

AHMEDNAGAR JILHA MARATHA VIDYA PRASARAK SAMAJ'

NEW LAW COLLEGE,
AHMEDNAGAR

STUDY MATERIAL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
(BA0402)

CLASS-BALLB-II

PREPARED BY- PROF. D. B. MORE
ASST. PROF.
(POLITICAL SCIENCE)
NEW LAW COLLEGE, AHMEDNAGAR

MODULE NO. 1

Meaning, Definitions and scope of International Relations

In the very beginning of the civilized world the states were mutually interlinked. In modern times the world has greatly shrunk as a result of scientific and technological development. As a result, events in one part of the world have an immediate impact on the rest of the world., Therefore the states maintain regular relations with other states of the world. As an alone individual is nothing similarly, a state without **other** state is nothing and in the present complex life, a state without relations with other cannot survive. Materialistic needs, religion, economic requirements, industrialization, security matters and trade etc. brought the states together. Inter-states wars yielded post-war treaties, economic and friendly agreements and international organizations. All these things are studied by international relations.

International relations are an old subject and can be traced in the old tribes. It was utilized by the Greeks and Romans in their relations. As a regular subject, international relations took start in the World War-I era and specially because of the second World War, Cold War between USA and USSR, disintegration of USSR, New World Order (NWO) of USA, global role of North Atlantic Treaty

Organization (NATO) emergence of international organization and diplomatic relations etc. developed this subject to great extent.

International Relations is the study and practice of political relationships among the world's nations, especially their governments. International relations mean interactions between nongovernmental groups, such as multinational corporations or international organizations such as the OIC or the United Nations (UN).

International relations is a broad and complex topic both for countries engaged in relationships with other nations, and for observers trying to understand those interactions. These relationships are influenced by many variables. They are shaped by the primary participants in international relations, including national leaders, oilier politicians, and nongovernmental participants, such as private citinns, corporations, and nongovernmental organizations. They are also affected by domestic political events and nonpolitical influences, including economics, geography, and culture. Despite all of these other influences, the primary focus of international relations is on the interactions between nations.

To understand these interactions, experts look at the world as a system of nations whose actions are guided by a well-defined set of rules. They call this system the interstate system. The interstate system has existed for less than 500 years and is based on a common understanding of what a nation is and how it should treat other nations. But recent changes in technology and international norms have caused some scholars to question whether this system will continue in the future, or be replaced by some other system of relationships that is not yet known.

From September 1814 to June 1815 representatives of the major European powers convened in Vienna, Austria, to reorganize Europe following the defeat of French emperor Napoleon I. The Congress of Vienna, as this conference became known, was a major event in the history of international relations.

Until the 1970s the study of international, relations centered mainly on international security studies i.e. questions of war and peace. Scholars believed a nation's military power was the most important characteristic in determining how that nation would relate to others. As a result, scholars focused on the relative military strength of one nation compared to others, alliances and diplomacy between nations, and the strategies nations used to protect their territories and further their own interests.

Since the 1970s the importance of economics in international relations has increased and the study of international political ' economy has received increased attention. The primary force driving the interaction between nations is

economic, not military. There is trade and economic relations among nations, especially the political cooperation between nations to create and maintain international organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

In both security studies and international political economy, experts strive to explain patterns of conflict and cooperation among nations. Conflicts among nations are expected since their political and economic aims and interests often depart. Cooperation does not refer to the absence of conflict but to the ability of nations to peacefully resolve their differences in a way that is acceptable to all parties involved. When cooperation fails, conflicts often escalate into coercion and ultimately war.

The term "International" was used for the first time by Jeremy Bentham in the later part of the 18th century with regard to the laws of nations. Consequently, the term "IR" was used to define the official relations between sovereign states.

The economic, social, cultural, political and military relations amongst the state of the world may also be included in the preview of the subject. Thus there are broadly two views regarding the meaning of international relations.

Narrow view: According to this view 'IR' includes only "The official relations conducted by the authorized leaders of the states." According to this view other relations do not fall in the domain of IR'

Broad view: Some scholars have taken a broad view of international relations, and included apart from the official relations between states, all intercourse among states and all movements of people, goods and ideas across the national frontiers within its preview.

Definitions of IR

"International relations is the branch of political science that studies relations between countries of the world." (Encarta).

"It is not only the nations seek to regulate, varied types of groups-nations, states, governments, people, region, alliances, confederations, international organizations, cultural organizations, religious organizations must be dealt with in the study of international relations if the treatment is to be made realistic." (Quincy Wright)

"International relations is concerned with the factors and activities, that affect the external policies and the powers of the basic units into that the world is divided." (Hoffman).

“International relations is the discipline, that tries to explain political activities across state boundaries (Trevor Taylor).

It embraces all kinds of relations traversing state boundaries, no matter whether they are of an 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

International relations studies foreign relations, diplomacy. agreements and pacts, international law, international organizations, inter-state interaction, war and peace, international justice and alliances etc.

pacts, international law, international organizations, inter-state interaction, war and peace, international justice and alliances etc.

Scope of International Relations

International relations topic cover diplomacy, treaties, question of war and peace, global happenings, commercial, cultural, educational. social, religious international alliances and international organizations etc. The scope of international relations can be discussed.

Establishment of League of Nations. In modern time the field. of the study was widened with the establishment of the League of Nations in 1920, after the First World War due to the sincere efforts of Woodrow Wilson of USA. The establishment of the League of Nations contributed to the study of international relations. Therefore, the study of international organizations and international institutions was also included in its preview.

Emergence of USA and USSR as a Super Powers. Emergence of USA and USSR as superpowers further widened the scope of international relations. After the second World War the world transformed into bipolarity from multi-polarity with USA and USSR flourishing in international affairs. Both the superpowers conducted international relations according to their own interests.

Establishment of United Nations. After the end of World War II various international conferences were held. Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin met at Tehran and Yalta. They agreed in principle to form a worldwide international organization for peace loving states. Therefore, an acceptable charter was signed on 26th June 1945. United Nations is a global organization of independent and sovereign states and its main aim is “to maintain international peace and security.” The establishment of the UN also contributed to the study of international relations to great extent.

Emergence of USA as a Superpower (New World Order). The end of USSR as a superpower in Dec, 1990 changed the whole world and USA emerged as a superpower that adopted international politics in such a way that majority of the

nations of the world visualized themselves as the subjected mission of the single power. The Gulf War of 1991 paved the way for USA to emerge as a superpower that resulted in the USA's N.W.O under that USA became the master of the world politics. Emergence of USA as a superpower also extended the scope of international relations.

Technological Development. Technology exercises profound influence on the power base of a state as well as the course of international relations. Technology at least in three spheres, industrial, communication and military, has greatly influenced the power of the state. Due to technological development the world has become a global village. Technological development also extended the scope and value of international relations.

Globalization. Due to certain reasons the scattered world is going towards integration. The world is now a single village and states are incomplete with one another. This situation increased the scope of international relation.

Historical origin of international relations

Kenneth W. Thompson has systematically analyzed the Evolutions of international relations in four stages:

- (1) The Diplomatic History Stage
- (2) The Current Events Stage.
- (3) The Law and Organisation Stage.
- (4) The Contemporary Stage.

1. The First Stage:

I. The Initial Attempts:

The first stage of the evolution of the subject stretched up to the end of the First World War and was dominated by the historians. "Before World War I," writes Schleicher, "there was almost no organised study of international relations either in American universities and colleges or elsewhere, although Paul S. Reinsch was

pioneering in the field when, in 1900, he lectured on World Politics at the University of Wisconsin.”

In the few courses that existed there, initial efforts were little more than unsystematic and often superficial attempts at discussing a wide variety of current problems which differed greatly in the level of their importance. No real attempt was, however made to study international relations in an organised and systematic way.

II. The Diplomatic History Stage:

The impact of World War I on the study and teaching of the discipline was tremendous. The importance and necessity of studying relations among nations was realized and this influenced the decision to provide an order to the attempts being made. For this purpose the decision was taken for establishing departments and chairs in various universities. Consequently the first chair of International Relations was established in 1919 at the University of Wales.

To begin with, the study was dominated by diplomatic historians and the attention was focused on the study of history of diplomatic relations among nations. The scholars concentrated on the study of past history of political and diplomatic relations among nations because diplomacy constituted the most major, rather the sole channel for the conduct of relations. They adopted a chronological and descriptive approach and made no attempt to draw some principles from their study of historical facts.

Diplomatic historians enjoyed the monopoly and the relations among nations were presented as historical descriptions without reference to how various events and situations fitted into the general pattern of international behaviour.

The whole concentration was upon the chronological description of history of diplomatic Nations and little attention was paid to the necessity of relating the present with the past. Their attempts brought to light certain interesting and important facts about past international relations but these failed to provide any meaningful help to the study of relations among nations.

The descriptive and chronological studies of the relations conducted by the diplomatic historians did not satisfy either the need for an organised study of the international relations of their time or the demands of the future development of the subject. Except for highlighting certain facts, this stage failed to render any significant help to the understanding and theorizing of international relations.

2. The Second Stage:

The Current Events Stage:

The concern and experience with the study of war-time relations gave a new turn to the discipline of International Politics. The creation of the Woodrow Wilson Chair of International Relations at the University of Wales opened a new era in the study of the subject. The study of current events and problems came to be regarded as the central theme of International Relations.

The review of newspapers, periodicals and journals was considered to be the right and necessary step for understanding the day to day relations among nations. Several scholars now came forward to place emphasis upon the need for the interpretation of current developments and problems at international level. An attempt was made to overcome the shortcomings of the first stage and replace the historical bias by the study of present events.

However, in itself this second stage was almost as much incomplete, partial and inadequate as the first stage. The first stage remained concerned with the study of past without relating it to the present. Likewise the second stage, the current events stage, was concerned with the present without attempting to trace the historical roots of the problems and events. This stage also lacked an integral view of international relations. Like the Diplomatic History stage, this stage also failed to study the future of international relations.

3. The Third Stage:

The Legal-Institutional Stage or the Law and Organisation Stage:

The third stage, which developed simultaneously with the second stage, involved an attempt to reform the nature and content of international relations in future through the development of international law and institutions. Shocked by the suffering inflicted by the First World War, the scholars adopted an idealistic outlook which focussed attention upon the task of reforming international relations by institutionalizing these through the development of international

institutions like the League of Nations, and by the codification the rules of International Law.

The Fourteen Points listed by President Wilson of United States were together regarded as a charter of reforms for relations among nations. The Paris Peace Conference and the subsequent establishment of the League of Nations gave strength to the optimism that it was possible and desirable to make efforts towards an improvement of international relations for eliminating war, violence, tyranny and inequalities.

For this purpose the Legal-Institutionalisms proposed three alternative approaches:

- (1) Creation of supra-national institutions for guiding and directing the efforts towards the preservation of international peace and security.
- (2) Securing a legal control of war by creating new international norms (International Law) for deterring war and should it occur, its destructiveness.
- (3) By eliminating weapons through global disarmament and arms control, peace should be strengthened.

The study of international relations at this stage was influenced by a strong faith in goodness of human relations, and consequently, it sought to study, codify and improve international law and institutions. War was looked upon as both a sin and an accident which was to be eliminated through institutionalization of relations.

It was believed that all international problems could be solved by developing a system of international law and by successfully organizing and working international organisations. The scholars at this stage were infused with a spirit of reformism under the influence of which they sought to reform the future of international relations. The establishment of an ideal international society free from war violence and other evils came to be adopted as the ideal.

The approach at this stage was again partial and incomplete. It concentrated upon future without realizing the importance of the past and present. It made little attempt to base the study of international relations upon an understanding of the past history and the knowledge of current problems faced by the nations.

It ignored the hard realities of international relations and instead adopted an idealistic approach which was soon found to be superficial and inadequate. The outbreak of the Second World War in 1939 proved the idealistic and unhelpful nature of the third stage.

No doubt the Law and Organisation approach rightly stressed the need for strengthening peace at international level, yet the solution that it offered was almost Utopian. It was idealistic in nature and content and was far away from the hard realities of international relations—use of power by for the states for securing goals of national interest. The scholars were putting the cart before the horse by attempting to develop legal institutions and organisations without first trying to understand the true nature of international relations.

Since the focus at this stage was narrow, the Law and Institutional approach failed to provide a durable basis to the study of highly dynamic nature and scope of international relations. The rise of dictatorships, aggressive nationalism, desperate quest for security, and certain other factors, like the economic depression of the 1930s, made the matters worst both for the League of Nations and International Law. The outbreak of the Second World War in 1939 gave a death blow to this stage and it virtually ended the era of idealism in international politics, as was advocated by the Law and Organisation Approach.

4. The Fourth Stage:

The evolution of International Politics in its fourth stage can be studied in serval sub-parts:

(A) Post-War Stage—The need for a Theory of International Politics:

The fourth stage in the evolution of the study of international relations began after the end of the Second World War. The deterioration in international situation which resulted into the outbreak of the Second World War amply proved the shortcomings of the approaches of inter-war period. The need for new approaches capable of examining and explaining relations among nations was felt in a big way.

The deep changes produced by the Second World War and its impact upon the power structure at the international level, created a really challenging situation. A number of scholars came forward to meet the challenge and in the process they initiated the fourth stage in the study of International Politics. Attempts were initiated for developing a theory of international relations.

(B) Comprehensive Study of all Factors and Forces and not only Institutions:

In this fourth stage, the emphasis got shifted from law and organisation to the study of all factors and forces which conditioned and shaped the behaviour of nations in the international environment. It was realized that there existed regular patterns in international behaviour which were far away from idealism. The role of power found acceptance as an incontrovertible fact of international relations. This realization led to the emergence of political realism which advocated the study of International Politics as struggle for power among nations. The emphasis came to be upon the study of the determinants and operation of foreign policy.

Further, the process of conflict-resolution at international level was accepted by many scholars as the field of research. The understanding and theorizing of international relations through a realistic and objective study came to be accepted as the goal of study. It was accepted that the aim was not to praise or condemn but to understand the nature of international issues, behaviour and problems.

(C) The Major Concern in the Post-War Period:

During 1945-2000, considerable progress was secured in the direction of developing a theory of International Politics. Many useful theories and approaches were developed. The beginning was made in the late 1940s with the development of a Realist Model of International Politics particularly as formulated by Hans Morgenthau. His Realist Theory advocated the study of International Politics as struggle for power among nations. It advocated National Power, National Interest and Foreign Policy as the fundamental units of study.

The main concern came to be the study of international relations-

(i) The motivating factors of foreign policies everywhere,

(ii) Techniques of conduct of foreign policies, and

(iii) Modes of resolution of international conflicts.

The study of international institutions now came to be conducted not from the legal and moral perspective but from the political perspective. For example the United Nations was viewed as a political organisation designed not as a substitute

of power politics but as an appropriate mechanism with which the direct national rivalries could be compromised through normal processes.

In an age which had witnessed two World Wars within a short duration and which was witnessing the super power rivalry and cold war in international relations, it was natural for the Realists to define International Politics as struggle for power in which each nation tried to secure the goals of its national interest by the use of national power. International Politics was viewed as politics among nations.

The ‘realistic’ posture of the Realists made it a power approach to international relations of the post-war years. However in the 1950s, there appeared fissures which gradually fragmented the realist school.

-----+-----

Significance of State Actors in International Relations

In the traditional perception, the state plays the leading role in international relations. However, after the World War , with the rise of communications technology, the deepening of international division of labor and the expansion of global trade, a good deal of international organizations was established. The international environment was changed due to globalization. It becomes easier for states to communicate with each other, which influence international political, economic, military and culture to a great degree. The increasing number of these organizations is parallel to the increasing levels of political, economic, military and cultural transactions between individuals, societies and states. These kinds of non-state actors challenge the “state- centric” perception. Therefore, in this essay, three sections will be used to discuss whether the state is still the most important actor in international relations. Firstly, it will cite two theories about the role of the state plays in contemporary international relations. Following this, it will give an account of whether the position of the state in international relations will be replaced because of globalization. Finally, it will illustrate the role of the state plays in international economy, politics and climate.

There are two prevailing theories about the role of the state in international relations. Neorealism emphasizes the state plays the most important role in international arena. On one hand, the state possesses sovereign power to insure domestic security. On the other hand, neorealism also stresses the state influence economy in international relations. Neoliberalism not only indicates that the state is the main behavior body in international system, but also affirms the role of non-states, such as international organization, transnational organizations and other

kinds of social organizations. As a by-product of intensified globalization process, these kinds of organizations have become more significant determinants of foreign policies of the state (Ataman, M., 2000).

Globalization influences the position of the state in international relations

By looking at globalization, the proliferation of non-state actors is gaining international influence and position. Non-state actors can be divided into international intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and transnational or international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Ataman, M., 2003). International intergovernmental organizations are created by states. They have official document of government agencies. On the contrary, transnational or international non-governmental organizations are established not by the state, but by some group of businessmen, individuals and other societal units. They have no legal connection with the state, so they are genuinely transnational (Oyugi & Walter O., 2004). But the state can restrain the activities of these kinds of organizations.

There are a number of powerful organizations such as the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the United Nations. Though these organizations own strong power in the international relations, they are entirely operated by states.

Along with the intensification of globalization, the growth of so many kinds of non-state actors is bound to influence the status of the state in international relations. But they can not substitute for the state. The state is still the most important actor in international relations.

The role of the state in the international economy, politics and climate

Globalization can be found everywhere, such as economy, politics and climate (Clapham and Christopher, 2002). Whether the role of the state in international relations can be replaced due to globalization, it will be discussed as follows:

Globalization has brought about the biggest influence to the economy. Globalization can run businesses, business also can run globalization. That is to say, if a boss of any company wants to make a profile, he has to deal with the government of the state. The state can suspend any operating company. Under this circumstance, the state proves to be the most important actor in international relations on account of it has a right to determine whether a new company can turn into the country business.

International politics is very important to coordinate international relationships, safeguard the world peace and make successful businesses. The state is responsible for international politics.

The peace of the world is an eternal theme in the international politics. How do the state and the world peace affect each other? The world peace is not able to be achieved only by one state. This utopian goal is only brought out by the endeavor of the whole world. Even though most of international organizations are making great efforts to prevent chaos caused by war, the state is also play the major role in international relations. The United Nations calls on every country should work together to fight against warfare. The relationships between peace and development are interdependency, interrelationship and inter-advance. It requires the state to play the leading role to coordinate the world circumstance, protect the world peace and then promote common development of the whole world.

Global warming is gradually become a significant topic in the world due to climate globalization, it persecutes nearly everybody. Because Global Warming could lead to glaciers melt, and sea level rise. Therefore, people are starting to take actions to deal with this problem. For example, in order to protect the environment, an international agreement “the Kyoto Protocol” is formulated. The purposes of the Kyoto Protocol are to cut down pollution and prevent greenhouse effect. However, the Kyoto Protocol is not formulated by individual or international organization, but drafted by states. It further proves the state play the most important role in international relations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the state is still the most impotent actor in international relations. There are several strong points can be listed to get this conclusion. First of all, international organizations govern the globe, and these organizations consist of states. The state influences and powers over international organizations. Following this, globalization changes the international environment and lead to many kinds of non-state actors spring up. To a degree, these non-state actors are gaining status and influence in global economy, politics and climate, but it impossible to replace the position of the state in international relations. Any international affair is not a problem of one state but of the whole world. Taking into account the whole of these reasons, it can be concluded that the state is still the most important actor in international relations.

Significance of Non-State Actors in International Relations

Some of the major role of non-state actors in international relations are as follows:

1. Changes in the Concept of Sovereignty and Nationalism:

The emergence of non-state actors and the transnational relations has attacked the state-centric international system. It has changed the nature of international relations. Non-state actors have forced a change in the concepts of sovereignty and nationalism. These have affected the role of the nation-states as the actors in international relations.

The policies, decisions and actions of the nation-states now bear the increasing influence of the presence and activities of the non-state actors. The latter have emerged as powerful non-political, commercial, economic, cultural, or trading actors in the international environment. Analyzing the role of non-state actors, Intergovernmental organisations (IGOs), international non-governmental organisations (i.e., INGOs or NGOs) and multinational corporations (MNCs)

Wye and Keohane have observed that these help to build and broaden the foreign policy agendas of national decision-makers by serving as transmission belts through which one nation's policies become sensitive to another's. At the same time non-state actors are pursuing their interests largely outside the direct control of nation-states. However these frequently involve governments in particular problems as a result of their activities.

Have Non-state Actors eclipsed the Nation-State System?

Though the non-state actors of international relations have emerged as important and active actors, these have not ended, or can end in the foreseeable future, the role of the nation-state. These have been playing an important role in promoting international cooperation and collaborations yet these have also been sources of conflict and tensions.

As for example, the multinational corporations have come to be mostly the instruments of neo-colonial control of the rich over the poor. Third world nations are now very eager to limit such a role of the MNCs. NGOs working in different

regions of the world, are at times involved in activities which are both competitive and conflictual in nature.

2. Non-state Actors and the Nation-States System:

The non-state actors have produced several big changes in the nation-states system as well as in the role of the nation-state in international relations. These have been instrumental in increasing international interdependence and relations, as well as in ordering and expanding relations in this age of interdependence.

These have, overshadowed and are still overshadowing the role of the nation-state in some areas. The low politics (Economic relations) has assumed more importance in international relations because of the growth of several economic and functional non-state actors, particularly the multinational corporations.

3. Non-state Actors as the products of the new International System:

However, in themselves non-state actors are the products of the nuclear age, space age, age of communication revolution, transportation revolution, welfarism, internationalism, and globalisation, which have in turn been the products of the nation-state system. Most of these non-state actors have emerged and are working because of the acceptance of their utility by the nation-states.

The inter-governmental organisations, and the international organisations like the United Nations and a host of other international agencies, have their existence in accordance with the wishes of the nation-states. The nation state still holds (near) monopoly on the use of coercive power in the international system. It still moulds the activities of non- state actors more than its behaviour is moulded by them.

