis, it provides critique to political modernization theory.
Question

- What is Political Modernization Theory.
• Given by Scholars like David Aptor, Edward shills, S.P. Huntington, W.W. Rostow, above scholars have suggested that the countries in third world should go for modernization, which includes industrialisation, secularization to address the poverty.
• Rostov has written a Book titled “The Stages Of Economic Growth A Non Communist Manifesto”. Rostov feels that all societies pass through similar stages of development, Western Scholars recommended the integration with international economy as a means for modernization and development.
Scholars like A.G Frank, I.Wallerstein held that the integration with international political economy results into development of underdevelopment.
According to Wallerstein, poverty in south, wars in balkans, all can be attributed to the operation of capitalism.
CRITIQUE BY DEPENDENCY SCHOOL

In his World System Theory, Wallerstein suggest to understand International politics as World system. Up till now there have been 2 world systems-
Up till now there have been 2 World Systems:

1. Up till 17th century
2. Since 17th century
1. UP TILL 17TH CENTURY

- It was political in nature (Roman empire), peripheries were paying tribute and core was redistributing the tributes.
2. SINCE 17TH CENTURY

- World system has become economic in nature, the basic goods are redistributed through market rather than through any centralized system in 17\textsuperscript{th} century.
- World system was led by Holland in 19\textsuperscript{th} century it came under the control of Britain.
- In 20th century it has been control by USA.
DEFINITION OF WORLD SYSTEMS

- World system is a multicultural territorial division of labour in which production and exchange of basic goods and raw materials necessary for day to day life take place.
1. Wallerstein has given the three dimensions of the World System.

1. Spatial Dimension
2. Temporal Dimension
3. Cultural Dimension
1) SPATIAL DIMENSION
Features

1. Core
2. Peripheries
3. Semi peripheries
1. CORE

- They are called as core countries because there is a concentration of economic power, political power, technical power and ideological power (haves).
2. PERIPHERIES

- Former colonies but now under neo-colonialism, there is no change in the situation as far as the world system is concerned, earlier also they were suppliers of raw material, cheap labor and market.
2. PERIPHERIES

- Presently also in the same situation.
- They lack all sorts of power (have nots).
3. SEMI PERIPHERIES

- Some countries in Periphery which had some level of industrial base, skill and semi skilled manpower have been able to perform better than others in Peripheries.

- Examples- China, India, Brazil, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea.
3. SEMI PERIPHERIES

- However Semi-peripheries have continued in the continuation of world capitalist system.

- They have acted as a shock absorbers for capitalism.
3. SEMI PERIPHERIES

• They have undermined the efforts of the organized working classes in the western countries.
• They have also undermined the efforts of environmental movements in the western countries.
3. SEMI PERIPHERIES

- Bourgeoisie of Western countries have shifted their operations in semi peripheries and have been able to make bigger profits.
1. Cheap labor is available

2. Poor environmental Regulation and hence use of outdated technology

3. Higher rate of returns on the capital invested.
3. SEMI PERIPHERIES

- These countries (semi peripheries) have become a neo-elite, exploiting the other countries in peripheries rather than providing leadership to developing countries.
- They have harmed the poor in the south and middle class and poor in the north.
2) TEMPORAL DIMENSIONS
Every world system has its life span, the Capitalist World System represents the following temporal features:

1. Cyclical Rhythms
2. Secular Trend
3. Crisis
1. CYCLICAL RHYTHMS

• It shows boom and bust in capitalism.
2. SECULAR TREND

- It reflects, contradictions of capitalism, decrease in wages will result in to slowdown of economy.
3. CRISIS

- Cyclical rhythms and secular trends ultimately result into crisis, i.e, Collapse of System.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the current position of World Capitalist System?</td>
<td>• The system is fast approaching towards its end which means it is the time to prepare Swan song.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) CULTURAL DIMENSION
CULTURAL DIMENSION

- Since it is a world system, it represents geo culture. Geo culture has two components and

- Both promote capitalism.
Geo Culture has two components

1. Science
2. Liberalism
CRITICAL EVALUATION OF WORLD SYSTEM

1. It suffers from economics reductionism. It suggest as if there is a single underlying cause behind all global events. Hence, in recent times chase Dunn is trying to reform the model by bringing political and military dimension.
2. According to post colonial Scholars even about theory is Eurocentric, as it is based on the history of Western world.
2. GRAMSCIAN TRADITION
SCHOLAR - ROBERT COX


- He became famous with his statement, when he held that “theory is always for someone and for some purpose”. 
SCHOLAR - ROBERT COX

• He has analysed liberal and realist theory and held that these theories are related with same purpose.

• They are written from the perspective of those who benefited out of such theories.
Robert Cox also criticized Instrumentalist approach because of economic reductionism and underline the role of ideological powers
He has analysed US hegemony and how US hegemony has been the product of both - its power of coercion and power to manufacture consent.
USA military power comes from its economic power, its economic power comes from by its ability to promote free trade.