4. A New Complexity in International Relations:

Non-state Actors have made international relations more complex and problematic. These have been in the main responsible for a reduced importance of political relations in the international system. Some of these have been acting as harbingers of international peace and security while some others have been acting as agents of neo-colonialism and dependency for the under-developed countries.

These have contributed towards the growth of internationalism, and dilution of nationalism in favour of internationalism. These have also been instrumental in

the emergence of several strong peaceful, developmental and ecological movements. In the study of international relations, these have given rise to the trans-national perspective.

The students of international politics cannot study the real nature and scope of their subject without studying the working and role of non-state actors in transnational relations. The institutionalization of trans-national relations through several non-state and inter-government organisations which act as important actors in international relations, is a continuing phenomenon of contemporary international relations. Non-state actors are bound to remain or even become stronger actors in the future course of relations among nations.

Module No 2 Approches to the study of International Relations

Realist Theory or Approach to the study of International Relations

Realism has been the most dominant school of thought in the post-world war international human relations and still continues to have relevance in the present international relations scenario. The principal line of thinking of the realist school is in terms of power and its exercise by states. In other words, it is chiefly concerned with real politics. Whereas realism demands that immediate

requirements should not be neglected for the sake of the present. Realists argue that even in future the national interest will continue to be the supreme political value and the idealists argue that in future the main concern of man would be human values. The realists hold that it is useless to spend energy on policies aimed at long-term objectives and utopian ideas which appear impracticable. The realist approach has little in common with the idealist or utopian approach which regards power politics as only an abnormal or passing phase of history.

The basic assumptions of realism are:

1. The international system is anarchic.
2. Sovereign states are the principal actors in the international system.
3. States are rational unitary actors each acting under the consideration of its own national interest.
4. National security and survival are the primary 'national interest' of each state.
5. In pursuit of national security, states strive to increase national power.
6. National power and capabilities determine the relations among states.
7. National interest, defined in terms of national power, guides the actions of the states in international relation.

The seeds of realism, however, could be traced to the writings of political philosophers like Thucydides, an ancient Greek historian who wrote the history of the Peloponnesian war and is also cited as an intellectual forerunner of real politics, Chanakya's Arthashastra, Machiavelli's Prince, Thomas Hobbes' Leviathan, Otto von Bismarck, a Prussian statesman who coined the term balance of power and Carl von Clausewitz, a nineteenth century Prussian general and military theorist who wrote on war in which he propounded his greatest dictum that war is nothing but a continuation of politics by other means.

Their understanding of real politics deeply influenced the political realists' perspective of looking at world politics especially from the view point of human nature which they relocated in the sphere of reified states. This leads to a discussion on the propositions put forward by some of the political philosophers and how they helped in the "construction of state", construction of masculinity" and construction of warrior mentality" in the discipline of International Relation. **Chanakya's Arthashastra**, discusses the principles of statecraft at length. The title, Arthashastra, which means "the science of material gain" or "science of polity", does not leave any doubt about its ends. Kautilya suggested that the ruler should use any means to attain his goal and his actions require no moral sanction. The problems and solutions he has suggested to the kings are still having practical significance and relevance.

Machiavelli's classic work The Prince is an embodiment of what a prince should actually be and the ways he should wield his power in order to gain and maintain his sway over his state and perpetuate himself in power. To the attainment of this end the prince is advised to resort to all unprincipled and unethical means not

sanctioned by any religious or scriptural nuances and still be virtuous. He should combine in himself the attributes of both a lion and a fox to be exercised according to the convenience of the demands of the situation. What redounds to perpetuation of power over the state is morality to the prince not some otherworldly nuances. The instrumentalities of power are the guiding star to the prince not people's established views and beliefs.

MORGENTHAU AND REALISM

Political realism in International Relations reached its zenith and assumed a grotesque stature in the hands of Han. J Morgenthau in his seminal work **Politics among Nations: The struggle For Power and Peace** (1948) which comes closer to being a realist textbook. Morgenthau's account of world politics is underpinned by the contrast he draws between two schools of modern political thought and their conceptions of the nature of humanity, society and politics. The first which closely resembles liberal utopianism believes that a rational and moral political order derived from universally abstract principles can be achieved by conscious political action. By contrast the second school, with which Morgenthau identifies and that he calls realism believes the world's imperfections are the result of forces inherent in human nature. His six Principles of political realism summarize his theoretical approach to the study of international relations as outlined below:

1. Politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature which is unchanging. Therefore, it is possible to develop a rational theory of politics and international relations based on these laws that reflects these objectives laws.
2. The key to understanding international politics is the concept of interest defined in terms of power. It sees politics as an autonomous sphere of action. It imposes intellectual discipline, infuses rational order into the subject matter of politics and thus makes the theoretical understanding of politics possible. There is no room for moral or ethical concerns, prejudices, motives, political philosophy, ideology or individual preferences in the determination of foreign policy because actions are constrained by the relative power of the state. The national interest which ought to be sole pursuit of statesmen is always defined in terms of strategic and economic capability.
3. Realism assumes that interest defined as power is an objective category which is universally valid but not with a meaning that is fixed once and for all. The forms and nature of state power will vary in time, place and context but the concept of interest remains consistent. The political, cultural and strategic environment will largely determine the forms of power a state chooses to exercise.

4. Universal moral principles cannot be applied to state action in their abstraction though the state behavior will certainly have moral and ethical implications. Individuals are influenced by moral codes but states are not moral agents. They must be filtered through concrete circumstances of time and place.

5. Political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe. It is the concept of interest defined in terms of power that saves us from the moral excess and political folly. Universal moral principles are not a reliable guide to state behavior. Interest is the perennial guide and standard by which political action must be judged and directed.

6. The political realist maintains the autonomy of the political sphere from every other sphere of human concern, whether they be legal, moral or economic. This helps to see the international domain as analytically distinct from other fields of intellectual inquiry with its own standard of thought and criteria for the analysis and evaluation of state behavior.

In spite of its universal acceptability as one of the guiding principles of foreign policy realism has been subject to various criticisms

1. Power-not the only motivation

In emphasizing power as the principal motivation for political behavior realist theory has not produced an acceptable definition of power. Measuring power presents formidable problems. There is no common unit into which the power is converted for measurement in realist writings. Moreover, power is necessarily related to the objective for which it is to be used. The amount and type of power vary with national goals. In addition, realists have been criticized for allegedly having placed too much emphasis on power to the relative exclusion of other important variables. In Stanley Hoffman's view "it is impossible to subsume under one word variables as different as: power as a condition of policy, and power as a criterion of policy; power as a potential and power in use; power as a sum of resources and power as a set of processes".

2. Flawed view of human nature

Morgenthau's realism was based on a priori assumptions about human nature which by definition cannot be tested or verified to any meaningful extent. He makes a number of claims about the biological basis of the human drive for power and domination, without explaining other aspects of the human conditions which are not as egoistic.

3. Unilluminating concept of national interest

The national interest concept has been the object of criticism. According to Thomas I. Cook and Malcolm Moos, "That national interest

is a necessary criterion of policy is obvious and unilluminating. No statesman, no publicist, no scholar would seriously argue that foreign policy ought to be conducted in opposition to, or in disregard of the national interest". Moreover it is difficult to give operational meaning to the concept of national interest. State leaders are constrained by many forces in interpreting the national interest. They are often captive of their predecessors' policies. They interpret national interest as a result of their cultural training, values and the data made available to them as decision makers. According to Michael Joseph Smith, realists having adopted Max Weber's ethic of responsibility have not presented a competent set of criteria for judging responsibility.

4. Construction of reality

Drawing from the Eurocentric system of the past the realist thinkers tried to apply a series of political concepts to the understanding and analysis of a vastly different contemporary global international system. According to Stephano Guzzini realist theory is best understood as an attempt to translate the maxims of nineteenth century European diplomacy into general principles of American social science. Such efforts have shaped academic research agenda and influenced policy makers. Different from what the reality is, such a mind set well entrenched by realist school in the realm of academic and policy making represents a construction of reality that led to policy action and academic **analyses**

5. Realism represents class relations

Marxists have argued from this that realism is primarily concerned with the reinforcement and reproduction of capitalist relations of production at both the domestic and international levels, and that the system of states structurally supports this mode of production. It is sometimes argued that there is a link between realism and ruling class interest in leading industrial societies. Realism may well play a significant role in reproducing a world order which favours dominant classes. Robert Cox criticized realism for its failure to recognize how its contribution to international stability preserves social and economic inequalities within and between societies.

CONCLUSION

The realists maintain that their approach is still relevant in the present international relations. The realist theory is pioneer and ranks as the most important attempt thus so far to develop a theory of international relations. In Robert Keohane's words, "Realism provides a good starting point for the analysis of cooperation and discord, since its tautological structure and its pessimistic assumptions about individual and state behavior serve as barriers against wishful thinking. According to R.B.J. Walker, political realism should be viewed "less as a coherent theoretical position in its own right than as the site of a great many contested claims and

SUMMURY

1 States are the principal characters in international relations, understanding the dynamics of the state not idealistic, normative and values etc determine the state policies. State policies are determined by national interests, security interest and power structures. Wars are combination of state politics. Chankya (Ancient India), Machiavellie (Mediaval Europe), Bismark (German politician in 19th Century) etc recognized the "Real" status of the states. They essentially hold that state does not always act as a moral or ethical entity but act as the national interests and security concerns. Hobbes argued that men act out of competition, diffidence and glory. They surrender their power to govern themselves to state, Leviathan for security and to avoid war.

2. In modern times many thinkers after witnessing the world wars and several other national conflicts and analyzing their causes felt that idealism is an inadequate theoretical framework to explain IR. They developed a theory based on real political scenario.

□ State must be recognized. Its nature must be identified. Conflict between states is inevitable. As an overreaching international organization it is difficult to control them. Ethics and morality must admit power politics and state policy.

3. IR must recognize true human nature promoted by interest in terms of power. State is a dynamic institute, though it is constantly guided by interest, all the factors do not remain constant. Moral principles are not the guiding principles. Power is not the only motivating factor biological aspects of human life need to be recognized. We must recognize morality, class relationship and politics. IR must integrate all aspects of human life and state

B.Idealism in International Relations

Idealism (Idealist Approach) and Realism (Realist Approach) have been two competing traditional approaches, each of which wants recognition as the sound approach to the study of international relations. Each advocates a particular view of the totality of international reality and believes that it can be adopted as the means for understanding and explaining all aspects of international relations. Both of these represent the classical tradition of the study of international relations. Both Idealism and Realism are normative approaches in essence and content.

The Idealist Approach holds that old, ineffective and harmful modes of behaviour i.e., war, use of force and violence should be abandoned in favour of new ways and means as determined by knowledge, reason, compassion and self-restraint.

The Realist Approach regards international politics as struggle for power among nations and justifies as natural the attempts of a nation to use national power for securing the goals of its national interest. It rejects the Idealist Approach as a Utopian approach. In fact both Idealism and Realism are opposed and competing approaches and each offers a particular view of international relations.

(I) Idealism in International Relations: The Idealist Approach:

Idealism stands for improving the course of international relations by eliminating war, hunger, inequality, tyranny, force, suppression and violence from international relations. To remove these evils is the objective before humankind. Idealism accepts the possibility of creating a world free from these evils by depending upon reason, science and education.

“Political idealism in international relations represents a set of ideas which together oppose war and advocate the reform of international community through dependence upon moral values and the development of international institutions and international law.”

“A world full of human happiness is not beyond human power to achieve.” —
Bertrand Russell

Idealist approach derives strength from the general idea of evolutionary progress in society and the spirit of liberal idealism which was at the back of American policies, particularly during the inter-war years. During the inter-war years (1919-39), the U.S. President Woodrow Wilson became its most forceful exponent.

The Idealist Approach advocates morality as the means for securing the desired objective of making the world an ideal world. It believes that by following morality and moral values in their relations, nations can not only secure their own development, but also can help the world to eliminate war, inequality, despotism, tyranny, violence and force.

“For the idealists, politics is the art of good government and not the art of possible. Politics provides for the good life and respect for his fellow humans, both domestically and internationally.” —Coulombis and Wolfe

As such Idealism advocates the need for improving relations among nations by removing the evils present in the international environment.

Main Features of Idealism:

1. Human nature is essentially good and capable of good deeds in international relations.
2. Human welfare and advancement of civilization are the concerns of all.
3. Bad human behaviour is the product of bad environment and bad institutions.
4. By reforming the environment, bad human behaviour can be eliminated.
5. War represents the worst feature of relations.
6. By reforming international relations, war can be and should be eliminated.
7. Global efforts are needed to end war, violence and tyranny from international relations.
8. International community should work for eliminating such global instruments, features and practices which lead to war.

9. International institutions committed to preserve international peace, international law and order should be developed for securing peace, prosperity and development.

The main supporters of idealism have been Mahatma Gandhi, Bertrand Russell, Woodrow Wilson, Aldous Huxley, William Ladd, Richard Cobben, Margret Mead, and others. They strongly oppose the realist view of international politics as struggle for power and national interest and advocate the use of reason, education and science for securing reforms in relations and for eliminating war and other evils from international relations.

In Political Science the history of Idealism is as old as that of Political Science. Famous Greek Philosopher **Plato is considered the first idealist thinker. The Idealists without bothering for the past and present are concerned for the future and they want to lay down principles to make the future better. Plato had prepared an outline of an idealist State. Similarly, in the international politics the supporters of idealistic view also want to build some institutions and principles which become the guide for the coming generations and the politics based on power struggle could be eliminated.**

The 19th and early 20th centuries saw two general schools of thought in IR. The realist tradition, where states were in a constant state of competition for power, focused on securing power and security through military might. -----

C. Marxian approach International relations

is based upon the concepts of Proletariat Internationalism, Anti-imperialism, Self-determination and Peaceful Co-existence.

It believes in the onward march of international relations towards its logical and destined conclusion—end of capitalism- imperialism, unity of the proletariat as one nation and true internationalism.

Marxian view of international politics is identical with its view of politics. Just as politics within a state involves a continuous struggle between the two contending classes, the rich (owners of means of production, and having monopoly over production, distribution and exchange) and the poor (the

workers, the underdogs who suffer exploitation at the hands of the rich), likewise international politics is a struggle between the capitalist states and the victims of capitalistic exploitation i.e. the poor and backward states.

International relations involve the exploitation of the poor states by the rich states through devices like imperialism and war.

The end of this era is destined to come through the spread of socialism in all states. Workers' revolutions against their internal exploiters would convert the states to socialism and then the forces of socialism would join hands to do away with capitalism at the global level. Finally international relations would get established on the basis of socialist brotherhood of all. The workers of the world would then live together as equal and participating members of the international community, free from exploitation.

Features of Marxian Approach:

Marxian approach to international politics has following key features:

1. Class Struggle between the Rich and Poor States:

The class struggle between the two economic classes is historically and eternally a true fact. Each society is divided between two economic classes—the rich i.e. haves and exploiters who own and use the material means of production for their selfish (profit) ends, and the poor i.e. have-not's and exploited class of workers which toils and yet suffers all exploitation at the hands of the rich.

Likewise, the international society also stands divided between capitalists (Bourgeoisie) states—i.e rich, developed and powerful states who hold a monopoly over the economic power and thereby over the political power, and the poor and down trodden underdeveloped states suffering exploitation at the hands of the bourgeoisie states. The former constitute the dominant and the latter the dominated part of the international society.

However, in the contemporary stage of international politics, the division has come to be between the imperial-bourgeoisie states (capitalist states) and the socialist states. The non-socialist states of the Third World really belong to the socialist class because they too are the victims of exploitation being inflicted by the imperial-bourgeoisie states.

2. The Need to end Imperialistic Exploitations in International Relations:

The imperial-bourgeois states are involved in strife and struggle among themselves and yet are united in maintaining and extending their control over the poor and developing states. They are maintaining a sort of balance of power for preserving their system that suits them. The working class in these countries is not yet in a position to overthrow the capitalists' rule either through the assertion of democratic instruments like elections or through revolutionary means.

It however derives strength from the power that their counter parts enjoy in the socialist systems and the improvement in their condition that has given them power to limit their exploitation at the hands of the bourgeois.

3. Neo-Colonialism as the new hard reality of International Relations:

Presently, the capitalist-bourgeois states are maintaining their power through neo-colonial control over the people of the Third World countries. These constitute the exploiting class in contemporary international relations. The other class is the working people, and not only the industrial workers who are struggling hard to end exploitation.

Their power to do so now stems from their capacity to resist the exploitation by their employers in the capitalist countries and the successes the working people have been able to register in the socialist countries. Working people of all countries are uniting in accordance with the call given by the Communist Manifesto. It is an important characteristic of international relations which must be analyzed for judging the true nature of contemporary internationalism.

Thus, Marxian approach seeks to analyze international relations in terms of the relations between the capitalist-bourgeoisies states on the one hand and socialist states and states of the Third World on the other hand.

Four Basic Elements of Marxian Approach:

Prof. Arun Bose in this article, lists the following four elements of the basic framework of Marxian view of International Politics:

1. Proletarian Internationalism:

Marxian view of International Politics is based upon the concept of Proletarian Internationalism which in itself is based upon the concept of unity of the working class at the international level. Marxism believes that the final objective to be secured is: International Socialist Order, through proletarian internationalism against bourgeois nationalism.

The concept of Proletarian Internationalism includes:

(i) The world of proletariats have a common interest, independent of all nationality;

A bourgeoisie

(ii) Working men have no country, since the proletariat of each country must first acquire political supremacy; must first constitute itself in a nation, it is itself national;

(iii) Unit action by the proletariat is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat; and

(iv) In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to....and hostility of one nation by another will come to an end.

2. Anti-Imperialism:

Marxian view of International Politics believes that the breakup of the bourgeois world order is inevitable. Capitalism has reached its final stage i.e., imperialism. Wars, militarism and armed conflicts have become the order of the day in this imperialist stage.

The contemporary era of international relations shows:

(i) Capitalism has become international and monopolistic;

(ii) Uneven political economic development is an absolute law of capitalism;

(iii) Hence, the proletarian revolution is possible not only in several countries of Europe, but even in one capitalist country which would form the nucleus, the base, the hegemony, of world socialist revolution attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries.

Thus overthrow of Imperialism is inevitable in international relations and spread of socialism is the means for this end.

3. Self-Determination:

Marxian approach accepts self-determination as the principle of organizing the international society. It advocates that all nations of the world must be free to determine their political destiny. Colonial system must go. Self-determination by all the nations alone can give an enduring and strong basis to international relations.

4. Peaceful Coexistence:

The Marxists advocate that all nation-states of the world must live peacefully without criticizing or undermining other's social and political systems.

It implies:

(i) Proletarian Revolution would be victorious first in several countries, or even in one country;

(ii) It has to survive capitalistic encirclement by relying on anti-imperialist contradictions;

(iii) The best way to achieve this is to try to work at the relations of peaceful coexistence between socialist states and, at least, some if not all the capitalist states.

The acceptance of peaceful coexistence, however, does not mean that the limits of socialism have been achieved; and that capitalism and imperialism will continue to prevail and shall never be overthrown. It only means that the struggle between the labour and capital, between the social systems, will continue in different forms till such time as the ideas and achievements of scientific socialism triumph over capitalism.

To sum up, Marxian approach to international relations is based upon the concepts of Proletariat Internationalism, Anti-imperialism, Self-determination and Peaceful Co-existence. It believes in the onward march of international relations towards its logical and destined conclusion—end of capitalism- imperialism, unity of the proletariat as one nation and true internationalism.

The Marxian approach to international relations, the socialists believe, can fruitfully explain its past, present and the future. The increased importance of international economic relations and the emerging struggle between the forces of colonialism now new-colonialism and anti-colonial Third World plus former socialist states is quoted by the supporters of the Marxian Approach to observe that these facts fully bring home the utility of Marxian Approach to international relations.

However, the critics describe it as a Utopian approach which cannot realistically explain the realities of politics and international politics. The exploitation of workers by the workers in the ‘Socialist Countries’; the continued presence of powerful national sentiments—even in the hey days of socialism in the former socialist states of Eastern Europe and Russia; the acceptance of peaceful coexistence instead of open and total support for class struggle and revolution; and the strength of nationalism against proletarian or class internationalism cannot be really explained by the Marxists.

In the last decade of the 20th century, non-communist, non-proletarian all-people liberalizing regimes were established in almost all the former socialist states of Eastern Europe and the Republics of Central Asia. These states have now abandoned Marxism in favour of political and economic liberalism.

This development has given strength to the principle of nation-state. Even the emergence of ethnic conflicts in some states has tended to reflect the weakness of Marxian thesis of economic class wars. As a concept of organization of regimes, Marxism has suffered a big decline. This has, in turn, decreased the popularity of Marxian approach.

However, the recent decline cannot be taken to mean that Marxian approach stands totally rejected as an approach to the study of international relations. It can be fruitfully used to explain several aspects of relations among nations, particularly the politics of economic relations between the developed and the developing countries of the world.

D. Impact of John Rawls on International Relations

In *The Law of Peoples* Having worked out a theory of justice for a self-contained liberal society in *A Theory of Justice* Rawls goes on to extend his approach to international relations in his work *The Law of Peoples*. *The Law of Peoples* represents Rawls's reflections on how reasonable citizens and people might live together peacefully in a just world. Rawls published this argument first in 1993 as a short article.

The fundamental aim of *The Law of Peoples* is to examine how the content of a theory of international justice “might be developed out of a liberal idea of justice similar to, but more general than, the idea of ‘justice as fairness’”.²⁹ By the law of peoples, Rawls makes reference to “a political conception of right and justice that applies to the principles and norms of international law and practice.”³⁰ Rawls begins with the assumption that no global government or world state would be legitimate or just

. According to him, any world government would either be a global despot or characterized by groups fighting to gain political independence. The law of peoples is then not a cosmopolitan initiative; rather it is international or perhaps interstate. However, once again Rawls remains forthrightly committed to the liberal doctrine, as his attempt is to work out a foreign policy that guides a liberal society in its interactions with other societies, both liberal and non-liberal.

The major motivating factor for the law of peoples is clearly the injustice prevalent in the international system. In the words of Rawls: Two main ideas motivate the Law of Peoples. One is that the great evils of human history – unjust war and

oppression, religious persecution and the denial of liberty of conscience, starvation and poverty, not to mention genocide and mass murder – follow from political injustice with its own cruelties and callousness...

The other main idea, obviously connected with the first, is that, once the gravest forms of political injustice are eliminated by following just (or at least decent) social policies and establishing just (or at least decent) basic institutions, these great evils will eventually disappear. Our hope for the future of our society rests on the belief that the social world allows a reasonably just constitutional democracy existing as a member of a reasonably just Society of Peoples.³¹ Rawls uses the term “Society of Peoples” to mean all those people who follow the ideals and principles of the Law of Peoples in their mutual relations. These people have their own internal governments, which may be constituted by liberal democratic or non-liberal but decent governments. The term “decent” is used for non-liberal societies whose basic institutions meet certain specified conditions of political right and justice and lead their citizen to honour a reasonably just law. In *The Law of Peoples*, Rawls aims to derive the laws to which well-ordered peoples would agree. For Rawls, well-ordered peoples include reasonable liberal peoples and ‘decent peoples’, that is, though they are not liberal, they have a ‘decent consultation hierarchy’, among other features. Rawls argues that the ‘Law of Peoples’ he endorses is a realist utopia. It is realistic because it takes account of many real conditions, for instance, by assuming a fair amount of diversity exists in the world; not all peoples of the world do or can reasonably be made to endorse liberal principles

.Here Rawls recognizes any principle of international justice must accommodate the fact that there is much more pluralism and diversity in worldviews – or reasonable pluralism, among societies than there is within a single liberal society. He specifies two conditions that govern its being realistic: first,

it is realistic because it takes applicable to ongoing political and social arrangements.

While A Theory of Justice justified the establishment of two principles of justice, in The Law of Peoples, Rawls justifies eight principles, which are as follows:

1. Peoples are free and independent, and their freedom and independence are to be respected by other peoples.
2. Peoples are to observe treaties and undertakings
- . 3. Peoples are equal and are parties to the agreements that bind them.
4. Peoples are to observe a duty of non-intervention
- . 5. Peoples have the right of self-defense but not right to instigate war for reasons other than self-defense.
6. Peoples are to honour human rights.
7. Peoples are to observe certain specified restrictions in the conduct of war.
8. Peoples have a duty to assist other peoples living under unfavourable conditions that prevent their having a just or decent political and social regime.

The main question, however, is how are these principles arrived upon? Rawls's derivation occurs in several stages. First, he concerns himself only with liberal peoples and the principles they would endorse. He employs two original positions to derive his Law of Peoples for liberal peoples: the first original position grounds the social contract of the liberal political conception of a constitutionally democratic regime while the second operates among representatives of liberal peoples. The first original position covers, by now, familiar territory. The parties in the original position must decide the fair terms of cooperation that will regulate the basic structure

of society. They are modelled as rational and “their aim is to do the best they can for citizens whose basic interests they represent, as specified by the primary goods, which cover their basic needs as citizens.”

Since parties are behind a veil of ignorance, they will be motivated to choose a basic structure of society that reflects the freedom and equality of persons.

After the principles governing the liberal society have been derived, Rawls moves to the international level. Now a second original position is employed to derive the foreign policy that liberal peoples would choose. The representatives of peoples are subject to an appropriate veil of ignorance for the situation. As Rawls argues, “they do not know, for example, the size of the territory, or the population or the relative strength of the people whose fundamental interests they represent. While they know that reasonably favourable conditions obtain that make democracy possible, they do not know the extent of their natural resources, of the level of their economic development, or any such related information.... This makes the use of the original position at the second level a device of representation just as it is at the first level.”

In addition, Rawls believes three organizations would be chosen: one aimed at securing fair trade among peoples, one which enables peoples to borrow from a cooperative banking institution, and one which plays a similar role of the United Nations, which he refers to as “a Confederation of Peoples (not states)”.

Having shown that liberal peoples would select the eight principles and three organizations, Rawls shows how decent peoples would select the same principles and organizations. What, first of all, are “decent peoples”, according to Rawls? Rawls specifies that for a people to count as “decent”, at least four central conditions must be met. First, the society must

not be aggressive; it must conduct its affairs in ways that are peaceful and respectful of other societies. Second, the system of law and its idea of justice must secure basic human rights for all members of the people. However, it is important to realize that the list of particular rights that must be secured is very short. It includes only the following:

a. The right to life, by which he means the right to the means of subsistence and security

; b. The right to liberty, which equates to freedom from slavery or forced occupation but also includes some liberty of conscience, enough to ensure freedom of religion and thought

; c. The right to personal property; and

d. The right to formal equality, by which he means that similar cases be treated similarly. He thinks all peoples (whether liberal or non-liberal) should be able to endorse this pared-down list of human rights. The third condition a decent people must satisfy is that judges and others who administer the legal system must believe that the law incorporates an idea of justice according to which there is a common good. Fourth, a decent people must have a “decent consultation hierarchy”, in which significant interests of all members of the people are taken into account.

Module No 3 . Peace and Conflict Studies

Introduction..

Since the beginning of history the goal of an enduring state of peace has been the foremost objective of human societies. The Upanishads positively reverberate with the most earnest prayers of peace. The Bible speaks of the vision of Isaiah in which swords were turned into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks, and man gave up the art of making war.

These ancient and deep-seated longings for peace have been poignantly reaffirmed after every war, as the evolution of man progressed through wars of every growing ferocity. It would seem that man has indeed made a fine art of destroying his own species with increasing efficacy and diminishing cost. And now in the age of thermonuclear weapons, computers and micro-electronics, the cult of war has reached its ultimate climax. We are closer today than year before to an entirely unprecedented type of universal disaster that could lead to the disappearance of the human species.

The question of peace in international relations has been endlessly discussed by statesmen/ thinkers and ordinary citizens. They have struggled to find ways to end forever the wars between nations

that have been moved by memories of bloody wars in the past, and by fear of more 2 terrible conflicts that could come . War has become a historical anachronism that should have been abolished a long time ago. Not only it is now rational to hope for the establishment of an enduring peace for the entire world, but the only wisdom in the nuclear age is to work, as well as hope, for such a 3 peace •

Definition of Peace

: How then are we to introduce the idea of peace? Peace of course is a state without war- Hence, it may be argued that war must be unconditionally rejected, irrespective of reasons, if we are to sustain peace. This is the negative concept of peace, a concept also known as blind antiracism or sentimental pacifism . None will object against the people with the trend of thought when they say that the inhuman misery of war must be prevented by all means. Nothing is wrong, for sure, with what they are saying.

The trouble* however/ is that, just as typhoons cannot be prevented by means of legislation, war cannot be stopped by a mere anti-war argument or sentimental desire. In other words, war is a supra-theoretical matter. Now, peace is a term that is used in referring to a state of concert secured through the mutual assurance of basic conditions necessary for independence and autonomy. Peace, therefore, has to be a joint effort, that is, bilateral rather than unilateral. If the idea of anti-war or peace is injudiciously advocated to exact from a people a one-sided renunciation of war, it will virtually come to no more than surrendering to the enemy.

Another kind of peace is a peace that stands on practical preventive measures against war, possibly through a series of mutual cooperative steps. This is the positive concept of peace.

In essence, it promotes, instead of the reckless idea of anti-war, a forum of international dialogue of nonviolence based on mutual trust and collaboration. This will bring us the relaxation of international tensions to start with, then the reduction of armaments, and finally a permanent peace on earth through the removal of utilitarianistic or idealistic absurdity and injustice that give rise to war .

If peace is to be based on the mutual concord aim at a liable society, first, we must bring about co-existence and prosperity through mutual understanding and friendship, and second, we must arouse, through the promotion of peace-oriented ideas, public hatred and indignation at aggressor by refusing to accept any provocation of war.

For example, when a nation attacks another, the entire world may rise up to stage protest rallies in denouncing the inhuman act of mass murder and destruction. By inspiring a peace-loving spirit in the minds of people in this way, we can rightly safeguard our peace.

It is true that by promoting the spirit of love for peace as well as the spirit of hatred against aggression throughout the world, we can create the circumstances under which not only local skirmishes are stopped from spreading but also big powers dare not conceive the idea of campaigning for a global war. Just as a big fire is started by a small spark, big wars are always set off by small incidents.

The First and Second World Wars were not any exceptions. Even a trivial dispute should be quenched lest it escalates into a world war . Truly a constructive way of establishing world peace must commence with uniting our minds into one rather than instituting systems or concluding treaties for surveillance purpose.

In other words, the work must begin with erasing alien feeling and/ at the same time advocating peace-loving ideas. Inasmuch as

the motive of all warfare originate from the human mind, war can not be prevented without changing the mind itself.

We should hurry on with the diffusion of the right knowledge of peace in its concept and principle. Only through the implantation of the correct idea of peace, will be able to acquire the strength to stop war . Social science has uncovered more knowledge about war than about peace, just as psychology probably has yielded more insights into negative deviance (such as mental illness) than into positive deviance.

Significance of Peace in International Relations

Stable international peace- that brings security and happiness to the citizens of all countries must mean much more than simple absence of war. It must eliminate violence and abuse of wealth and power. It must constantly expand the body of accepted international law. It can not eliminate all conflicts of personal or national interest, but it must provide means of settling those conflicts on the basis of the law. And it must be founded on the truth that the major interest of all nations, the really vital "national interests" are not in conflict, but are common interests that the nations share and that they can only be promoted by common action.

In the second half of the 20th century/ the achievement of stable peace must mean a major effort by the

advancement countries to eliminate the grinding poverty and ignorance in which nearly two-thirds of humanity now live. This can best be done through international institutions of the United Nations. It can only be done if the arms race is ended. It can only be accomplished if the resources and genius now devoted to weapons are diverted to science and engineering for the betterment of all mankind* rather than for mankind's destruction. The alternative to war lies in the constant constitutional growth of the parliamentary/ executive and legal institutions of the United Nations.

Today almost everyone in every country would say that he is in favour of peace. Western democracies would add: that "if only the communists would give up their plot for world conquest all nations could without arm and live in prosperity together". In the communist countries many would say almost the same* only substituting the word "imperialists" with "communists".

Such people pointed out that throughout recorded history/ war organized armed conflict between groups# tribes/ cities and nations had been a constant feature of human society. They believed that military success was the height of human achievement and that armed might was the measure of national greatness and prestige.

In support of their belief they argued and a handful of militarists still argue along the following line of reasoning:

(i) that man is by nature a fighting animal;

(ii) that his progress has been achieved by the survival of the fittest in the unending struggle for wealth and power;

(iii)that stable peace is therefore contrary to the decisive forces in human evolution happy and that if stable peace could be achieved, man's worth and achievements would decline. As things have been in the past* the militarists say* so they must be in the future, they concluded that because there 13 always have been wars, there always will be wars.

The fact that disarmament is not an effective and reliable method of preserving peace is too obvious to pass unnoticed. So an alternate idea was suggested: to use armaments in order to oppose and punish the aggressor, or to put it differently, in the absence of cooperative means of preventive war, to enforce peace through military methods. This idea is by no means so new as its protagonists believe. Nor is the record of its application very encouraging.

CONFLICT AND METHODS OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION

The states system is inherently competitive. States interact with each other in the contemporary system in numerous fields such as trade, international security, tourism, cultural exchanges, control of nuclear weapons etc. When governments of nation states collaborate with each other, some areas of disagreement will arise. Insofar as states seek to preserve and increase their power and stature relative to each other, rather than to cooperate and coexist, they come inexorably into conflict. Enhancement of prestige, aggrandizement of power and promotion of ideology are objectives that have attracted opposition and conflict because of their lack of specific content and clearly defined limits.

The existence of conflict in the global system has obliged states to develop techniques for the resolution of their disputes. The methods have been developed over the centuries for the conflict resolution. It can be resolved either through pacific methods and if not then through forcible or coercive means. The UN has also taken over the responsibility for resolving international disputes but it has not proved successful in resolving the underlying issues but merely put a lid on extensive violence.

Interactions between states in the contemporary system are numerous and diverse. We often classify them according to issue areas, such as trade, international security, tourism, technical cooperation, cultural exchanges, control of nuclear weapons and the like. Virtually all the relationships contain characteristics of conflict. Even in the most collaborative enterprise between governments, some areas of disagreement will arise. The parties to an international conflict are normally, but not necessarily the governments of nation states. Parties seek to achieve certain objectives such as additional or more secure territory, security, control of valuable resources, access to markets, alliances, world revolution, the overthrow of an unfriendly government and many other things. In order to achieve or defend these objectives, their demands, actions or both will run counter to the interests and objectives of other parties.

Conflict Perception

All states in the process of interaction confront with each other. State A on the input end making demands to the State B on the output end, which is to give response. State A is the demand maker, stressing on certain demands. Both the demand maker as well as decision maker are sovereign states.

Decisions taken by State B may not be in conformity with the demands of State A and are not binding, they have to compromise and when they fail to do so, conflict arose; e.g, Pakistan being State A demanded that Kashmir should be given independence but State B i.e. India does not compromise thus conflict arose. Holsti has defined conflict as “a situation involving incompatible collective objectives and the possibility of armed conflict between two or more governments”

Conflict Resolution

The existence of conflict in the global system has obliged states to develop techniques for the resolution of their disputes. The development and implementation of peaceful strategies for settling conflicts using alternatives to violent forms of leverage is known by the general term conflict resolution.⁹ The methods developed over the centuries for the resolution of international conflict may be classified into three general categories: a) methods of pacific conflict resolution; b) coercive procedures short of war; and c) forcible procedures through war.

The methods of pacific resolution make available a variety of peaceful substitutes for violence. In general terms, they may be classified as diplomatic- political or judicial. They are following:

Diplomacy

Diplomacy is a means to settle international disputes. It is the art of approaching or persuading the opponent for resolving an issue peacefully. Diplomacy can be used in national politics. It can be used to settle the regional and ethnical disputes peacefully. It involves direct government to government interactions. Sir Ernest Satow in his guide to diplomatic practice explained diplomacy as “The application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between governments of independent states.”

Diplomacy is the process of conducting communication among states through officially recognized representatives. The communication is almost continuous among states as their representatives or diplomats protect state interests and reduce conflict. Diplomacy has an instrumental value in the settlement of specific conflicts. States may prosecute their differences and intensify their conflicts by a great variety of methods, but tensions between them are most effectively managed and reduced through diplomatic means.

Diplomatic methods of resolving conflict can be attempted through direct negotiations, good offices, mediation, inquiry and conciliation. These different forms of diplomacy are less formal than either judicial settlement or arbitration. If the parties to an international dispute are disposed to discuss their differences rather than to threaten one another or to fight about them; they will resort to negotiations as a means of settlement. Direct Negotiations may take the form of bilateral or multilateral diplomacy. Such negotiations may be conducted between heads of states, directly through ambassadors and other accredited diplomats of the concerned parties or through an international conference.

When two states are unable to reach agreement and relations between them become strained it is permissible for outside actors to offer their services in an effort to facilitate a settlement. The technique of good offices may be invoked A

“tender of good offices” is a polite inquiry as to whether the third state can be of service in preserving or restoring peace .it is often extended at the request of one of the parties to the controversy and is frequently made after a rupture of diplomatic relations or in course of war. If it is accepted on both sides, the third state may transmit suggestions for a settlement between the parties or may make suggestions itself.

In the latter case true “mediation occurs”. Most conflict resolution uses a third party whose role is mediation between two conflicting parties, according to Goldstein.

Mediation

Mediation is a procedure by which, in addition to providing good offices, a third party participate actively in the negotiations. It tries to reconcile the opposite claims and to appease mutual resentments developed by the contending parties. The mediator may not impose its own solution on the dispute but is expected to take a strong initiative in proposing formulas. In the first convention of the first Hague Peace Conference of 1899, it is provided that “the function of a mediator was declared to be that of reconciling the opposing claims and appeasing the feelings of resentment which may have arisen between the states at variance.”

Most of the today’s international conflicts have one or more mediating parties working regularly to resolve the conflict short of violence. There is no hard and fast rule denoting what kinds of third parties mediate in what sort of propose solutions based on an assessment of each side’s demands and interests. As there is a lack of any procedure in both methods for conducting a thorough investigation into the facts of the law, hence these steps may be considered as preliminary to the more specialized techniques of conciliation and inquiry.

Inquiry designates the resolution of conflict through establishment of a commission of inquiry. Such a group, consisting of an equal number of members from each of the disputing parties plus one or more from other states, act to facilitate a solution of the conflict. Thus, in case of disputed boundaries, boundary commission may be appointed to inquire into the historical and geographical facts which are the subject of controversy and thus clarify the issue for a boundary agreement. The commission of inquiry does no more than determine the facts of a dispute by means of impartial investigation.

Conciliation

Conciliation is a procedure that combines inquiry and mediation. It signifies the reference of a dispute to a commission or committee to make a report with proposals to the parties for settlement, such proposals not being of a binding character. According to Judge Manly O. Hudson “Conciliation is a process of formulating proposals of settlement after an investigation of the facts and an

effort to, reconcile opposing contentions, the parties to the dispute being left free to accept or reject the proposals formulated.”

Conciliation multiplies the pacifying effects of both mediation and inquiry in the resolution of troublesome disputes. It is the most formalized diplomatic and political method of settling international conflicts. It is particularly useful for serious political disputes because its flexibility makes it more adaptable to varying circumstances than more rigid judicial or legislative procedures. Its object is always peace by compromise not justice by law.

Conflict situation can be resolved through bargaining process between two or more than two states. Bargaining is one of the prepositions for resolving the severe conflict which conflict. Today the UN is the most important mediator on the world scene. Some regional conflicts are mediated through regional organizations such as the European Community and the Organization of American States. Mediators may actively develop from severe crisis. Deterrence is also a bargaining. Bargaining is the adjustment or syntheses of the divergent perceptions or the divergent vital strategic goals with the main purpose of retaining major self interests.” Bargaining may be defined as “tacit or direct communication in an attempt to reach agreement on an exchange of value-that is, of tangible or intangible terms that one or both parties value.”

Judicial methods

Judicial methods of resolving conflict are an attempt to regularize the terms and procedures that form the basis of the disposal of disputes. The two judicial procedures are arbitration and adjudication. Solutions are reached on the basis of law and in some cases equity but they explicitly exclude political compromise because only legal disputes can be judicially resolved. The awards of arbitration and the decisions of an international court are binding on the disputing parties and hence these procedures are described as decisional or binding.

□ **Arbitration:** The procedure known as arbitration is one of the oldest methods used by western countries to settle international disputes.¹⁵ It means reference of a dispute or conflict between the states to a third party, freely chosen by the parties, who make an award. If both sides agree in advance to abide by a solution devised by a mediator the process is called arbitration.¹⁶ In that case both sides present their arguments to the arbitrator who decides on a fair solution. For example the Israelis and Egyptians submitted their border dispute over the hotel at Taba to arbitration when they could not come to an agreement on their own.

□ In its simplest form, arbitration involves the negotiation by the parties to the dispute of a bilateral treaty, known as compromise, in which they state clearly the question to be arbitrated, name the arbitrators and set forth the rules of procedure and principles of law to be applied. When a dispute is not both sides agree in advance to abide by a solution devised by a mediator the process is called arbitration.¹⁶ In that case both sides present their arguments to the arbitrator who

decides on a fair solution. For example the Israelis and Egyptians submitted their border dispute over the hotel at Taba to arbitration when they could not come to an agreement on their own.

□ In its simplest form, arbitration involves the negotiation by the parties to the dispute of a bilateral treaty, known as compromise, in which they state clearly the question to be arbitrated, name the arbitrators and set forth the rules of procedure and principles of law to be applied. When a dispute is not submitted to the judgment of a single arbitrator, such as the sovereign of a third state, a tribunal is set up consisting usually of one or two nationals of each of the disputing states, plus one or more nationals of outside states. These may be named in the compromise. One of the outsiders usually acts as umpire. As C.C Hyde defined arbitration as “an impartial adjudication according to a law and that before a tribunal of which at least a single member, who is commonly a national or state neutral to the contest, acts as an umpire.” The tribunal reaches decision by a majority vote and submits a written statement of the award to the respective disputants. An arbitral award is binding upon the parties. However it can be rejected on certain grounds. The process of arbitration is identical with that of adjudication except as to the method of choosing judges.

□ **Adjudication:** International disputes can be settled by a properly constituted international judicial tribunal applying rules of law. The only general organ of judicial settlement at present available in the international community is the International Court of Justice at The Hague, which succeeded to and preserves continuity with the Permanent Court of International Justice. The court is supposed to decide the case(s) on the basis of international law and jurisdiction usually extends only to legal issues.¹⁸ That government will not agree to this method of conflict resolution which has a weak legal position in a contentious situation. □ Most of the conflicts have important legal aspects, but one or both of the parties do not wish to characterize the situation in legal terms because their political objectives and actions are not compatible with existing legal principles or jurisdiction. In other cases, a justifiable dispute is not handled by legal procedures because of greater tensions and conflicts between the two states. There is also problem of the sources of modern international law and governmental attitudes towards that law. There must be considerable common interest between the opponents before the procedure can be used. Both the parties must agree that settlement should be based on rules of international law and it should be an award outcome, whereby one party wins and one loses, rather than a compromise. But these prerequisites are seldom found simultaneously in conflicts and crises.