It has been able to promote free trade by convincing other countries that it is in their interest to do so.

Thus, ultimately it benefits USA.
Thus, realists focus on the role of military power, instrumentalist on economic power but it is also important to understand the role of ideological power in international politics.
3. CRITICAL SCHOOL

The Frankfurt School
and Cultural Marxism
Critical School (reflectiveists) Critical School of Marxism in International politics is based on Frankfurt School.
WHAT IS THE THEME OF FRANKFURT SCHOOL

- Frankfurt School Scholars try to understand various form of operations and look for the ideas which can bring emancipation.
- In international politics this school is also known as emancipatory School.
- The prominent exponent is Andrew linklater.
WHAT IS HIS PROPOSAL

1. He suggest to make territorial Boundaries Relevant.
WHAT IS HIS PROPOSAL

2. He suggest to create new Moral Boundaries.
3. He suggest to strengthen Grassroot Democracy.
POSTCOLONIAL APPROACH
INTRODUCTION

• To represent the perspective of the scholar from the post colonial societies on conventional theories.

• Post colonialism comes from the ideas of Edward Said known for “Orientalism”.

• Orientalism is based on foucault's theory of knowledge power connection.
WHAT IS THE ARGUMENT OF POSTCOLONIAL SCHOLARS

1. International Relations Theory is Eurocentric (Realism, Liberalism, Marxism, Social Constructivism).

- It is based on the history and experiences of the people in western countries.
- It has not been returned from the perspective of people in post colonial world.
Gayatri Spivak has raised the question, "can subaltern speak"?
WHAT IS THE ARGUMENT OF POSTCOLONIAL SCHOLARS

• 2. Like other theories International Relation theory is not free from knowledge- Power Connection.

• The purpose is to maintain the domination of the west on the rest.
WHAT IS THE ARGUMENT OF POSTCOLONIAL SCHOLARS

3. Many of the basic concepts either do not apply in context of third world countries or when applied it results into negative consequences.

Mohammed Ayub (Third World Realist) suggests that the concept of security dilemma has limited relevance because these countries suffer more from internal security threat or insecurity dilemma.
WHAT IS THE ARGUMENT OF POSTCOLONIAL SCHOLARS

4. They highlight the arrogance of western scholars. According to Stanley Hoffman, “International Relation is American social science”.
• According to Morgenthau, Africa is politically empty and according to K. Waltz it is ridiculous if we built International relations theory on the foreign policies of Malaysia, Costa Rica.
WHAT IS THE ARGUMENT OF POSTCOLONIAL SCHOLARS

• 5. According to post-colonial scholars if seen from the perspective of third world countries, International politics is hierarchical civil rather than Anarchical.
SYSTEMS THEORY

- Purpose- To build scientific theory of International politics.

- Exponent - Morton Kaplan.
SYSTEMS THEORY

• Objective of **Morton Kaplan**
  • To prepare Grand theory of International politics which can explain the past, present and future of the International politics.
Sources of influence

1. General System Theory
2. David Easton
1. GENERAL SYSTEM THEORY

• It aims at creating a pool of knowledge by bringing concept from different disciplines.
2. DAVID EASTON

- Easton has developed the model of political system.
ADVANTAGES OF SYSTEM THEORY ACCORDING TO KAPLAN:

1. Most suitable for the International politics because International politics is also interdisciplinary.
ADVANTAGES OF SYSTEM THEORY ACCORDING TO KAPLAN-

2. System approach is non normative and hence we can build scientific theory.
• He has developed ten models of international politics and some are even hypothetical models.
According to Kaplan, there are 5 variables in each system.

1. Essential rules of the system
2. Transformation rules.
3. Actor variables.
5. Information variables.
10 MODEL OF MORTON KAPLAN
1. BALANCE OF POWER SYSTEM

• Historical model existed till World War first.
2. BIPOLAR MODEL (TIGHT BIPOLAR).
3. LOOSE POLAR MODEL
4. VERY LOOSE MODEL
5. UNIVERSAL ACTOR MODEL HYPOTHETICAL MODEL

[Diagram showing the Universal Actor Model with connections to USA, India, UK, and NK.]
6. HIERARCHICAL MODEL

Diagram:

- U.S.A.
- One country central
- Other countries

Text:

Hierarchical Model

Opposite of universal model.
7. UNIT VETO SYSTEM

- Opposite to HIERERICAL MODEL Model.

- Each country become a calling powerful, all have complete capacity to destroy each other.
7. UNIT VETO SYSTEM

Each country becomes equally powerful.

All have complete capacity to destroy each other.
8. INCOMPLETE NUCLEAR DIFFUSION MODEL

- Incomplete nuclear diffusion model.