Coercive Procedures Short of War

States turn to coercive but non violent methods of settling a dispute if pacific procedures fail to produce satisfaction. Among the non violent coercive techniques are the recall of diplomats, expulsion of opposing states' diplomats,

denial of recognition of a regime, breaking off diplomatic relations and suspension of treaty obligations. More obviously “unfriendly” is the class of actions involving force short of war: blockade, boycott, embargo, reprisal and Retorsion.

□ **The Pacific Blockade:** It appears to have been first employed in 1827; since that date there have been about 20 instances of its employment.¹⁹ It is also a measure involving force short of war for the settlement of dispute. However, it is sometimes employed in peace. In times of war, the blockade of a belligerent state’s ports is a very common naval operation. It is generally designed to coerce the state whose ports are blockaded into complying with a request for satisfaction by the blockading states.

□ **Retorsion:** Another hostile strategy but short of war for resolving the conflict is Retorsion which means an unfriendly but legal act by another state. It does not involve the armed force. The best known instance of Retorsion is the severance of diplomatic relations, e.g. the US broke off diplomatic relations with Iran when its citizens seized the US embassy in Tehran in 1979. Other acts of Retorsion involve revocation of diplomatic privileges or withdrawal of fiscal or tariff concessions.

An unusual act of Retorsion was President Jimmy Carter’s refusal to allow athletes from US to participate in 1980. Olympics held in Moscow. His decision was a protest against the Soviet Union’s invasion of Afghanistan in 1979.

□ **Reprisals:** Another hostile method is reprisals. These are methods adopted by the states for securing redress from another state by retaliatory measures. It means coercive measures adopted by one state against another for the purpose of settling some dispute brought about by the latter’s illegal or unjustified conduct. The coercion can be non violent such as the seizure of property or a naval blockade, or violent as in the case of an armed attack. Reprisals are usually thought of as illegal whereas Retorsion consists of retaliatory conduct to which no legal objection can be taken. Reprisals are only justified if their purpose is to bring about a satisfactory settlement of a dispute.

-----+----++
--

Arm Race-Disarmament

An arms race denotes a rapid increase in the quantity or quality of instruments of military power by rival states in peacetime. The first modern arms race took place when France and Russia challenged the naval superiority of Britain in the late nineteenth century. Germany’s attempt to surpass Britain’s fleet spilled over into World War I, while tensions after the war between the United States, Britain and Japan resulted in the first major arms-limitation treaty at the Washington Conference.

The build-up of arms was also a characteristic of the Cold War between the US and the Soviet Union, though the development of nuclear weapons changed the scenario. Over the past

century, the arms race metaphor has assumed a prominent place in public discussion of military affairs. But even more than the other colourful metaphors of security studies, balance of power, escalation, and the like it may cloud rather than clarify understanding of the dynamics of international rivalries.

An arms race denotes a rapid, competitive increase in the quantity or quality of instruments of military or naval power by rival states in peacetime. What it connotes is a game with a logic of its own. Typically, in popular depictions of arms races, the political calculations that start and regulate the pace of the game remain obscure. As

Charles H. Fairbanks, Jr., has noted, ‘The strange result is that the activity of the other side, and not one’s own resources, plans, and motives, becomes the determinant of one’s behavior.’” and what constitutes the ‘finish line’ of the game is the province of assertion, rather than analysis. Many participants have claimed that the likelihood of war increases as the accumulation of arms proceeds peace.

A close examination of the historical evidence reveals a different picture. Political purposes almost always drive and govern arms races. It is common for a major race to be initiated by a state interested in changing the political status quo. In some cases, the response of states content with the status quo is swift and resolute, but in other cases it is constrained by domestic political or economic considerations or diverted by diplomatic calculations. The course of an arms race has frequently exacerbated a sense of rivalry and occasionally even determined the timing of a war; but most often it has ended in a political settlement between rivals or in a decision by one side to moderate its build-up.

The first competitive build-up in which contemporaries used the arms race metaphor seems to have been the naval rivalry in the late nineteenth century, in which France and Russia challenged Britain in the context of acute tensions over colonial expansion. The British responded with a determination to remain masters of the seas.

The ultimate result was not war, but rather an Anglo-French political settlement in 1904 and an Anglo-Russian rapprochement in 1907 against the background of a rising German threat.

The German challenge to Britain in the early twentieth century involved the most famous naval arms race of all. As the post Bismarck political leadership decided that Germany must become a world power, Admiral von Tirpitz was able to justify building a large German battle fleet. When the British finally responded, the upshot was a competition that fit an action-reaction model more closely than any other arms race. The Germans in the end could not keep up, because of domestic difficulties in raising taxes and pressures to give greater priority to spending on the army. Though the naval arms race did poison Anglo-German relations, it was the actions of the German army, not the German navy that ultimately produced war in 1914. A third major naval arms race, involving the United States, Britain, and Japan, erupted at the end of World War I. It was fuelled by Japanese efforts to expand their political influence in East Asia and by an American attempt to gain greater political leverage over Britain. This was a race that, for financial reasons, none of the participants wanted to run very far. It ended at the Washington Conference of 1921-1922 with the first major arms-limitation treaty ever and a new political settlement for East Asia. In fact, an arms race among European armies had some part in the outbreak of World War I. In the July crisis of 1914, German chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg took greater risks in brinkmanship than he might have otherwise done, because of a presumption that Russia’s stepped up efforts to improve its military capability meant Germany would be in a stronger position to win a war in 1914 than later.

Similarly, Adolf Hitler was in a rush to attack France in 1940 and the Soviet Union in 1941, partly because of the dynamics of an arms race that he had started in the 1930s. Held back by domestic financial constraints, Britain and France had lagged behind. But they and Germany’s

other adversaries, had accelerated their rearmament in the late 1930s and Hitler moved forward his program of conquest lest the German lead to be overtaken. Japan, too, succumbed to 'now or never' calculations in 1941. Its naval leaders appreciated that the Japanese navy had gained a lead over the US Pacific Fleet in every class of warship, but that a massive American naval program begun in 1940 would leave them far behind by 1943. Coupled with the effects of an American oil embargo against Japan, this playing out of the dynamics of an arms race helped to prompt an attack on the United States in December 1941. But in this case, as in the two European wars, hegemonic political ambitions fuelled the conflict.

Leads and lags in an arms race against a background of a hegemonic struggle characterized the Cold War as well, but the deterrent effect of weapons of mass destruction made 'now or never' calculations much less tempting for the superpowers of the nuclear age. The arms competition between the United States and the Soviet Union did not fit an action-reaction model very well. For domestic political and economic reasons, the United States was slow to rearm in the late 1940s even as it perceived hegemonic ambitions on the part of the Soviets. After the United States did great increase in its nuclear and conventional arms during the Korean War, the Soviet leadership for its own domestic reasons made only a partial response. When from the mid-1960s the Soviets undertook the most massive peacetime military build-up in history, the United States chose to disengage somewhat from the race. Not until after 1979 did it reassess its posture. The new qualitative improvements embodied in the last American arms spurt of the Cold War made Soviet military leaders nervous and helps to explain why they were willing in the mid-1980s to accept the new ideas promoted by Mikhail Gorbachev in hopes of raising the technological level of Soviet society. The arms race that had produced the greatest anxiety among contemporaries ended in the most astonishing political settlement of the past century.

ARMS RACE A THREAT TO WORLD PEACE

The nuclear arms race threatens world peace because the weapons being created had the potential to destroy the whole world. The superpowers paranoia for one another grew as the power of the weapons created grew and multiplied further threatened world peace since any minor movement made by either power could have been misinterpreted as an attack.

However, it becomes clear that the arms race did in fact deter any form of violence between the USA and the USSR. This was due to their fear of mass destruction and that it was more a competition of ability between the two powers rather than a desire to attack their opponent. The arms race wasn't threatening; the fact that both nations had the capability to destroy the world can be seen as enough for the arms race to have been a threat to world peace. The Culture of secrecy that developed during the arms race threatened world peace because it fueled the paranoia consuming each nation as to whether the other had military superiority. The fears concerning both powers led to assumptions being made on the other country's progress, this is evident with the profound effect the Gaither report of 1957 had on the US. The report which was commissioned just after Sputnik heightened fear that the Soviet Union had military superiority because there was a missile gap between the two nations.

Nuclear Arms Race a Threat to World Peace

The culture of secrecy and the ignition of fear it created made the arms race a threat to world peace. Additionally, the concentration of power in the hands of both nations encouraged dangerous tactics to be considered, such as, the US doctrine of 'massive retaliation' in 1954. The US was confident at this point of their nuclear superiority over the world and believed that no nation would risk a war against their nuclear based force, it used the method of brinkmanship which involved going to the brink of nuclear war.

Therefore the method was extremely provocative and if used would easily cause further hostility and conflict, especially since the USSR was adopting similar methods. An example of

Brinkmanship can be seen in the Cuban Missile crisis 1962 which did arguably come to the brink of nuclear war, it's an example of how dangerous the method is since if both powers were attempting to use it wouldn't have the desired effect of forcing the other country into submission.

Consequently it seems the arms race in the 1950's had led to over confidence for both nations to be considering such tactics which undoubtedly would have threatened world peace. However, the nuclear arms race did arguably deter both nations from participating in direct conflict due to the threat it would disrupt world peace. This concept of nuclear deterrence arose during the Korean War due to the direct conflict posed not only Korea but also the world.

To prevent nuclear escalation procedures were followed such as Stalin not becoming directly involved in the war and Truman not using nuclear weapons against China, since this would lead to Russia having to support China and an indirect nuclear conflict taking place.

When evaluating the Cuban Missile Crisis it is evident that the different concepts and methods have on the outcome of nuclear threat, massive retaliation led to a quarantine in the Cuban crisis, whilst in the Korean War nuclear deterrence led to peaceful existence of both countries in opposition with no nuclear threat.

But this show that different methods being interpreted played a key role in the arms race being a threat to world peace and that it solely the nuclear arms being created. It is also clear during 1949-62 that the arms race was more of a competition between the two powers, hence 'race'. Neither concluded any form of destruction or conflict as a result of the arms race, therefore it's difficult to view the race as a threat.

It is evident that it was simply a competition since it also involved technological and space advances, such as when Sputnik was launched in 1957, US failed in launching their own satellite Vanguard which was seen as a great failure and embarrassment for the US. The Soviet Union seemed to advance with rocket technology and in 1961, Yuri Gagarin became the first man in space. This indicates that particularly for Russia the arms race was not only about military advancements but overall technological advancements.

It illustrates that the arms race was more about being the smartest and most powerful nation rather than bringing about the others destruction and thus being a threat to the world. It appears that the arms race wasn't only about the destructive weapon but about the paranoia and the ego of the two powers. Both nations were in fierce competition with the other to be the best super power and this seemed far more important to them than actually attacking the other nation, this is clear due to both countries agreeing to nuclear deterrence and limited war.

Neither country wished to disrupt peace but simply lived in fear of the other country developing a more powerful weapon they could confront the other with, or succeeding them in space technology and thus being the better nation. Although any confrontation that had taken place rarely truly would have led to a nuclear war, there was always a slight threat that even with the most minute misinterpretation a missile could have been fired. This concern combined with the fact that both nations have the capability to destroy the world and the nuclear arms race was a threat to world peace.

Disarmament

Introduction.

Disarmament in the broad sense means the total abolition of armaments of all types – conventional as well as nuclear. It is different from regulation of armaments which means reduction and restriction of armaments. The desire for the total ban on armaments has been expressed time and again since the beginning of the 20th century, but its intensity began to grow only after the Second World War. With the use of atom bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the question of disarmament assumed new dimensions. The problem of disarmament is not only legal but is also economic, political, military and technical. Its legal aspect became significant with the efforts of the United Nations for the formulation of comprehensive international conventions.

UN and the Regulation of Armaments provisions of the Charter

One of the main purposes behind the establishment of the UN was the maintenance of peace and security. It advocates disarmament as one of the ways of achieving its goals. Article 11 of the UN Charter entrusts the General Assembly to consider the general principles governing disarmament and regulation of armaments and to make recommendations in this regard to members or the SC or both. **Article 26 makes the Security Council responsible for plans to be submitted to the members and establish a system for the reduction of armaments.** Article 47 refers to the functions of the Military Staff Committee, which is to assist and advise the Security Council's military requirements including the regulation of armaments and possibly disarmament

The above provisions do not confer final authority of the UN. It cannot impose the rule of disarmament on states and the provisions of disarmament are too weak. Further, it is possible to achieve armament faster than disarmament.

The UN Charter does not define the term "disarmament". The process of disarmament is not consistent with the UN Charter.

However, some weapons have been banned outright such as banning the testing of nuclear weapons, restrictions on armaments, chemical weapons treaty, poly weapons etc. while some are on the agenda such as nuclear weapons and land mines.

These provisions have been interpreted by jurists differently. Some are of the view that the UN Charter does not confer authority on the UN to impose upon its members a system for disarmament or even regulation of armaments.

The UN has assigned the matter of disarmament to the General Assembly. It approved its Resolution 1(1) in 1946 which included among its goals, "the elimination of the national armaments of atomic weapons and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.

Disarmament Efforts made by Institutional Machinery

1. In 1946 the Atomic Energy Commission was established by the General Assembly for submission of proposals to the Security Council regarding the peaceful use of atomic energy and for the elimination of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction.
2. In 1947 the Commission for Conventional Armaments was established by the Security Council to consider measures for the reduction of armaments and armed forces, together with an effective system of guarantee.
3. In 1952 both the Commissions were dissolved and were replaced by the Disarmament Commission, established by the General Assembly. It consisted of the members of the Security Council and Canada. Their purpose was to prepare proposals for the regulation, limitation and balanced reduction in stages of all armed forces and all armaments.
4. In 1957 and 1958, the Commission was enlarged; the latter included all member states of the UN. However, after this, only 2 sessions were held in 1960 and 1965.
5. Efforts were continuously made by the General Assembly towards general and complete disarmament from time to time. Disarmament matters were soon given a new impetus within the bilateral talks of states. Changes were seen in the disarmament machinery.

6. In 1959, the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament was established.
7. In 1962, the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament was established.
8. In 1969, they changed the name to Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). Membership extended to 26 and then 30.
9. In 1979, Conference of the Committee on Disarmament became the Committee on Disarmament and finally in 1983 became the Conference on Disarmament. It was to define its own rules of procedure and develop its own agenda, taking into account the recommendations of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General of the Conference was appointed by the Secretary-General of the UN.
10. In 1984, the Conference on Disarmament established 4 Ad hoc Committees formerly called working groups.
11. In 1988, the Conference on Disarmament established 5 Ad hoc Committees to continue to work on banning chemical and radiological weapons, preventing the arms race in outer space, comprehensive programme on disarmament, effective arrangements against the threat or use of nuclear weapons, etc.
12. In 1993, a Convention was concluded on the banning of chemical weapons through a multilateral treaty prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of radiological weapons.

Efforts of the General Assembly

The General Assembly convened 3 Special Sessions on Disarmament making continuous efforts in relation to disarmament.

The First Special Session, 1978:

A Final Document consisting of an Introduction, a Declaration, and Programme for Action and recommendations concerning disarmament negotiations and machinery for the same was adopted. This was to be achieved by the Disarmament Commission which constituted all the members of the UN. It was a deliberative body subsidiary to the General Assembly.

The Second Special Session, 1982:

The session was mainly about discussions related the Final Document made under the 1st session. Consensus could not be reached on the acceptance of the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament and thus the members solemnly committed to it all of the State Members of the UN.

The Third Special Session, 1988:

To develop a complete program of action concerning nuclear and conventional disarmament various tasks were undertaken. It was to review and appraise the current international situation thereby achieve progress in the disarmament field. However, no consensus could be reached on the following matters, bringing an end to the arms race in outer space; creating a relationship between disarmament and development; Creating nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace and acquisition of nuclear capability by South Africa and Israel. The session was widely viewed as a success even though no consensus could be reached by the parties. This was because it exhibited the interest of various states in the matter.

The General Assembly is still determined to make progress in the field of disarmament in spite of the limited success of the 3 Special Sessions. In 1990, it adopted the 7 paragraph Declaration of the 1990's as the Third Disarmament Decade.

Notable Treaties in the field of Disarmament

Partial Test Ban Treaty, 1963 [PTBT]

- The Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and under Water is commonly known as PTBT which was signed in Moscow in 1963.
- The treaties provided that all parties to the treaty were to prohibit, prevent and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control.
- This treaty did not prohibit nuclear tests underground.
- It was proposed to convert this treaty into a comprehensive test ban treaty and to this effect, an Amendment Conference was held in 1991.
- The conference failed to reach a unanimous conclusion, however, some aspects of comprehensive test ban especially those with regard to sanctions against non-compliance were acknowledged.

- The treaty thus could not achieve a comprehensive test ban and thus decided to wait for a more appropriate time after achieving progress with respect to the same.

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, 1968 [NPT]

- There are 2 kinds of states involved in this – Nuclear Weapon States and Non-Nuclear Weapon States,
- There exist some obligations on the Nuclear Weapon States. They undertake – a). Not to transfer any nuclear weapons or explosive devices. They will also not transfer any control over such weapons or devices directly or indirectly. b). Not to assist, encourage or indulge manufacture or production or acquiring of nuclear weapons.
- The Non-Nuclear Weapon States undertake – a). Not to receive any nuclear weapons or other devices or control over them. B). Not to produce, manufacture or acquire such nuclear weapons or devices.
- The parties to the Treaty undertake to facilitate and participate in the exchange of equipment, materials and scientific information for the purpose of peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Purpose:

- The treaty provides for prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons and devices.
- It ensures peaceful means nuclear activities.
- It promotes peaceful uses of nuclear energy.
- It also encourages and promotes nuclear disarmament.

The main problem with NPT is that the Nuclear Weapon States are under no obligation to commit themselves to total nuclear disarmament. Even though the treaty has to be reviewed every 5 years, no final declaration has been adopted as yet as the Nuclear Weapon States has not given any commitment. In 1995, this treaty was extended for an unlimited period. This was done firstly, to receive universal adherence to the treaty, secondly, to prevent any nuclear warfare and thirdly for the systematic elimination of armaments.

In 2000, all the states came together and demanded a definite plan of action from the US and other Nuclear Weapon States. One of the main criticisms of this treaty is that it is inequitable and discriminatory as the Non-Nuclear Weapon States could not acquire, manufacture or receive any such weapon from any other state. The result was that even though the treaty provided for non-proliferation, it resulted in the horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. India did not become a party to this treaty as it had a limited and restricted **approach.**

Convention on Biological Weapons, 1972

This convention prohibits production, acquisition, retention and stockpiling of biological agents and toxins. If there is non-compliance by one state party, other state parties can approach the SC which will take necessary measures.

Convention on Chemical Weapons, 1993

Each state party undertakes – never under any circumstances, to develop, produce, acquire, stockpile or retain chemical weapons or to transfer them directly or indirectly to any other state. They are never to use chemical weapons, never to encourage military preparations to use chemical weapons. These states are never to assist, encourage or induce in any way activities prohibited under this convention. A state not in compliance with the convention shall be required to take remedial action and will be subject to several penalties including sanctions.

This treaty has been criticized on the ground that it is not global and it is not verifiable and thus may not work.

Nuclear Weapon Free-zone Treaties like the Antarctic Treaty, Outer Space Treaty, Sea bed Treaty as well as the Moon Agreement are agreements where all nuclear acts are prohibited.

Bilateral Treaties on Disarmament

Bilateral Agreements are sometimes more successful than multilateral agreements. In 1963, an MOU was established between USSR and USA to facilitate a disarmament process. A direct link was established between Moscow and Washington known as the 'hotline' or 'hotlink'. Subsequently in 1971, the Satellite Commission was established between USSR & USA followed by high-speed satellite transmission i.e. to transmit graphs, texts, materials, etc. Then in order to prevent a nuclear war, there was an agreement called the Nuclear Accident Agreement which provided certain safeguards or measures in case of unauthorized use of nuclear weapons or nuclear accidents.

Then in 1972, a treaty was established between USSR and USA called the **Anti-Ballistic Missile System or ABM Treaty**. This was for the employment, development, and testing of ABM systems.

In 1974, USA and USSR entered into another agreement known as the Threshold Test Ban Treaty which prevented them from conducting any underground tests. And in 1979, **SALT Treaty (Strategic Armed Limitation Treaty)** was entered into which aimed at reducing existing stockpile or armaments and improving on it. This treaty was violated on many accounts by USA and USSR as their domestic laws do not provide for this treaty even though this treaty is of much significance.

Moscow Treaty of 2002 – USA and USSR agreed to reduce long-range missiles by 2012.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) – Indian Position

As the name suggests it puts a total ban on nuclear testing. After 1945, there has been a number of efforts towards disarmament, although a total ban has still not been achieved. This may be because of the emergence of superpowers and the Cold War. After the Cold War, the political climate was suitable for CTBT and after many discussions; it led to the adoption of the CTBT in 1996. On one hand, there was serious persuasion by states to adopt CTBT but were themselves testing nuclear weapons. **In 1995 there were about 2000 nuclear tests carried out the world over, including India.**

CTBT was adopted on 10 September 1996 by a General Assembly Resolution by 158 states which was an overwhelming majority. However, states like India, Libya, etc. voted against the treaty and 5 states abstained from voting including Cuba, Lebanon, and Mauritius etc. One of the basic aims of the treaty was to bring an end to all nuclear tests and explosions leading to nuclear disarmament

The parties to the treaty undertook not to carry out any nuclear weapon tests or explosions within their jurisdiction or control. The purpose and object of the treaty shall be carried out by the CTBT Organisation, which has other bodies under it such as the Secretariat, Conference of States, Executive, etc. CTBT by virtue of being a treaty is to be incorporated into domestic law.

The treaty provides for a verification system which includes:

1. International monitoring system for monitoring compliance or violation of treaty provisions.
2. Provides for consulting and clarification of treaty provisions.
3. It provides for on-site inspection.

4. It provides for confidence-building measures.
5. It provides for various non-compliance measures including collective measures against states etc.
6. In case of any dispute, it provides that peaceful means should be resorted to or refers the same to the ICJ.

The treaty is to be reviewed every 10 years for an unlimited period. A member has the option of withdrawing from the treaty in case of national interest of the state. The treaty is said to come into force after 180 days of ratification by the states as mentioned in Annexure II of the Treaty. There are 44 states that have been listed in Annexure II and currently, only 30 states have ratified the treaty. Among the 44 states, there are all the nuclear weapon states and other capable nuclear weapon states. CTBT has currently been signed by 187 states.

Reasons as to why the treaty has not been ratified by states like India, Pakistan and Israel:

1. **Limited Scope:** the treaty has limited scope. On one hand, USA insists on other states joining the treaty and on the other, the US itself has not ratified it. Since the US has not given its commitment, India too has not signed it. All kinds of nuclear tests have not been banned by the treaty. Only those nuclear tests which result in explosions have been banned, thereby implying that tests can still be carried out as long as there is no explosion. This can easily be done in laboratories and scientifically advanced states. India wants that traditional and advanced testing should be banned, however, the US has refused.
2. **Discriminatory and Unequal:** All states already possessing nuclear weapons can continue to possess these weapons as long as there is no further testing. This is against Article 2 of the UNC which provides for equal rights.
3. **Insistence on the signing:** due to the fate of the treaty being in the hands of the 44 states that are listed in Annexure II, many states insist on other weaker states to ratify the treaty.
4. The current verification system under the CTBT does not have the capability to detect all kinds of nuclear explosions.

5. In a regular situation, underground nuclear testing is banned under CTBT. However, the feasibility of the same shall be examined consequently and the treaty shall be appropriately amended. Thus, the treaty is not a definite one and has scope for change according to the circumstances faced with in the future

Causes of War

What Is a War?

A war is typically fought by a country or group of countries against an opposing country with the aim of achieving an objective through the use of force. Wars can also be fought within a country in the form of a civil or revolutionary war.

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, "war" is defined as

- 1. A state of armed conflict between different countries or different groups within a country.**
- 2. A state of competition or hostility between different people or groups.**
- 3. A sustained campaign against an undesirable situation or activity.**

Wars have been a part of human history for thousands of years, and have become increasingly destructive as industrialization and technology have advanced.

What Is the Cause of Conflict?

There is rarely one single, clear cause of conflict and, ultimately, war. The causes of a war are usually numerous, and several reasons for a conflict can be intertwined in a complicated way.

Many theories have been put forth over the years as to why wars happen, and some of the greatest minds have offered their take on the subject.

In the article below, I'll provide a general overview of the eight main reasons for war.

Eight Main Causes of War

1. *Economic Gain*
2. *Territorial Gain*
3. *Religion*
4. *Nationalism*
5. *Revenge*
6. *Civil War*
7. *Revolutionary War*
8. *Defensive War*

Continue reading for more information on each of these reasons for war.

1. Economic Gain

Often wars are caused by one country's wish to take control of another country's wealth. Whatever the other reasons for a war may be, there is almost always an economic motive underlying most conflicts, even if the stated aim of the war is presented to the public as something more noble.

In pre-industrial times, the gains desired by a warring country might be precious materials such as gold and silver, or livestock such as cattle and horses.

In modern times, the resources that are hoped to be gained from war take the form of things like oil, minerals, or materials used in manufacturing.

Some scientists believe that as the world's population increases and basic resources become scarce, wars will be fought more often over fundamental essentials, such as water and food.

Historical Examples of Wars Fought for Economic Gain

- **Anglo-Indian Wars (1766-1849) – The Anglo-Indian wars were a series of wars fought between the British East India Company and different Indian states. These wars led to the establishment of British colonial rule in India, which gave Britain unrestricted access to exotic and valuable resources native to the Indian continent.**
- **Finnish-Soviet War or "The Winter War" (1939-1940) – Stalin and his Soviet Army wanted to mine Nickel and Finland, but when the Finnish refused, the Soviet Union waged war on the c**

2. Territorial Gain

A country might decide that it needs more land, either for living space, agricultural use, or other purposes. Territory can also be used as “buffer zones” between two hostile enemies.

Related to buffer zones are proxy wars. These are conflicts that are fought indirectly between opposing powers in a third country. Each power supports the side which best suits their logistical, military, and economic interests.

Proxy wars were particularly common during the Cold War.

Historical Examples of Wars Fought for Territorial Gain

- **Mexican-American War (1846-1848) – This war was fought following the annexation of Texas, with Mexico still claiming the land as their own. The U.S. outfought the Mexicans, retaining Texas and incorporating it as a state.**

- **Serbo-Bulgarian War (1885-1886)** – Bulgaria and Serbia fought over a small border town after the river creating the border between the countries moved.
- **Arab-Israeli War or "Six Day War" (1967-1988)** – Israeli forces took the territories of the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, from Jordan.

3. Religion

Religious conflicts often have very deep roots. They can lie dormant for decades, only to re-emerge in a flash at a later date.

Religious wars can often be tied to other reasons for conflict, such as nationalism or revenge for a perceived historical slight in the past.

While different religions fighting against each other can be a cause of war, different sects within a religion (for example, Protestant and Catholic, or Sunni and Shiite) battling against one another can also instigate war.

Historical Examples of Wars Fought for Religion

- **The Crusades (1095-1291)** – The Crusades were a series wars sanctioned by the Latin Church during the medieval age. The aim of crusaders was to expel Islam and spread Christianity.
- **Thirty Years' War (1618-1648)** – When Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II tried to impose Roman Catholicism on the people of his domains, a faction of Protestants from the north banded together, sparking war.
- **Lebanese Civil War (1975-1990)** – The Lebanese Civil War was primarily sparked from conflicts between the Sunni Muslim, Shiite Muslim and Christian Lebanese populations.
- **Yugoslav Wars (1991-1995)** – The Yugoslav wars consisted of the Croatian War and the Bosnian War. The wars were fought between the orthodox Catholic and Muslim populations of former Yugoslavia.

- **Second Sudanese Civil War (1983-2005)** – This ethnoreligious war was caused by the Muslim central government's choice to impose sharia law on non-muslim southerners.

4. Nationalism

Nationalism in this context essentially means attempting to prove that your country is superior to another by violent subjugation. This often takes the form of an invasion.

Dr. Richard Ned Lebow, Professor of International Political Theory at the Department of War Studies, Kings College London, contends that while other causes of war may be present, nationalism, or spirit, is nearly always a factor. In his essay "Most wars are not fought for reasons of security or material interests, but instead reflect a nation's spirit," he writes:

"[Literature on war and its causes] assumes security is the principal motive of states and insecurity the major cause of war. Following Plato and Aristotle, I posit spirit, appetite and reason as fundamental drives with distinct goals. There can be little doubt that the spirit is the principal cause of war across the centuries."

Related to nationalism is imperialism, which is built on the idea that conquering other countries is glorious and brings honor and esteem to the conqueror.

Racism can also be linked to nationalism, as can be seen in Hitler's Germany. Adolf Hitler went to war with Russia partly because the Russians (and eastern Europeans in general) were seen as Slavs, or a group of people who the Nazis believed to be an inferior race.

Historical Examples of Wars Fought for Nationalism

- **Chichimeca War (1550-1590)** – The Chichimeca war was one of many wars fought during the Spanish conquest of the Aztec civilization in modern day Mexico.
- **World War I (1914-1918)** – Extreme loyalty and patriotism caused many countries to become involved in the first world war. Many pre-war Europeans believed in the cultural, economic and military supremacy of their nation.

5. Revenge

Seeking to punish, redress a grievance, or simply strike back for a perceived slight can often be a factor in the waging of war. Revenge also relates to nationalism, as the people of a country which has been wronged are motivated to fight back by pride and spirit.

Unfortunately, this can lead to an endless chain of retaliatory wars being set in motion which is very difficult to stop.

Historically, revenge has been a factor in many European wars,

Historical Examples of Wars Fought for Revenge

- **World War II (1939-1945)** – The rise of the Nazi Socialist Party and Germany's eventual domination of the European continent were direct results of the Treaty of Versailles, which imposed strict punishments on Germany.
- **War on Terror** – The September 11th attacks on the World Trade Center in 2001 prompted President George W. Bush to initiate a war on terror. This global war began with an invasion of Iraq and is ongoing.

6. Civil War

These generally take place when there is sharp internal disagreement within a country. The disagreement can be about who rules, how the country should be run or the people's rights. These internal rifts often turn into chasms that result in violent conflict between two or more opposing groups.

Civil wars can also be sparked by separatist groups who want to form their own, independent country, or, as in the case of the American Civil War, states wanting to secede from a larger union.

Historical Examples of Civil Wars

- **American Civil War (1861-1865)** - The American Civil War was fought by the Union army and the Confederate army as a result of the long-standing controversy over slavery.
- **Russian Civil War (1917-1923)** – The Russian Civil War followed immediately after the Russian Revolution, with the

Red Army and the White Army vying to determine Russia's political future.

- **Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) – The Spanish Civil War was fought between the Republicans, who were loyal to the left-leaning Second Spanish Republic, and the Nationalists, a largely aristocratic conservative group led by General Francisco Franco.**
- **Korean War (1950-1953) – The Korean War was a war fought between North Korea, which was supported by China, and South Korea, which was supported primarily by the United States.**

7. Revolutionary War

These occur when a large section of the population of a country revolts against the individual or group that rules the country because they are dissatisfied with their leadership.

Revolutions can begin for a variety of reasons, including economic hardship amongst certain sections of the population or perceived injustices committed by the ruling group. Other factors can contribute too, such as unpopular wars with other countries.

Revolutionary wars can easily descend into civil wars.

Historical Examples of Revolutionary Wars

- **Portuguese Restoration War (1640-1668) – The Portuguese revolution ended the 60-year rule of Portugal by Spain.**
- **American Revolution (1775-1783) – The American Revolution gave the 13 North American colonies independence from British rule and established the United States of America.**
- **French Revolution (1789-1799) – The French Revolution was a battle that represented the rise of the bourgeoisie and the downfall of the aristocracy in France.**
- **Haitian Revolution (1791-1804) – The Haitian Revolution was a successful slave rebellion that established Haiti as the first free black republic.**

8. Defensive War

In the modern world, where military aggression is more widely questioned, countries will often argue that they are fighting in a purely defensive capacity against an aggressor, or potential aggressor, and that their war is therefore a “just” war.

These defensive wars can be especially controversial when they are launched preemptively, the argument essentially being that: “We are attacking them before they inevitably attack us.”

Historical Examples of Defensive Wars

- **Iraqi Conflict (2003-Present)** – An international coalition, led by the US, invaded Iraq on the grounds that the country's leader, Saddam Hussein, was developing weapons of mass destruction, and therefore presented a threat to surrounding countries and rest of the world. The war was controversial as the allegations made about the weapons of mass destruction made by the US and UK were shown to lack substance.

Francis Fukuyama's views on End of History

February, 1989, Francis Fukuyama gave a talk on international relations at the University of Chicago. Fukuyama was thirty-six years old, and on his way from a job at the *RAND* Corporation, in Santa Monica, where he had worked as an expert on Soviet foreign policy, to a post as the deputy director of policy planning at the State Department, in Washington.

It was a good moment for talking about international relations, and a good moment for Soviet experts especially, because, two months earlier, on December 7, 1988, Mikhail Gorbachev had announced, in a speech at the [United Nations](#), that the Soviet Union would no longer intervene in the affairs of its Eastern European satellite states. Those nations could now become democratic. It was the beginning of the end of the [Cold War](#).

At *RAND*, Fukuyama had produced focussed analyses of Soviet policy. In Chicago, he permitted himself to think big. His talk came to the attention of Owen Harries, an editor at a Washington journal called *The National Interest*, and Harries offered to publish it. The article was titled “[The End of History?](#)” It came out in the summer of 1989, and it turned the foreign-policy world on its ear.

Fukuyama’s argument was that, with the imminent collapse of the Soviet Union, the last ideological alternative to liberalism had been eliminated. Fascism had been killed off in the Second World War, and now Communism was imploding. In states, like China, that called themselves Communist, political and economic reforms were heading in the direction of a liberal order.

So, if you imagined history as the process by which liberal institutions—representative government, free markets, and consumerist culture—become universal, it might be possible to say that history had reached its goal. Stuff would still happen, obviously, and smaller states could be expected to experience ethnic and religious tensions and become home to illiberal ideas. But “it matters very little what strange thoughts occur to people in Albania or Burkina Faso,” Fukuyama explained, “for we are interested in what one could in some sense call the common ideological heritage of mankind.”

Hegel, Fukuyama said, had written of a moment when a perfectly rational form of society and the state would become victorious. Now, with Communism vanquished and the major powers converging on a single political and economic model, Hegel’s prediction had finally been fulfilled. There would be a “Common Marketization” of international relations and the world would achieve homeostasis.

Even among little magazines, *The National Interest* was little. Launched in 1985 by Irving Kristol, the leading figure in neoconservatism, it had by 1989 a circulation of six thousand. Fukuyama himself was virtually unknown outside the world of professional Sovietologists, people not given to eschatological reflection. But the “end of history” claim was picked up in the mainstream press, Fukuyama was profiled by James Atlas in the *New York Times Magazine*, and his article was debated in Britain and

in France and translated into many languages, from Japanese to Icelandic. Some of the responses to “The End of History?” were dismissive; almost all of them were skeptical. But somehow the phrase found its way into post-Cold War thought, and it stuck.

One of the reasons for the stickiness was that Fukuyama was lucky. He got out about six months ahead of the curve—his article appearing before the Velvet Revolution, in Czechoslovakia, and before the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, in November, 1989. Fukuyama was betting on present trends continuing, always a high-risk gamble in the international-relations business.

Any number of things might have happened for Gorbachev’s promise not to cash out: political resistance within the Soviet Union, the refusal of the Eastern European puppet regimes to cede power, the United States misplaying its hand. But events in Europe unfolded more or less according to Fukuyama’s prediction, and, on December 26, 1991, the Soviet Union voted itself out of existence. The Cold War really was over.

Events in Asia were not so obliging. Fukuyama missed completely the suppression of the pro-democracy movement in China. There is no mention of the massacre in [Tiananmen Square](#) in “The End of History?,” presumably because the piece was in production when it happened, in June, 1989. This does not seem to have made a difference to the article’s reception, however. Almost none of the initial responses to the piece mentioned Tiananmen, either—even though many people already believed that China, not Russia, was the power that liberal democracies would have to reckon with in the future. “The End of History?” was a little Eurocentric.

There was also a seductive twist to Fukuyama’s argument. At the end of the article, he suggested that life after history might be sad. When all political efforts were committed to “the endless solving of technical problems, environmental concerns, and the satisfaction of sophisticated consumer demands” (sounds good to me), we might feel nostalgia for the “courage, imagination, and idealism” that animated the old struggles for liberalism and democracy. This speculative flourish recalled the famous question that John Stuart Mill said he asked himself as a young man: If all the political and

social reforms you believe in came to pass, would it make you a happier human being? That is always an interesting question.

Another reason that Fukuyama's article got noticed may have had to do with his new job title. The office of policy planning at State had been created in 1947 by George Kennan, who was its first chief. In July of that year, Kennan published the so-called X article, "[The Sources of Soviet Conduct](#)," in *Foreign Affairs*. It appeared anonymously—signed with an "X"—but once the press learned his identity the article was received as an official statement of American Cold War policy.

"The Sources of Soviet Conduct" defined the containment doctrine, according to which the aim of American policy was to keep the Soviet Union inside its box. The United States did not need to intervene in Soviet affairs, Kennan believed, because Communism was bound to collapse from its own inefficiency. Four decades later, when "The End of History?" appeared, that is exactly what seemed to be happening. That April, Kennan, then eighty-five, appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to declare that the Cold War was over. He received a standing ovation. Fukuyama's article could thus be seen as a bookend to Kennan's.

It was not the bookend Kennan would have written. Containment is a realist doctrine. Realists think that a nation's foreign policy should be guided by dispassionate consideration of its own interests, not by moral principles, or by a belief that nations share a "harmony of interests." To Kennan, it was of no concern to the United States what the Soviets did inside their own box. The only thing that mattered was that Communism not be allowed to expand.

The National Interest, as the name proclaims, is a realist foreign-policy journal. But Fukuyama's premise was that nations do share a harmony of interests, and that their convergence on liberal political and economic models was mutually beneficial. Realism imagines nations to be in perpetual competition with one another; Fukuyama was saying that this was no longer going to be the case. He offered Cold War realists a kind of valediction: their mission, though philosophically misconceived, had been accomplished. Now they were out of a job. "Frank thought that what was happening spelled

the end of the Realpolitik world,” Harries later said. It must have tickled him to have published Fukuyama’s article.

Twenty-nine years later, it seems that the realists haven’t gone anywhere, and that history has a few more tricks up its sleeve. It turns out that liberal democracy and free trade may actually be rather fragile achievements. (Consumerism appears safe for now.) There is something out there that doesn’t like liberalism, and is making trouble for the survival of its institutions.

Fukuyama thinks he knows what that something is, and his answer is summed up in the title of his new book, “[Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment](#)” (Farrar, Straus & Giroux). The demand for recognition, Fukuyama says, is the “master concept” that explains all the contemporary dissatisfactions with the global liberal order: Vladimir Putin, Osama bin Laden, Xi Jinping, Black Lives Matter, #MeToo, gay marriage, *ISIS*, Brexit, resurgent European nationalisms, anti-immigration political movements, campus identity politics, and the election of Donald Trump. It also explains the Protestant Reformation, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, Chinese Communism, the civil-rights movement, the women’s movement, multiculturalism, and the thought of Luther, Rousseau, Kant, Nietzsche, Freud, and Simone de Beauvoir. Oh, and the whole business begins with Plato’s Republic. Fukuyama covers all of this in less than two hundred pages. How does he do it?

Not well. Some of the problem comes from misunderstanding figures like Beauvoir and Freud; some comes from reducing the work of complex writers like Rousseau and Nietzsche to a single philosophical bullet point. A lot comes from the astonishingly blasé assumption—which was also the astonishingly blasé assumption of “The End of History?”—that Western thought is universal thought. But the whole project, trying to fit Vladimir Putin into the same analytic paradigm as Black Lives Matter and tracing them both back to Martin Luther, is far-fetched. It’s a case of Great Booksism: history as a chain of paper dolls cut out of books that only a tiny fraction of human beings have even heard of. Fukuyama is a smart man, but no one could have made this argument work.

Why is the desire for recognition—or identity politics, as Fukuyama also calls it—a threat to liberalism? Because it cannot be satisfied by economic or procedural reforms. Having the same amount of wealth as everyone else or the same opportunity to acquire it is not a substitute for respect.

..

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. MODULE NO. 4

FOREIGN POLICY AND DIPLOMACY

Evolution and Meaning of Foreign Policy

Development of Nation-States and increasing interactions among them has resulted into formation of foreign policy in the modern times. Establishment of United Nations and process of decolonization that has

liberated many states into sovereign entities have further provided impetus to interrelationships among states. There is certain unanimity among scholars and statesmen on necessity of a foreign policy for each state, since no state will like to function in complete isolation from rest of the world. Feliks Gross said that even a decision to have no relations with a particular state is also a foreign policy or, in other words, not to have a definite foreign policy is also a foreign policy. For example, India's decision to have no diplomatic relations with Israel up to 1992 was integral part of its foreign policy. India wanted to continue good diplomatic and trade relations with Israel's adversaries, i.e. the Arab states, whose support on Kashmir was crucial for India, along with access to crude oil. A state without foreign policy will look like a team playing football without any strategy to post the goals, hence all eleven players being clueless about their role and functions on the playground. Thus, in a modern state that lacks foreign policy; the External Affairs Ministry will have no priorities in developing bilateral relations or participating in multilateral forums. The Defence Ministry will have no clear cut ideas about armed preparations of country's military, since no criteria have been set up before it to define friends and to recognize enemies in the international sphere. The Finance as well as Commerce Ministry will struggle to take stand on issues of import-export during bilateral or multilateral trade negotiations. A state without a foreign policy can be compared to a ship in the deep sea without knowledge of directions. As the radar on the ship navigates it towards land destination, foreign policy leads the state in fulfilling its national interest and acquiring rightful place among comity of nation-states. Therefore, it can be said that foreign policy will exist as long as sovereign states operate in international sphere.

Each nation has the right and power to secure the goals of her national interest in international relations. It is her supreme duty to satisfy the needs of her people. Each nation wants to be self-reliant in all areas of activity. However, in reality no nation can achieve cent per cent self-

reliance and self-sufficiency. These are ideals towards which a nation can try to move.

“The Foreign Policy of a nation is always made and implemented with an eye on the situation in various regions of the world. A situational change in West Asia or South-East Asia or Africa necessitates a change or modification of the foreign policies of many nations.”

Nations have always been interdependent and these are bound to remain so even after attaining high levels of development. “Interdependence has been an incontrovertible fact of international relations.” It compels every nation to get essentially involved in the process of establishing and conducting relations with other nations. Each nation establishes diplomatic, economic, trade, educational, cultural and political relations with other nations.

For giving meaning and direction to her relations with other nations, each nation formulates and adopts a Foreign Policy. It is through its foreign policy that it tries to secure the goals of national interest in international relations. The behaviour of each nation in international environment is always conditioned by its foreign policy.

What is Foreign Policy?

Foreign Policy can be defined as a set of principles, decisions and means, adopted and followed by a nation for securing her goals of national interest in international relations. Foreign Policy defines the goals of national interest and then tries to secure these through the exercise of national power.