- Situation in which 14 to 15 countries possesses Nuclear weapon.
9. Detente System
10. UNSTABLE LOCK SYSTEM

1. Opposite to Detente system.
10. UNSTABLE BLOCK SYSTEM

2. High level of tension between superpowers.
3. High level of mutual suspension.
10. UNSTABLE BLOCK SYSTEM

4. Very dangerous situation.
1) According to Stanley Hoffman, it is a huge misstep in the right direction. It does not even capture the basic stuff of international politics.
2) Model does not fulfill even the basic requirements of system theory. It does not explain environment boundary process.
CRITICAL EVOLUTION

3) It does not explain domestic variable shipping International politics.
4) The real importance of International Relations theory is its capacity to give ideas on peace.
5) None of the models have contemporary relevance. At present cobweb model, complex interdependence model serves the purposes better.
GAME THEORY
SCHOLAR

- Thomas Schelling (neo realist)/ strategic realism
TYPE OF THEORY

- Scientific
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the purpose of theory?</td>
<td>• To make predictions about the decisions to be made by the states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Assumption</strong> - to consider International politics as a game played by nations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHICH TYPE OF GAME

- It is a game of strategy which requires strategy building.
- Actors - Nation-states are actors in International politics and they are going to be rational.
- Every game has its payoff (outcome of result).
Type of Games

1. On the basis of number of persons
2. On the basis of outcome
1. On the basis of number of persons there are two types:

A. 2 - Person’s Game

B. N' Person’s Game
2. On the basis of outcome - two types

A. Zero Sum game
B. Non zero sum.
In International politics, there are two very common games:

1. Chicken Games
2. Prisoner's Dilemma
1) CHICKEN GAME (TWO PERSONS, NON ZERO SUM)

- The game is used to predict the course of action countries will take in a situation, where there is possibility of head on collision resulting into complete destruction.

- Example –
1) CHICKEN GAME (TWO PERSONS, NON ZERO SUM)

- Example-
- 2. Standoff between India and China, suggests that right choice to avoid the major catastrophic without thinking about the prestige.
- It suggests that in international politics, Nations are concerned primarily for their survival and prestige is secondary.
2. PRISONER'S DILEMMA (TWO PERSONS, NON ZERO SUM GAME)

- Primarily used to predict the cause of arms race.
- It is based on the concept of security dilemma.
1. Despite the fact states are rational actors, situations in International Politics are such that they are not able to go for the best course of action.
WHAT IS THE MESSAGE?

2. It suggest that nations prefer to take the course of action which minimizes the losses rather than maximizes the gains.
3. Situations in international politics is such that cooperation may prove detrimental whereas defection may results into huge benefit. This suggests that in International politics, nations preferred defection over cooperation.
Case study

- Nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan

What was the challenge

- The challenge for the scholars is to predict whether India and Pakistan will make nuclear weapons or not.
WHAT WAS THE CHALLENGE

1. India and Pakistan are traditional rivals.
2. India and Pakistan have gone for 3 direct war.
WHAT WAS THE CHALLENGE

3. Pakistan has lost each time, Pakistan did not get any real support either from USA or from China.
4. Since Pakistani is a weaker party, in order to address its security dilemma Pakistan would require strategic balance with India.
Pakistan can not depend on others. It has to go for self help. Hence, Pakistan will opt for nuclear weapons.
5. In case of India, there was a confusion because India has been champion the cause of disarmament.
WHAT WAS THE CHALLENGE

6. India and Pakistan both poor countries having mass poverty and limited resources. It would have been the best if they co-operate and agree on not making nuclear weapons.
WHAT WAS THE CHALLENGE

• However, huge trust deficit exists hence they cannot cooperate.
• Hence both will go for acquiring nuclear weapons.
• The party which trusts or cooperate and does not make nuclear weapon will be at huge loss.
WHAT WAS THE CHALLENGE

• This shows that nations do not give primacy to cooperation because it may prove detrimental.

• Above game comes from the classic story of prisoner's dilemma.
WHAT WAS THE CHALLENGE

- Suppose there is a murder in the town, police has got caught two persons on the ground of suspensions and do not have enough evidence.

- The challenge of police officer is either both should accept the crime or at least one accept the crime.
WHAT WAS THE CHALLENGE

- Officer puts them into separate cells.
- So that there is no communication between them, He gives such options that ultimately both accept that they have committed the crime.
WHAT WAS THE CHALLENGE

- If there is any communication channel they would have come to know what is going on in the mind of other.
- They have gone for the best option.
- Since such situation does not exist they will go for the option which minimizes the risk rather than that maximizes the gain.
DECISION MAKING APPROACH.

- **Purpose** - Analysis of Foreign Policy.

- **Scholar** - HW Brook, Burton Sapin, Richard Snyder.
They have differentiated between decision making & problem solving.

Decision making is a reactive process where person is looking for problem as well as the alternative. Foreign policy should be considered as decision making rather than problem solving, it means foreign policy is proactive approach rather than just set of responses.
They have differentiated between decision making & problem solving.

In decision making, scholars analyze the role of personality factor, environmental conditions, and institutional factors.
KEY CONCEPT

2. World capitalist Economy and Globalization.