Definitions of Foreign Policy:

1. “Foreign Policy is the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment.” —George Modelski

2. “Foreign Policy is the substance of nation’s efforts to promote its interest’s vis-a-vis other nations.” —Normal Hill

3. “Foreign Policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete courses of action and to attain these objectives and preserve its interests.” —Padelford and Loncoln

4. “Foreign Policy is a thought out course of action for achieving objectives in foreign relations as dictated by the ideology of national interest.” —Dr. Mohinder Kumar

OBJECTIVES OF FOREIGN POLICY

Following are some of the key general objectives that we can locate in foreign policy of almost every country:

1. A foreign policy protects unity and integrity of a country. For example, a major focus of India’s relations with China is to ensure country’s territorial integrity by rejecting Chinese claims on Indian terrains. It takes note of incorrect map of India issued by foreign countries and agencies, and asks to make appropriate amends in it
- . 2. A foreign policy defends interests of its citizens. For example, successive Indian governments keep in mind interests of farmers while negotiating bi-lateral and multi-lateral trade agreements. A primary interest of any country is in selfpreservation and well-being of its citizens. In international arena, interests of various countries often clash with each other and the states have to protect their own interests vehemently. A foreign policy aims at promotion of economic progress of the country. In modern times, economic development is one of the key factors in determining state’s international status. Thus, the treaties and agreements concluded

with other states are drafted in a way to protect and promote economic interests of its own.

. A foreign policy also protects interests of its citizens beyond the borders. For example, the External Affairs Ministry takes up issue of racial discrimination and harassment of Indian students in Australia with the Australian government in order to protect its citizens in that country. 4. A foreign policy also protects dignity and sentiments of the people of Indian origin throughout the world. For example, Indian government had asked its French counterpart to reconsider ban on Sikh's turbans in that country even though the Sikhs there may not be Indian citizens anymore and had accepted French citizenship. 5. A foreign policy tries to maintain contacts and develop good relations with all other states in order to enhance economic and technological co-operation with them with a view to promote its own interests. Indian government lost no time in recognizing newly independent African and Asian countries and immediately established diplomatic relations with them to create its sphere of influence and good will in those countries. On the contrary, diplomatic cut-off with a particular country on issues of ideology or national interest can also be part of state's foreign policy. India had not only boycotted the racist South African regime in the past, but also led the international imbroglio against it as a matter of its principled stand against racism in the world. Although above mentioned examples are Indian foreign policy centric, foreign policies of almost all the states are full of similar examples.

Scope of the Foreign Policy:

Each foreign policy contains:

1. A set of principles, policies and decisions adopted and followed by the nation in international relations.

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

“A student of Foreign Policy analyses the actions of a state towards external environment (i.e., other states) and the conditions, usually domestic, under which those actions are formulated.” —Holstei

“The study of foreign policy includes both the study of national objectives to be achieved and the means used for securing these.” — Ceeil V. Crabb

In simple words, it can be observed that Foreign Policy is a set of principles and decisions, a plan of action and a thought out course of action adopted and used by a nation for conducting relations with other nations and all international actors with a view to secure the preferred and defined goals of her national interest.

Elements of Foreign Policy:

The foreign policy of a nation is formulated and implemented by its policy makers. In doing so they take into account the national interest of the nation, the internal and external environment, the national values, the foreign policy goals and decisions of other nations and the nature of international power structure. These constitute the factors/elements of Foreign Policy.

1. Size of State Territory:

The size of a state is an important factor of its Foreign Policy. Size influences the psychological and operational environment within which the foreign policy-makers and public respond. It includes, as Rosenau says, both human and non-human resources. Nations with large human and non-human resources always try to be big powers and they have better chances of becoming big powers in international Relations.

Foreign Policy of a big sized state is bound to be different from the foreign policy of a small-sized state. Public and foreign policy-makers of big sized states are definitely governed by their desire to be big powers in the World. Size has been a factor in the foreign policies of the U.S.A., Russia, China, India, Brazil, France and others. Large sized states, with few exceptions, always formulate and use an active Foreign Policy and through it these play an active role in international relations.

However, size alone is not an independent determinant of foreign policy. Resources and capabilities of the state are not always dependent upon size. The countries of the Middle East, even with small sizes but with the largest quantity of oil resources, have been playing quite an active role in international relations. Japan is relatively a small sized state and yet its role in international relations has been active and influential.

Israel, despite being a small sized state has been influencing the course of politics among nations. Before 1945, Britain, with a small size, could play the role of a world power. Large size poses the problem of defence, security and maintenance of communications. In the absence of natural boundaries, the large size of a nation very often creates the problem of relations with neighbouring states. Despite being the large sized states, Australian and Canadian foreign policies have not been very active. Russia is a large sized state but its role in contemporary international relations continues to be weak.

2. Geographical Factor:

Geography of a state is relatively the most permanent and stable factor of its foreign Policy. The topography of land, its fertility, climate and location are the major geographic factors which influence the Foreign

Policy of a nation. These factors determine both the needs as well as the capability to fulfill the needs of the people of a nation.

Suitable geographical factors can help and encourage the nation to adopt and pursue higher goals. The role played by English Channel in the development of Britain as a major naval power and consequently as an imperial power is well known. The influence of the Atlantic Ocean on the US Foreign Policy has been always there. Indian Foreign Policy now definitely bears the influence of the geographical location of India as the largest littoral state of the Indian Ocean.

The relatively unhelpful geographical conditions of Canada have been a factor in the determination of its Foreign Policy. The territorial expanse makes it difficult for other nations to think of securing an outright military victory over Russia. The location of Pakistan too has influenced its relations with India, China and the Central Asian republics. The geographical distance from Pakistan has been a factor in the foreign policy of Bangladesh.

The natural resources and the food production capacity of a nation is directly linked with its geography. These factors are also important factors in the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. Adequate existence of vital natural resources—minerals, food and energy resources—have been helping factors of the US and Russian foreign policies.

Food shortage was a source of limitation on Indian Foreign Policy in the 1950s & 1960s. Consumer goods shortage have been hitting hard the foreign policy and relations of Russia. Large quantities of oil have made it possible for the West Asian and Gulf nations to adopt oil diplomacy as a means of their foreign policies.

Geography, as such is an important and permanent factor of foreign policy, yet it is not a deterministic factor. The revolutionary developments in communications and modern warfare, and the ability of nations to overcome geographical hindrances have tended to reduce the importance of geography.

3. Level and Nature of Economic Development:

One of the main reasons why the US Foreign Policy has been very often successful in securing its national objectives, particularly in relation to the poor and economically lowly placed states of the world is the high degree of its economic development. The developed countries of our times are highly industrialized and economically developed states. These can use foreign aid as a tool for securing their foreign policy goals.

The global perspectives and policies of the two super-powers (1945-90) were again governed by their vast economic and industrial resources and their needs for foreign markets and trade. In fact, all economically and industrially developed nations (Group of seven plus one, countries in particular) are now playing a more a vigorous role in international relations than the lowly developed and developing countries.

The strong commitment of the foreign policies of the lowly developed and developing countries to the cause of a New International Economic Order is again a proof of the role of economic factors of international relations.

The level of economic development also determines the scope of relations that a nation wishes to establish with other nations. The Foreign Policy of Japan in the contemporary times is directly and fundamentally related to its economic development. The military preparedness and military capability of a nation is again directly related to the factor of economic development and industrialization. Only industrially and economically developed nations can hope to become major and stable military powers.

Economic power constitutes a fundamental dimension of national power in contemporary times and at present; it can be used more effectively for securing foreign policy goals. The US economic power has been a major instrument of its foreign policy. Economic weakness of Russia has forced it to change its policy towards the U.S.A. and other countries. Steadily developing India economy has definitely given a boost to India's foreign relations. Thus, the level and nature of

economic development, industrialization and modernization are important factors of foreign policy.

4. Cultural and Historical Factors:

The cultural heritage and the history of a nation are again important and valuable factors of its Foreign Policy. The norms and traditions that characterize the life of the people of a state are highly influential factors of its foreign policy. During the process of interpreting and formulating the objectives of national interest, the decision makers are always governed by their cultural links, historical traditions and experiences.

Strong cultural unity of the people is always a source of strength for them. It materially influences their ability to secure the objectives of national interest during the course of international bargaining. Historical experiences and cultural links further help them to analyze and assess the nature and scope of relations with other nations. Indeed, the weakness of the foreign policies of most of the Asian and African states has been largely due to the presence of internal dissensions and conflicts among their peoples.

Bitter experiences with the policies of imperialism and colonialism have been a determining factor of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial contents of the foreign policies of most of the new sovereign states. History is an important factor in determining the relations among the neighbouring nations. Foreign policy interactions between India and Pakistan are mostly the legacies of past history. The shadow of the history of 1962 still influences the course of Sino- Indian relations.

However, cultural values and links are always subject to perpetual changes and adjustments. Historical experiences too are forgotten in the face of national interest. The existence of conflict among the European nations, despite their cultural links and the development, and continuance of strong US—Japanese friendship and relations bear ample proof that cultural and historical factors have to have combination with other factors before influencing the course of Foreign Policy.

5. Social Structure:

The structure and nature of the society for which the foreign policy operates is also an important element. The nature of social groups and the degree of conflict and harmony that characterize their mutual relations are determined by the social structure. A society characterised by strong internal conflict and strife acts as a source of weakness for the foreign policy.

A society of united, enlightened and disciplined people with a high degree of group harmony is always a source of strength. The democratization of the process of policy-making in recent times has increased the importance of social structure as an element of foreign policy. The linkages between the domestic and international environments have tended to strengthen the role of this element.

6. Government Structure:

The organisation and structure of government i.e. the organisational agencies which handle the foreign policy-making and implementation is another important element of foreign policy. The shape of the foreign policy is also determined by the fact as to whether the government agencies handling it are democratically constituted or not.

Whether the authority relations are centralized or decision-making is free and open. The government officials also act as decision makers and this factor always influences the formulation of foreign policy. Foreign policy of a nation has to adapt to the environment. In a centralized and authoritarian system, the foreign policy can remain and often remains isolated from the domestic environment.

The nature of legislature-executive relations is also an influential factor in Foreign Policy decision-making. The harmony between the two, as is there in a parliamentary system, can be a source of strength and lack of harmony between the two can be a source of hindrance for the foreign policy makers. Similarly, the nature of party system, elections and electorate are other influential factors. The continuity in Indian Foreign Policy has been also due to the nature of government-making in India.

7. Internal Situation:

Like the external situational factors, sudden changes, disturbances or disorders that occur within the internal environment of a nation also influence the nature and course of foreign policy. The resignation of President Nixon over the issue of Watergate Scandal considerably limited the foreign policy of USA under President Ford.

The internal opposition to the military regime in Pakistan during 1947-89 was a determinant of Pakistani foreign policy. Similarly, the declaration of emergency in India in 1975 did materially affect the relations of India with other countries particularly the super powers. A change of government is always a source of change in the foreign policy of a state.

The rise of new leadership in China is now an important input of Chinese Foreign Policy. The rise of Congress-led UPA Government in India in 2004 acted as a source of some changes in relations with India's neighbours. The internal situation of Pakistan—a military dominated state trying to be a democratic political system has always been a factor of Pakistan's Foreign Policy.

8. Values, Talents, Experiences and Personalities of Leaders:

Since the Foreign Policy of a nation is made and implemented by leaders, statesmen and diplomats, naturally it bears an imprint of their values, talents, experiences and personalities. The ideas, orientations, likings, disliking, attitudes, knowledge, skill and the world-view of the national decision-makers are influential inputs of Foreign Policy. The differences among the leaders are also influential inputs of a foreign policy.

The differences between the Foreign Policy decisions of various U.S. Presidents and their Secretaries of States have been due to the differences in their attitudes and personalities. The Indian Foreign Policy till 1964 was often, and rightly so, described as Nehru's Foreign Policy. The support at home and the popularity that PM Nehru enjoyed acted as imputes of foreign policy.

Pakistani Foreign Policy, under the influence of the ideas of General Musharraf, has undergone a big change. India's decision to develop

nuclear weapons was definitely made under the influence of the ideas and the world- view of BJP leaders, who came to be power holders in 1998. The foreign policy of each nation is influenced by the personalities of its leaders. The change in leadership often produces a change in the foreign policy of a nation.

However, this does not mean that this factor is an independent determinant of Foreign Policy. Leaders are always guided by the dictates and demands of national interest. Each leader is committed to the securing of national interests of the nation. The vital interests of the nations are a source of continuity if the personalities and attitudes of the leaders are a source of change. The two have to be balanced before these serve as foreign policy inputs.

9. Political Accountability:

In the words of Rosenau, “the degree to which public officials are accountable to the citizenry, either through elections, party competitions, legislative oversight, or other means, can have important consequences for the timing and contents of the plans that are made and the activities undertaken in foreign affairs.”

A political system which is both responsive to and responsible before the people, works in a different environment than the political system which is a closed system i.e., a system which is neither open nor accountable to the people. As such foreign policy of an open political system is more responsive to public opinion and public demands than the foreign policy of a closed political system. The difference between the foreign policies of democratic and totalitarian/authoritarian states is always largely due to this factor.

10. Ideology:

Foreign Policy is a set of principles and a strategic plan of action adopted by a nation to fulfill the goals of national interest. It has always an ideological content. For securing support for its goal as well as for criticizing the foreign policy goals of other nations, it needs and adopts an ideology or some ideological principles.

It, therefore, always tries to use the ideology as well as to popularize its ideology. The ideology of communism remained an important factor

of the foreign policies of communist nations during 1945-90. Anti-Communism and Pro-Liberal Democracy ideologies have always influenced the shape and course of foreign policies of non-communist Western nations. Ideological conflict remained determining factor in the cold war policies (1945-90) of both the super powers.

The drive in favour of democratisation, decentralisation and liberalisation in the socialist states of Europe, the new states of Central Asia, Russia and Mongolia has given a new direction to international relations of post-1990 period. Similarly, ideological commitments have been a source of affinity in the foreign policies of Islamic nations.

11. Diplomacy:

Diplomacy is the instrument by which foreign policy of a nation travels beyond its borders and establishes contacts with other nations. It is diplomacy which tries to secure the goals of foreign policy during the course of relations with other nations. Besides being a means, diplomacy is also an input of foreign policy. The world view sketched by diplomacy and the reports prepared by the diplomats are valuable sources of foreign policymaking.

The modes of operation and quality of diplomacy always affect the operational quality and efficiency of a foreign policy. In the late 1960s the contacts between India and Chinese diplomats helped the emergence of a definite trend towards normalization of Sino- Indian relations. It has been through diplomacy that India and Pakistan have been trying to initiate and adopt confidence building measures. Morgenthau regards Diplomacy as the best instrument of power management among states.

DIPLOMACY

Diplomacy is a science of communication, dealing and negotiations between two nations through their bureaucratic channel. It is an established methods of influencing the decisions and behavior of

foreign governments and people through dialogue, negotiations and other measures short of war or violence. In diplomacy there is always a path to find solution of a problems above all difficulties. It is the best known method to solve the disputes between two territories. Diplomacy even helps to cope with hardship of poverty and developmental interruptions.

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

The purpose of diplomacy is to strengthen the state, nation, or organization it serves in relation to others by advancing the interests in its charge. To this end, diplomatic activity endeavors to maximize a group’s advantages without the risk and expense of using force and preferably without causing resentment. It habitually, but not invariably, strives to preserve peace; diplomacy is strongly inclined toward negotiation to achieve agreements and resolve issues between states. Even in times of peace, diplomacy may involve coercive threats of economic or other punitive measures or demonstrations of the capability to impose unilateral solutions to disputes by the application of military power. However, diplomacy normally seeks to develop goodwill toward the state it represents, nurturing relations with foreign states and peoples that will ensure their cooperation or—failing that—their neutrality.

placed on rights by different societies, war and peace, ethnic conflict the environment and power.

Diplomacy and Foreign Policy

Cultivating and managing a favourable world opinion toward a nation-state is the mandate of diplomacy. Diplomacy generally refers to a government's process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation's ideas and ideals, its institutions and culture, as well as its national goals and current policies.

By this accord, nation-states partake in the most pluralistic organizing institution in the international system. One state can confidently enter into diplomatic relations with another under a shared understanding. With sovereignty mutually recognized, nation-states can use diplomacy as the means to achieving political ends. Foreign policy is the content of foreign relations, comprising the aspirations and aims a country wants to achieve in its relations with other states and international governmental organizations. A developmental foreign policy is pro-engagement; it is not isolationist. It is fundamentally concerned with addressing domestic, continental, and global disparities and inequalities. Some countries formulate and publish their foreign policy goals. Sometimes a country's foreign policy goals are not published, but kept under wrap for security purposes.

Diplomacy plays an important part in shaping what happens in international relations. Diplomacy provides the spokes for one state's political interests to interface with those of another without resorting to military force. Diplomacy is used to manage the goals of foreign policy focusing on communication. Diplomacy attempts to manage the goals of foreign policy mostly by implementing goals but also by preparing foreign policy decisions. Diplomacy is negotiated when the interests of

states cannot be fully reconciled, and explicit bargaining is required to reveal the area of agreement. On the other hand, even when the will or opportunity to negotiate is absent, and when it is not explicit, bargaining can converge upon and underscore common interests between states, avoid misunderstandings, highlight the potential for communication between adversaries, and define practical steps to strengthen the harmony of interests. Non-negotiated bargaining is critical for international norms of behaviour. Convergent interests are commonly understood as increasing the potential of interstate cooperation. Convergence is stimulated either by shifts in national interest or by new opportunities to recognize those shifts.

WHAT IS DIPLOMACY?

- *1. The coexistence of separate political units necessitates a certain degree of contact amongst themselves. There is a need for communication between governments & the business of communicating between governments is technically termed as diplomacy.*
- *2. The Oxford dictionary defines diplomacy as the management of international relations by negotiation.*

Evolution OF DIPLOMACY

The foundations of diplomacy were established long before 1948 in times when states did not yet exist and cities pioneered as foreign policy entities. Diplomacy and foreign policy thus existed before the existence of states. The terms foreign policy and diplomacy have been used almost interchangeably. In international relations discourse the link between these two terms has traditionally been conceptualized as a rather simple objective versus tool relationship, in which diplomacy represents merely a lesser tool of

foreign policy in the world (James 1993). These two concepts were shaped by major political transformations. They can affect the constitution and transformation of notions of political subjectivity, sovereignty, national identity, mediation and international order.

- *Diplomacy as an instrument of foreign policy is nothing new and can be traced back to antiquity. Greece, Byzantium; Renaissance Italy made the most notable contributions to its evolution. But the origins of organized diplomacy dates back to the Congress of Vienna, 1815 & the subsequent regulations of Aix-la-Chapelle ultimately established the diplomatic services & the representation of the powers on an agreed basis.*
- *Four categories of representation were defined-*
 1. *Ambassadors, papal legates & papal nuncios*
 2. *Extra ordinary envoys & plenipotentiary ministers*
 3. *Minister's resident*
 4. *Charge d' Affaires*

NICOLSON'S MEANING TO DIPLOMACY

- *Synonym for foreign policy*
- *Negotiation*
- *The machinery by which such negotiation is carried out*
- *A branch of the foreign service*
- *An abstract quality or gift, which, in its best sense implies skill in the conduct of international negotiations and in its worst sense, implies the more guileful aspects of tact.*

Morgenthau referred to diplomacy as the brain of state power.

FUNCTIONS OF DIPLOMACY

Morgenthau provides four functions of diplomacy. These functions imply that one must:-

1. Determine the objectives of diplomacy in light of power actually & potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives.
2. Assess the objectives of other nations and the power actually & potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives.
3. Determine to what extent these different objectives are compatible with each other &
4. Employ the means suited to the pursuit of these objectives.

TYPES OF DIPLOMACY

- ***TRADITIONAL DIPLOMACY***
- ***NEW DIPLOMACY***

TRADITIONAL DIPLOMACY

- ❑ Till the end of 18th century diplomacy was branded as old or traditional diplomacy.

- ❑ It was old European kind of diplomacy
- ❑ The old diplomacy carried out its tasks in a world made up of states that were small, separated, limited in power and blessed ironically enough by half-hearted political loyalties.

Patience was a watchword, negotiations and talks would be initiated, broken off, resumed, discontinued temporarily and re-opened again by professionals in whose lexicon there was no substitute for diplomacy.

- TRADITIONAL DIPLOMACY is also known as-

- ❑ *Old diplomacy*
- ❑ *Bilateral diplomacy*
- ❑ *French/Italian system of diplomacy*

FEATURES OF TRADITIONAL DIPLOMACY

- ***STRUCTURE-Had a communication process between recognizably by modern states rather than any other forms of political organizations such as the Catholic church. It was Europe-centric. Diplomacy was virtually European Diplomacy. Traditional diplomacy was the monopoly of the aristocratic class and of the professional diplomats who shared a rapport with each other.***
- ***PROCESS-Diplomacy organised on bilateral basis & undertaken in secrecy characterised by certain rules and procedures.***
- ***AGENDA-Parochial and narrow***

NEW DIPLOMACY

- ❑ *The 19th century diplomacy is referred to as modern diplomacy or new diplomacy.*
- ❑ *Factors like development in technology and communication, importance of public opinion and change in the structure of international society after Post-second world war gave birth to new diplomacy.*
- ❑ *Europe was no longer the center of international affairs.*

FEATURES OF NEW DIPLOMACY

- *STRUCTURE-Structure of new diplomacy was same as of old diplomacy. States still remained the major actors. The only difference was that the stage has to be shared with non-state actors.*
- *PROCESS-Diplomacy became more complicated activity involving states and non-state actors. Alongside bilateral negotiations on a state-to-state basis, groups of states negotiated multilaterally in inter-governmental organisations like the U.N.& other non-governmental organizations.*
- *AGENDA-The agenda contained a no. of economic,social,welfare issues identified as low politics & military,war,peace issues identified as high politics.*

TYPES OF NEW DIPLOMACY

- ❑ *Democratic diplomacy*
- ❑ *Totalitarian diplomacy*
- ❑ *Summit diplomacy*
- ❑ *Personal diplomacy*

- ❑ *Diplomacy by conference*
- ❑ *Parliamentary diplomacy*
- ❑ *Multilateral diplomacy*
- ❑ *Bilateral diplomacy*

DEMOCRATIC DIPLOMACY

- *Common form of diplomacy by the turn of 21st century.*
- *Participation of people in the politics of the state.*
- *Importance of public opinion.*

TOTALITARIAN DIPLOMACY

- *The rise of totalitarian states like Germany, Italy, The soviet union after the first world war a new but disturbing kind of diplomacy came-up.*
- *Use of modern techniques of military, political and psychological power to expand their spheres of influence ,gain and control over other states and subvert other regimes and further their aggressive policy of expansion.*

SUMMIT DIPLOMACY

Direct participation of foreign minister, Heads of States and Heads of Governments in diplomatic negotiations.

PERSONAL DIPLOMACY

- *Normal channels of diplomacy are used only to a limited degree.*
- *Heads of States embark on using their personal agents or representatives to handle delicate problems in international relations.*

- *They even sometimes grow a tendency to consult their personal favorites rather than the foreign ministers.*
- *Sometimes they directly approach his counterpart in the other country.*

DIPLOMACY BY CONFERENCE

Involves periodic meetings of regional and international organizations attended by a no. of representatives of the member states and sometimes the non-member states too.

PARLIAMENTARY DIPLOMACY

- *A continuing organization*
- *A regular public debate exposed to the media*
- *Rules of procedure which govern the process of debate*
- *Formal conclusions ordinarily expressed by resolution*

MULTILATERAL DIPLOMACY

- *Having many sides.*
- *Involving more than two nations or parties*

BILATERAL DIPLOMACY

- *consists of the political, economic, or cultural relations between two sovereign states*
- *It is in contrast to unilateralism or multilateralism, which refers to the conduct of diplomacy by a single state or multiple states, respectively. When states recognize one another as sovereign states and agree to develop diplomatic relations, they exchange*

diplomatic agents such as ambassadors to facilitate dialogues and cooperation.

Impact of Diplomacy on Foreign Policy

Diplomacy is inevitably driven by changing events, if not exclusively so. The points of contact between states have increased dramatically. International trade, tourism, migration, development assistance, and cultural exchanges have linked countries together. The communications revolution, the impacts of modern technology, the emergence of new non-government influences (business, the professionals, civil society), the new risks (environmental dilapidation, resource scarcity), as well as those intractable afflictions (poverty) magnified by globalization are all set to undermine diplomatic services over the pursuit of relations and issues between countries. Diplomatic communication, traditionally based on “government-to-government” and “diplomat-to-diplomat” interactions, has expanded to include “government-to-people” contacts. Foreign public opinion today is gaining ever more significance in forming an emerging globalized public and influencing international political process and outcome. Issues that used to be considered part of the domestic domain, figure prominently today on the international agenda. Publics, domestic or foreign, do not always have an informed view or coherent opinion on matters related to cross-national and foreign policy issues. Direct and effective linkages between public opinion and policies always do not exist either. However, the role of individuals and their expressed opinions do form a climate of opinion in which decision-makers pursue policies. Therefore, the perceptions and opinions held by foreign publics regarding a given nation are critically important to decisions by nation-state.

The goals of a country’s foreign policy are increasingly influenced by domestic and external forces, thus, the objectives of a country’s foreign policy undergo frequent changes. With the changing global political and economic landscape, the proliferation of media and communication technologies, the emergence of new actors in global affairs, and most of all, the complex confluence of these facets, the credibility and

effectiveness of standard communication practices in diplomacy is under challenge. Managing the information flow in such contexts is the realm of diplomacy, particularly in the new world of globalization and communication.

Diplomacy today struggles to reflect the diversity and pluralism of the globalized age. It is almost impossible to examine any problem in contemporary international relations effectively without considering the diplomatic challenges which it poses, the innovations in diplomatic practice which it calls forth, and the contribution which diplomacy can make to easing the problem in such a way as to contribute to a more peaceful, just, and orderly world.

Role of Multinational companies and impact of Pressure Politics on Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

The three concepts are greatly intertwined. This is evident from the manner in which they relate to each other, and one cannot discuss any one concept without mentioning the others. This has been illustrated in this section and empirical evidence has been provided in order to clearly show this relationship.

Diplomacy is an instrument of foreign policy. Through this instrument, negotiations and peace treaties have been signed among states in order to enhance state-state relations. Governments of one country engage governments of another country. This is accomplished by diplomats in order to improve the foreign policy of a country. For example, the US used public diplomacy to improve her foreign policy towards other countries abroad especially in the Middle East. This was affected after the September 11th terror attack. Increased globalization has caused public diplomacy to grow in importance in modern foreign policy.

Social media diplomatic tools like twitter and face book now allow global interconnectivity that goes beyond countries' borders, political systems and ideologies. This has thus changed foreign policies of countries. For instance, in China despite severe media censorship, the democracy movement in Tiananmen Square spread its messages around the world in 1989 via fax machines. This changed China's interactions with the rest of the world. since new state actors were brought in. this form of diplomacy is contributing to changes in the economic infrastructure, trade relations as well as internal and external politics of state. This diplomacy is redefining power in world politics therefore changing the foreign policy of countries (Nye, Owens, Cohen, 1996). In addition, this diplomacy working through NGOs and interactive technologies such as the internet are creating a global civil society and pressure groups such as Amnesty International or green peace serve as new actors in the making of foreign policy of states.

Foreign policy enables the setting of the agenda of world politics and renewal of interest in foreign policy through diplomacy. For example, the events of 11th September 2001 focused attention on the centrality of decisions taken by states and other independent actors such as Bush's strategy to eliminate terrorism danger to the whole world. Diplomacy is a tool of foreign policy and war, alliances and international trade may all be manifestations of it. For example, the US has long used its diplomatic relations with other nations and international organizations to formulate and implement her foreign policy. As binding agreements among nations, treaties remain a central tool among representatives of the world's nations to uphold shared interests and obligations. Specific treaties including those that created international organizations like NATO continue to be a mainstay of foreign policy.

Military force is a diplomatic tool that countries use to achieve their foreign policies (Vladimir, 1978). During the Cold War, the US used the policy of containment, which employed military and economic pressure to hold Soviet Union power in check. This enabled the US to sell her ideologies to the rest of the world (Waltz,

2005). The end of the Cold War brought new challenges and the use of US military power as a tool of foreign policy and on several occasions, military was committed to diplomatic activities such as peacekeeping and nation building activities.

International trade is an important tool of foreign policy in which nations participate in a market system of imports and exports with other nations. For example, for most of our history, nations erected high tariffs or taxes to lessen the effects of foreign products on domestic economies. Trade policies remain critical to foreign policies of countries. The US for example seeks ways to reduce trade barriers through regional and international agreements such as GATT and NAFTA.

Diplomacy enhances state to state relations among nations and this provides an essential framework for the conduct of foreign policy. For example, many American officials regarded withholding diplomatic relations as a way to punish countries for actions ranging from human rights abuses, to failure to abide by the international law to specific treaty violations and acts of war. having no relations and the resulting prolonged absence of a diplomatic presence in a country, seriously handicaps America's ability to achieve major foreign policy and national security goals. Diplomatic relations should therefore be maintained, unless security requires closing the embassy (Vladmir, 1978)..

Global health diplomacy is the relationship between health and foreign policy. Even if what affects health today is transnational in nature, countries remain core actors that must reorient their health and foreign policies in ways that align their national interests with the diplomatic, epidemiological and ethical realities of a globalized world.

Nevertheless, the cutting edge of global health diplomacy raises certain cautious regarding health role in foreign policies.

Competition among countries' national interests sometimes impedes foreign policy coherence, which makes attainment of health goals more difficult. After September 11th incident in America, their attitude changed. President Obama acknowledges that America's new foreign policy must include assistance to troubled nations as a key diplomatic tool in re engaging as a leader on the international stage. Improving global health is America's cornerstone to their foreign policy footing.

In the recent years, global health issues have risen to the highest levels of international politics and have become accepted as legitimate issues in foreign policy. It is an instrument of statecraft. Foreign policy can endanger health when diplomacy breaks down or when trade considerations trump health. Health can be used as an instrument of foreign policy in order to achieve other goals. Health can be an integral part of diplomacy and besides foreign policy can be used to promote health goals. Generally, health is an integral part of the global agenda in terms of security, economic and social justice.

The conduct of foreign policy has been enhanced by information and communication resources available to non state actors. The emergence of a global civil society in the form of over 30,000 NGOs alongside nearly some 200 state actors as well as IGOs, Trans National Corporations (TNCs) and Trans Media Corporations (TNCs) , has added to the complexity of foreign policy (Commission on Global Governance, 1995). In addition, telecommunications as a diplomatic tool is contributing to changes in the economic infrastructures, competitiveness, trade relations, as well as internal and external politics of states. It also affects national security, including the conduct and deterrence against wars, terrorism, civil war, the emergence of new weapons systems, command and control and intelligence collection, analysis and dissemination. For instance, the Persian Gulf War provided a glimpse of what future wars might look like (Commission on Global Governance, 1995). The emergence of an international politics of cultural identity organized around religious, ethnic or

racial fetishisms suggests what the future issues in foreign policy might be.

Global communication as a tool of diplomacy is redefining power in world politics (Nye and Owens, 1996). Major changes seem to be taking place in both hard and soft power conceptions and calculations. In addition, global television communication networks such as CNN, BBC and Star TV have added image politics and public diplomacy.

Headline diplomacy refers to how news coverage affects foreign policy (Seib, 1997). The news coverage shapes the design and implementation of foreign policy. By influencing the political attitudes of opinion-shaping elites and the public at large, the news media can profoundly affect the conduct of foreign policy (Seib, 1997), examples of press influence on foreign policies of states include the news media's definition of success and failure, as in reporting the 1968 Tet Offensive in Vietnam. News reports can lead to public impatience, which can pressure presidents as happened during the Iran hostage crisis of 1979-81. In addition, presidents can anticipate and control news media coverage, as was done by the Bush administration during the 1991 Gulf War. Press revelation or suppression of secret information affects foreign policy, as in the cases of the Bay of Pigs, the Cuban missile crisis and various intelligence operations. Coverage of humanitarian crises affects public opinion.

Tacit diplomacy has also contributed to foreign policy behavior between states. Tacit diplomacy involves scientific issues such as genetically modified organisms (GMOs) or synthetic biology. Scientific cooperation between states can help to change a diplomatic relationship or enhance the economic trade and or security of countries. Science also informs the processes related to for example, securing arms control, mitigating climate change, improving food security or reducing illegal trade in endangered species. This form of diplomacy governs how the global community

of scientists interacts via understood, but generally unstated, behavioral norms. This interaction has positive implications on the foreign policies of countries.

Commercial diplomacy involves the use of international business as a tool of a country's foreign policy.

International business has always been intimately linked to the politics of the global economy, thus affecting the foreign policy of countries. Nations use commercial diplomacy to expand trade and investment in the context of declining economic policy sovereignty. The creation of the WTO in 1995 led to an extension of the rules and regulations of international trade and trade related matters. Major nations in the South and East are now key players and the driving force behind the continuing and increasing economic integration of nations through age-old processes of international trade and foreign direct investment.

Module No. 5.

International Organizations

The advent of international organizations is somewhat a recent phenomenon. Rapid industrialization resulted into revolutionary improvements in the facilities of travel, transportation, and communication within and between states. These improvements offered opportunities but also generated new problems for governments. The sheer complexity of all this led governments to seek new forms of interstate co-operation that resulted, by the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, in what used to be known generally as international organization.

The term 'international', thought to be the creation of Jeremy Betham, is often seen as an inapplicable designation. Instead, it is claimed, the term 'interstate' or 'intergovernmental' should be used when describing an activity -war, diplomacy, relations of any kind --conducted between two sovereign states and their governmental representatives.

The use of the term 'organizations' and 'institutions' also need some clarification. It is generally seen that some authors use these both terms interchangeably. We often come across the phrases like

'international institutions' or 'international organizations' used to describe a same body International relations, whether between governments, groups or individuals, are not totally random and chaotic but are somewhat organized. One form of the organization of international relations can be seen in the institutions --- ' the collective forms or basic structures of social organization as established by law or by human tradition--- whether these be trade, commerce, diplomacy, conferences or international organizations.

An international organization in this context represents a form of institution that refers to a formal system of rules and objectives, a rationalized administrative instrument and which has a" formal technical and material organization: constitutions, local chapters, physical equipment, machines, emblems, letter-head stationery, a staff, an administrative hierarchy and so forth."

As stated a few paragraphs earlier, the International organization system is a very recent phenomenon in the history of international relations. Some writers date it back to the Congress of Vienna [1815] while others take the year of the creation of the first international institution,

the International Telegraph Union [1865], known today as the International Telecommunication Union, as its starting date.

However, the development of the international organizations and conventions really did not take root until the last quarter of the 19th century. In the year 1865, France, Belgium and Italy created the Latin

Monetary Union; in 1874, the Postal Bureau, presently known as the Universal Postal Union, was founded; it was followed, in 1883, by the creation of the Union for the Protection of Patents; and the Berne Convention on Copyright was signed in 1886.

The initial international organizations were technical in nature and had very specific and limited regulatory functions, which had become indispensable to a greatly needed systematic co-operation between member states in areas where they could not cope by themselves with modern developments. The Inter-Parliamentary Union emerged at the end of the Nineteenth century with a specific purpose of arbitration with a view to resolve conflicts between the nations having disputes, but gradually developed into an organization striving for establishment of general peace in the world.

Definitions:

There is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes an international organization although some consensus has emerged. The Yearbook of International Organizations (1976!7) lists eight criteria for inclusion under the rubric of international organization. They can be summarized thus:

The aims must be genuinely international with the intention to cover at least three states.

Membership must be individual or collective participation, with full voting rights, from at least three states and must be open to any individual and entity appropriately qualified in the organization's area of operations. Voting must be so that no one national group can control the organization.

The constitution must provide for a formal structure giving members the right periodically to elect governing bodies and officers. Provision should be made for continuity of operation with a permanent headquarters.

Officers should not all be of the same nationality for more than a given period.

There should be substantial contribution to the budget from at least three states and there should be no attempt to make profits for distribution to members.

Those with an organic relationship with other organizations must show it can exist independently and elect its own officials.

Evidence of current activities must be available.

There are some negative criteria: size, politics, ideology, fields of activity, geographical location of headquarters, nomenclature are irrelevant in deciding whether a set-up is an 'international organization' or not.

The formation of international organizations has been a notable feature of the international relations since 1945. Perhaps the most feature of international scene today, in comparison with a century ago, is the proliferation of international organizations of all types. This growth has responded in part to the need for maintaining international peace and security, and in a greater part to the pressing demands of nations for cooperation in the economic, social and technical fields.

The League of Nations was the first universal comprehensive organizations formed by the international community of nations. It was created in 1919, after the

First World War. This creation marked a turning point in the evolution of world affairs. Until the creation of the League of Nations, world affairs were to a large extent influenced by the periodic international conferences that were held in Europe. The system of conferences dealing with problems that concerned two or more states had dominated the European affairs during the nineteenth century. Although the Peace Conference of Westphalia of 1648, which ended the Thirty-Year War (religious war) in Europe, was the first conference held in Europe, the Congress of Vienna of 1815 initiated the era of international conferences and multilateral treaties. The Congress of Vienna, which terminated the Napoleonic Wars, was a significant turning point because it marked the first systematic attempt to regulate international affairs by means of regular international conferences. The system of Congress of Vienna lasted for a century and institutionalized not only the balance of power approach to international relations and politics, but also a semi-formal international order.

The concept of international conference was introduced as a form of extended diplomacy because the diplomatic contacts were unable alone to cope completely with the complexities of international affairs. International conferences and diplomatic contacts were used by European nations during the nineteenth century as forms of cooperation to introduce or promote their political and economic relations, and to face world issues. In many cases, conferences resulted in international treaties or

formal peace. European nations held several conferences in the nineteenth century, the major conferences were: the Paris Conference of 1856, the Berlin Gathering of 1871 and the Berlin conference of 1878 which dealt with the questions of the Balkans; and the Berlin Conferences of 1884 and of 1885 which dealt with the European interests in Africa.

During the course of time, conferences proved that they were inadequate to fulfill the objectives they were intended to achieve. A conference could only be convened at the initiative of one or more states involved, usually following international crises. Only invited states could attend. An invited state involved might refuse to attend. Decisions could not be taken except by unanimous agreements. These factors severely restricted the use and effectiveness of conferences as methods of state cooperation. However, conferences constituted an important prelude to the establishment of international institutions.

In the nineteenth century, several inter-governmental institutions were also established covering transportation, communications, health and economic cooperation. Examples of such institutions were the commission of the Rhine (1831), the Commission of the Danube (1856), the International Telegraphic Union (1865) and the Universal Postal Union (1874). Such international institutions were not comprehensive ones, but functional ones joining together governmental departments or administrations for specific purposes. They were created

by multilateral treaties. The powers entrusted to them varied, but most of them performed important administrative and legislative functions. They combined permanent bureaus or secretariats and periodic conferences. Their decisions could be taken by majority vote. These features constituted a step forward in state cooperation since they enable the institutions to overcome the weaknesses of conferences, particularly the principle of unanimity.

The nineteenth century also witnessed the creation of several international non-governmental institutions dealing with specific matters. Examples of such institutions were the International Committee of the Red Cross (founded in 1863) and the International Law Association (founded in 1873). Such private institutions created the machinery for regular meetings and many established permanent secretariats. The works of these institutions were, and remain, of considerable value in influencing governmental activities and stimulating world action in specific matters of international concern.

The establishment of international institutions in the nineteenth century was significant since they paved the way for international organizations of the twentieth century. The innovation of the twentieth century was the creation of universal comprehensive organizations, such as the League of Nations and the United Nations.

Just as the First World War had led to the establishment of the League of Nations, the Second World War led to the establishment of the United Nations. In these two cases,

States developed ways for maintaining international peace and security and for cooperations between nations. These two organizations laid the foundation for the system of international organizations.

Today, the United Nations forms the key-stone of the system of international organizations. Affiliated with the United Nations are the specialized agencies. Beside these organizations, there are many regional organizations of various types and forms, in Europe, in America, in Asia, in Africa, and in the Pacific

The League of Nations:

Man is a peace-loving animal. What is anger in a man's life is war in the life of a state. After the dust of the war settles down there is a search for peace. After the Thirty Years' War was over a peace formula was evolved to maintain the peace in Europe.

At the close of the Napoleonic War there came into being a peace machinery called the Concert of Europe. Both the efforts could not perpetuate peace in Europe or the world.

So took place the First World War which had a record of human casualty and destruction of national property. So there was an increased discussion on the need of peace which could be possible only by goodwill and tolerance. So, during the explosive days of the war there was an ever-growing talk on how to enforce peace in the world.

The League of Nations was born close on the heels of the First World War. As a matter of fact, the conditions of the global war like the reactions to the horrors of the war and the desire to keep the balance of power for the safeguard of the nations were the immediate factors responsible for this world body.

The reaction of heavy bloodshed and death of ten millions of population and devastation of property worth Rs. 386,000,000,000 made every country harbour the idea of keeping away from the war, which brought in its wake famine, pestilence and economic ruination.

The coming of a war could be checked if there was a balance of power in Europe, which alone can guarantee against aggression. Thus the creation of the League of Nations had a holy purpose.

In the USA there emerged a public opinion called a “**League to Enforce Peace**” in June 1915 with a four point programme. The Republican leader William Howard Taft took a leading role in it. This was backed by wide public support.

The League called for the submission of all international disputes to arbitration, called the Council of Conciliation. It also suggested the use of economic and military force by all states against the warring state. It also recommended for periodical congresses to codify international law.

In 1916, President Woodrow Wilson of the USA expressed the desire to participate in any association of nations. This was a period when the USA remained neutral in the First World War. After the USA joined the

war club, she insisted that peace in future can be maintained only by a partnership of all democratic countries on a world basis

One of President Wilson's Fourteen Points carried a proposal for an Association of Nations to ensure mutual guarantee of political independence and territorial integrity of all states. A draft entitled "Proposals for Avoidance of War" was published in 1915, which contained a preface written by Lord James Bryce.

This was quickly followed by the establishment of "The League of Nations Society" in 1915 and "The League of Free Nations Associations" in 1918. These two bodies were amalgamated into the "**League of Nations Union.**"

A draft convention was drawn up by the British Foreign Office in March 1918. Wilson's first draft was done in July 1918. It was General Smuts' plan in December 1918 that outlined the Council and the Mandate System. Wilson prepared the second draft on 10 January 1919 and the third one ten days hence.

These three drafts were revised and sent to the League of Nations Commission of the Peace Conference for its consideration under the chairmanship of Wilson. On 28 April 1919 the draft was unanimously adopted and the Covenant of the League of Nations was incorporated into the Treaty of Versailles, which was signed by the German Delegation on 28 June 1919. The League of Nations was formally inaugurated in 19 January 1920 with its headquarters at Geneva in Switzerland.

. Membership of the League:

The members of the league were of two categories – original members and non-original members. Those countries that signed the Versailles Peace Treaty and accepted the Covenant of the League before 20 March 1920 were the original members. The non-original members could be included in the League by a resolution adopted by two-thirds votes in the assembly of the League.

The withdrawal or removal of a member was done in three ways:

By giving a notice for such withdrawal two years in advance;

The League could expel any member on the ground that it violated any norm of the covenant; and

Any member not accepting or ratifying any amendment would automatically cease to be a member.

3. The Structure of the League:

The structure of the league consisted of five organs, namely the Assembly, the Council the Secretariat, the Permanent Court of International Justice and the International Labour Organisation. These are taken up one after another:

The Assembly:

The Assembly was the principal organ of the League. It consisted of the representatives of the various states which were members of the League. All the decisions

of the League were to be unanimous. One member state had only one vote. The Assembly would discuss on the political and economic issues which had a bearing on the peace or danger for the world.

The Assembly would render advice to the member states to reconsider the questions of amendment of the treaties that fell through by lapse of time. In addition to the supervision of the work of the Council, it would revise the budget presented by the Secretariat.

The Council:

The executive organ of the League was called the Council. It was comprised of the permanent members, the non-permanent members and the ad hoc members. Its original permanent members were England, France, Italy, Japan and the USA. Germany and Russia were given permanent seats on their entry in 1926 and 1934, respectively. The non-permanent members were elected by the Assembly for a tenure of three years.

There were eleven non-permanent members. The council set to meet at least once a year. Its jurisdiction of action was any issue that involved the general peace of the world. It was to evolve ways and means to reduce armament by the member states. It was also required to plug the making of munitions and implements of war by private bodies. Its main function was to safeguard the territorial integrity of each member states.

If a dispute would run riot, the Council would institute an enquiry into it which should be completed within six months. Whenever any member state would adopt

belligerency, it was enjoined upon the Council to ask the other member states to contribute their military, naval and air potentialities to protect the interest of the aggrieved country. Any conflict between the member and non-member states was also taken up by the Council, which would diffuse the crisis by an acceptable settlement.

The Secretariat:

The Secretariat was the administrative organ of the League. Its headquarters was located at Geneva in Switzerland. The Secretary-General was the head of this establishment. The employees of the Secretariat were appointed by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Council.

The staff of the Secretariat had certain privileges and immunities in their official capacities. The member states had to contribute towards the expenditure of the Secretariat. Unlike the Assembly and the Council which functioned from time to time, the Secretariat had to work round the year without any break.

The Permanent Court of International Justice:

This body was commonly known as the World Court. Its judges were appointed by the Assembly and the Council. The permanent seat of the court was at the Hague. The court had fifteen judges whose tenure was for nine years. The judges could be re-elected. Every member state referring a dispute to the court could appoint one judge of its nationality, if it had no such judge in the court. Its budget was prepared by the Assembly.

The main function of the court is to interpret any dispute in international law and determine when any treaty obligation was violated. It had the authority to give advice to the Assembly and the Council whenever such opinion was sought for. By 1937 as many as forty-one states agreed to submit before the World Court all disputes, to which they were a party in regard to international law and international treaty. No appeal would lie against the order of the court. But the court could review and change its decision on the basis of new facts and circumstances.

International Labour Organisation:

Since labour was a new factor in the national life of all countries after the Industrial and Technological Revolution, the League considered it prudent to have an organ on this new field. The organisation aimed at improving the conditions of labour in all corners of the globe. Its governing council was comprised of the representatives of the governments, employers and workers.

In its annual meeting the organisations would take major decisions on labour. Several international organisations and unions were subjected to the control and advice of the organisation. The most important of them were International Commission for Air Navigation, International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, International Bureau for Information and Enquiries Regarding Relief to Foreigners, International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, Central International Office for the Control of Liquor Traffic in Africa, etc.

4. Objects Aim of the League:

The aim of the League was to remove the war conditions from all corners of the globe. The belligerent temperature of the globe and war hysteria which had transformed the world into a powder magazine might explode into conflagrations any moment. There was talk and strong feeling that if mankind was to be saved from the catastrophe which awaited it, it should replace international anarchy by international order.

The doctrine of international solidarity must take the place of the doctrine of national sovereignty. What is the doctrine of internationalism? It stands for a family of self-respecting and self-governing nations unified to each other by ties of equality and living at peace and concerned with each other.

There must be an end of throttling the throat of a neighbour. Internationalism tells us that peace can only come, from our having confidence and trust in each other. It is based on the goodwill and tolerance between all the nations of the world.

The basic objective of the League was to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security. The members of the League agreed that in the case of a dispute likely to disturb the peace they would submit the matter for orders by the Council or a judicial decision by the World Court. In case any member state resorted to war, that member would be considered as the committer of an act of war against all other members of the League. Thus the League of Nations was the first major endeavour as an

international organisation to maintain peace and international cooperation in the globe.

Functions and Achievements of the League:

The league started functioning with a note of promise. It achieved some remarkable triumphs in ending some international disputes.

It has also success in social and economic fields:

The affair of the Aaland islands was a record achievement of the League. Sweden and Finland were claimants of the island which was the entrance to the Gulf of Bothnia. In 1921 the League permitted Finland to retain sovereignty over the island and the inhabitants who were Swedish were granted local self-government. This was a great step forward in the peaceful settlement of international problems.

The league had a hard task over the Corfu incident involving Italy and Greece in 1923. The crisis arose over the murder of four Italian members of a commission in Greek territory. The Italian dictator Benito Mussolini seized the opportunity and sent an ultimatum to Greece, who appealed to the League for help. The League asked Greece to pay a huge sum as compensation to Italy. On receipt of the amount, Italy withdrew from Corfu. In this way the League succeeded in averting a war.

The international boundary between Poland and Germany and between Yugoslavia and Albania was laid down by the League. A menacing quarrel between

Turkey and England over rich oil deposits in Iraq was also amicably solved by the League in 1924.

The League made some praiseworthy progress in the exchange and repatriation of nearly 500,000 prisoners of war. It saved from certain starvation 1,000,000 persons in the Greco-Turkish War of 1921-1922. The League also lent the desperately needed financial aid to Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary and the Free City of Danzig.

The League introduced a system called the “mandate”, under which the territories captured from the central powers and Turkey were to be kept under the supervision of various countries. The League exercised its supervision over the working of the mandates, which were devised to promote the welfare of the backward sections under the guidance of the major powers like England, France, Belgium, South Africa, New Zealand, Australia and Japan. This not only put an end to the annexation of the dependent states by the victorious or big powers, but kept these under the supervision and welfare programmes of the advanced countries.

The League had more success in non-political issues like health, humanitarianism and intellectual activities. It underlined the importance of hygienic techniques to lessen epidemics in various nations. It made an investigation into the question of slavery in certain quarters of the world. It also undertook the publication of books and periodicals about national and international problems of all kinds and relayed important information, especially in the field of health from its own radio stations.

The League immensely succeeded in bringing a coordination among the economic, social and cultural spheres. It conducted a supervision over the safe return of the war prisoners. It looked after several hundred refugees who had left Turkey. It also instituted a medical service to check traffic in women, exploitation of children and sale of opium.

The most lasting gifts of the League were the International Labour Organisation and the Permanent Court of International Justice that rendered useful services between 1919 and 1939. The former mainly aimed at establishing social justice on the principle that labour is not a commodity but a right of the workers to have free associations and collective bargaining. Keeping close to the ground, many member states took up several liberal legislations for the welfare of labour.

. Failure of the League:

The League had a long catalogue of failures. The major failure of the League was on the issue of disarmament which, though one of the main aims of it, could not be pressed into successful implementation. As a matter of fact, there was little or no progress in this frontier.

There grew intense military and naval preparedness among England, the USA and Japan. This arms race was a direct challenge to the League. It was over this question of disarmament that Germany and France fell out. And this vexed question led to the withdrawal of Germany from the League, which cast the die for the doom of the League.

The League failed to take any positive stand in diffusing the tension between England and Egypt. Nor could it successfully mediate over the dispute between China and the European powers in connection with the right of the foreigners in China. Its most grievous blunder was to remain a silent spectator when Japan attacked China, Italy attacked Abyssinia and Germany attacked Czechoslovakia.

Causes of the Failure of the League of Nations:

Although the League of Nations was the first bold step in easing world tension, it was doomed to failure for the following causes:

In the first place, the League was badly timed. Although there were high-sounding words associated with the aims and objects of the League, it was outwardly a world organisation but inwardly and really an instrument for the domination by the Allies over the defeated countries inasmuch as since its inception there had been a chain of treaties and counter-treaties among the Allies.

The Post-First World War period was not a good time for the world to have such an organisation, because it was a time of imperialism, territorial expansion and grabbing the neighbours' lands. Europe was fluid and nothing permanent was possible.

In the second place, the League was inherently weak in the absence of some big powers like the USA, Germany and Russia who stayed away from it. No doubt Russia and Germany joined the League later on, but it was too late and they did not stay there long because of their respective national interest. Thus

nationalism was the be-all and end-all of every country, though they wore the mask of internationalism.

In the third place, with the exclusion of the USA, Russia and Germany, the League became the plaything of two close neighbours, namely England and France who were known for aggressive imperial designs. Thus the League became the imperial instrument of the Anglo-French nationalism.

They gave lip-service to the League. The British Prime Minister Lloyd George sincerely disliked the League. As for the French Prime Minister George Clemenceau, he did not fight shy to tell Woodrow Wilson- **“I like your League of Nations, I like it very much, but I do not believe in it.”** This type of hypocrisy impeded the prospect of the League from its very inception.

Fourthly, the League had double standards inasmuch as it favoured the capitalist bloc of powers and adopted a biased and prejudiced attitude towards the communist bloc of powers. It is, therefore, small wonder that the League time and again condoned all the lapses of Italy and Germany and did not adopt a tough line against them. But a single lapse of Russia with regard to Finland goaded the League to take such a drastic step as expelling Russia from the League.

Fifthly, the unanimity in decision which was the procedure in the League enabled a very small state to upset the scheme of the League. When Fascist Italy attacked Spain, the League could not go through with the condemnation of Italy because of the veto of a small

state like Portugal. As a matter of fact, behind every small member there was a big power to back from behind. Thus the League was a virtual puppet show of the string-holders from behind.

Lastly, the League was a teeth-less tiger in the sense that it had no arms of its own to deploy against a rebel nation. How could a belligerent nation be brought to its knees if there is no adequate weaponry to use against it? Thus in the absence of an army of its own, the League could not implement or execute its decision.

Thus its decisions and works remained rather on papers only. This was a very serious handicap of the League.

UNO

Establishment of the U.N.O (United Nations Organization)

London Declaration:

When the Second World War was going on, the Big Powers assembled at London On 12 June, 1941.

These countries were England, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, France, South Africa, Greece, Belgium and Czechoslovakia. All the countries assembled at the

James Palace at London. They declared for an international peace organisation in this London Declaration.

Various attempts were made for the establishment of the U.N.O. These efforts have been discussed below.

The Atlantic Charter:

During the Second World War, England's Prime Minister Winston Churchill and the U.S.A. President Franklin Roosevelt met in a ship on the Atlantic Ocean. They signed a declaration on 12 June, 1941 which is known as Atlantic Charter. In this declaration importance was attached for the establishment of an international organisation. Importance was also attached on the prevalence of international peace, non-aggression and formation of one's own Government by a country.

Declaration of the UNO:

ADVERTISEMENTS:

Atlantic Declaration was recognised on 1 January 1942. After that, declaration was made about the United Nations Organisation. 26 Countries signed this agreement later. In this declaration it was unanimously accepted that the member nations should help each other and without their permission it was impossible to make alliance with the enemy countries.

Moscow Declaration:

The Foreign Ministers of USA, England, Russia and China assembled at Moscow, on 30 October, 1943. In this declaration a decision was taken regarding the

establishment of an International Organisation and every nation could take part in it.

Teheran Conference:

On 1 December, 1943, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin met at Teheran. In this Conference, the three leaders put emphasis on international peace and security. A declaration was also made in this Conference regarding these principles.

Dumbarton Oaks Conference:

This Conference played a vital role in creating an international organisation. In this Conference, a discussion was made regarding the name, structure, functions and different parts of the Organisation.

Yalta Conference:

A Conference was arranged at Yalta on 11 February 1945. In this conference Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin assembled again. They put emphasis on the creation of an international Organisation to keep up world peace. In this Conference, many unsolved problems of Dumbarton Oaks Conference were solved in this Conference.

San Francisco Conference:

This Conference was the last attempt for the formation of United Nations Organisation. It was held at San Francisco on 25 June 1945. All the 51 nations present there, discussed on the UNO Charter. After the recommendation of countries like USA, Soviet Russia, England, France, China etc. it was declared that the UNO Charter would function soon. Thus, the UNO came into existence on 24 October, 1945.

Establishment of the United Nations Organization:

As stated earlier, the UNO Charter was recognised on 24 October 1945 and the UNO was established. It played a vital role in keeping world peace. Gradually its membership started to increase. Now UNO has 191 member states. These numbers will increase in future. Really, the establishment of the UNO created a new chapter in the world history. Along with the establishment of UNO, the maintenance of world peace began to take a concrete step.

In order to reduce the gap between Russia and United States of America in the Cold War period, the attempt of the UNO was remarkable. The role of UNO in undertaking many welfare activities in the nook and corner of the world is praiseworthy.

Important Organs of the United Nations Organization!

The Structure of UNO has been formed with the following organs. These organs are the 'General Assembly', 'Security Council', 'Economic and Social Council', 'International Court of Justice' and 'Trusteeship Council'.

The General Assembly:

The chief organ of the UNO is General Assembly. It consists of the members of the UNO. The maximum number of representatives from each member state is five. But each of the countries has only one vote. The General Assembly is like the World Parliament. It ordinarily meets once in a year. In case of emergency a

special session is held. It controls the works of the 'Economic and Social Council' and 'Trusteeship Council'. It also appoints General Secretary and amends the UN Charter.

The Security Council:

The Security Council consists of 15 member states. The Security Council constitutes having five permanent members. These members are the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Russia and China. The permanent members have the power to 'Veto' any of the decision being taken by the Council.

This means that even if the issue is being supported by a majority, it cannot be settled. It implies that there has to be a consensus of all the five permanent members for a decision to be taken. It appoints the Justice of the International Court of Justice. It has also power for amendment in UNO Charter. However, the Security Council plays a predominant role in sustaining world peace.

ADVERTISEMENTS:

The Economic and Social Council:

Another main organ of the UNO is the Economic and Social Council This Council has 54 members. One third or 18 members are elected every year by the General Assembly for a term of three years. This council gives proposal for international Economic, Social, Cultural, Educational and Health Problems.

This Council also tries restlessly to wipe out poverty from the world. 'The International Labour

Organisation' (ILO), 'Food And Agricultural Organisation' (FAO), 'World Health Organisation' (WHO), 'United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation' (UNESCO) and 'International Monetary Fund (IMF) are the prominent organs of this Council.

The Trusteeship Council:

ADVERTISEMENTS:

The Trusteeship Council is also another part of the UNO. All the permanent members of the Security Council are the members of this council. But they cannot apply their veto power in this council. The Trusteeship Council aims at helping the countries through different measures. It coordinates among various regions and members.

It also receives applications from several trusteeship regions and takes steps for the improvement of the lot of the people of these regions. It looks after various welfare projects of the trusteeship regions and guides them in achieving success in these measures.

The International Court of Justice:

The International Court of Justice consists of 15 Judges elected by the Security Council and the General Assembly. According to the UN Charter, each one of them has to be from a different country. The court gives advisory opinion on legal matters to the organs and special agencies of the UNO when solicited.

It also considers legal disputes brought before it by nations. It is located at The Hague. A case in this court can be discussed in the presence of minimum nine

judges. There is no fixed age for the retirement of a judge of the International Court of Justice. Of course, this international court has not achieved great success in many cases till today.

The Secretariat:

The Secretariat is the prominent organ of the UNO. The day-to-day functioning of the 'UN is done by the Secretariats whose head is Secretary General. He is appointed by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council. As the Head Office of the UNO is situated at New York, the Secretariat also functions from that place.

It organises the International Conference to solve the international problems. It reflects a vivid picture on Human Rights, Disarmament and Development etc. It gives information to the mass media on behalf of the UNO on various aspects.

With the establishment of the UNO, a new sun of world peace appeared in the horizon. It tried to create a beautiful world full of peace, prosperity and tranquility. Besides International Court of Justice, all other organs of the UNO are situated in New York. Six languages like English, French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic and Chinese are used in the UNO. Thus, the UNO is committed to establish World Peace.

Important Agencies of the United Nations!

The UN has two major functions to perform:

To maintain international peace and security by solving disputes between nations and by developing friendly relations among them;

To foster worldwide cooperation and understanding to solve international economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems.

To maintain international peace and security, the UN functions through its General Assembly, the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat. To solve economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems and to develop international cooperation, a number of specialized agencies have been established. They work under the supervision of the UN's Economic and Social Council.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO):

The UNESCO was created in 1946 with its headquarters in Paris. It encourages the spread of universal education. It believes that a better understanding among the different nations could be achieved through collaboration in education, science and culture.

The UNESCO devotes a large portion of its funds to projects for educational and scientific development in Third World countries. It also encourages an exchange of technology between countries and international cooperation between artists, scientists and scholars.

The United Nations international children's fund (UNICEF):

The UNICEF has its headquarters in New York. The organization was established in 1946 with the aim of providing aid to children and their mothers in countries devastated by the Second World War.

The UNICEF looks into the issues of child health, nutrition and education. It provides medical aid and medicines to fight disease, especially in the underdeveloped countries of the world. It also assists in the running of childcare centres. It tries to solve the problem of child labour.

A large portion of its funds comes through the sale of greetings cards.

The International Labour Organization (ILO):

The ILO was set up in 1918 after the end of the First World War. It has its headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. It was later on turned into a specialized agency of the United Nations entrusted with the task of improving the conditions of labour throughout the world.

Through various schemes, the ILO helps the member countries in vocational training and small-scale handicrafts. It attempts to improve the conditions of work and the standard of living of workers. It sets international standards for basic human rights child labour and social well-being.

It pays special attention to the problems of women and children.

It also endeavors to popularize workers' cooperatives. The ILO's decisions are not binding but they exert moral pressure on Governments.

The World Health Organization (WHO):

The WHO was established on 7 April, 1948, which is observed as the World Health Day. The headquarter of the WHO is in Geneva.

main purpose of the WHO is to improve the standard of health all over the world. It believes that good health is a fundamental right of every human being. The WHO helps countries to strengthen their health systems. It helps them by giving important medicines and other supplies for medical care. It also undertakes programmes for immunization against major infectious diseases.

The WHO is concerned about proper food supply and nutrition. It helps to provide safe drinking water and adequate sanitation to everybody. It had organised the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (1981-1990).

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO):

The FAO was founded in 1945 with its headquarters in Rome.

The FAO undertakes programmes for developing agriculture, forestry and fisheries. Its aim is to eliminate hunger. It has developed a programme called 'Food for All'

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP):

The UNDP was formed in 1950 with its headquarters in Paris.

The projects initiated by the UNDP aim at helping developing nations to make better use of their natural and human resources, to expand productivity and improve the living standards of the people. It attempts to strengthen and expand educational systems at the university level and support research methods for new discoveries.

The UNDP also provides loans and grants to encourage self-help activities in the poor countries. It is also one of the agencies which work to support global programmes on HIV and AIDS. India has benefited greatly through these agencies

Working of the United Nations:

The United Nations has done a lot of useful work in the political field. In January 1946, Iran formally charged the Soviet Union with interference in her internal affairs and asked the Security Council to investigate and effect a settlement. The Security Council asked the two Governments to settle their differences by direct negotiations. On 23 May 1946, Moscow and Tehran announced that the Soviet troops had evacuated from Iran.

After the World War II, the people of Indonesia proclaimed the Republic of Indonesia and declared their independence. Holland refused to accept her independence and there were armed clashes. The matter was brought before the Security Council which directed the parties to stop hostilities and issued cease-fire orders. It offered its good offices to settle the dispute and appointed a Good Offices Committee for that purpose. In spite of many ups and downs, the United Nations played an important part in the recognition of the independence of Indonesia.

In January 1946, the Soviet Union complained that the stationing of British troops in Greece and British interference in the internal affairs of Greece endangered peace and security in that region. The view of the Security Council was that British troops were called into Greece by her own Government. In August 1946, Ukraine alleged that the policy of Greece was threatening peace in the Balkans. The allegation of Greece was that Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria were provoking Communist guerillas against her.

The Security Council appointed a Special Investigation Commission which reported that Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria were actually aiding the pro-Communist revolutionaries of Greece. The General Assembly also appointed a Sub-Committee on the Balkans which reported that the Northern neighbours of Greece were giving large-scale aid to Greek guerillas. In December 1950, the General Assembly set up a Standing Committee to go into the matter.

Supported and incited by the Government of Pakistan, the tribal's launched raids upon Kashmir in October 1947. On 1 January 1948, India lodged a complaint with the Security Council that the Government of Pakistan was assisting the raiders who were attacking the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The Security Council set up a United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan.

The Commission asked the two Governments to stop fighting, withdraw their troops from the State of Jammu and Kashmir and to plebiscite be held to determine the future of the State. India and Pakistan agreed to those proposals and cease-fire became effective from 1 January 1949. The United Nations

appointed Admiral Nimitz, Sir Owen Dixon and Dr. Frank Graham to mediate between the two countries.

The Security Council also discussed the Kashmir issue on many occasions but nothing has come out of that. When there was a war between India and Pakistan in 1965, the Security Council issued several calls for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of armed forces. The efforts of the Security Council succeeded in bringing about a cease-fire between the two countries. When Pakistan attacked India in 1971, the Security Council asked both the parties to stop fighting. In spite of all the help given by the United Nations, the question of Kashmir remains unresolved.

When Britain announced her intention to terminate her mandate of Palestine, the General Assembly appointed a Sub-Committee on Palestine. The United Nations also appointed a mediator for Palestine.

It also appointed a Truce Commission in April 1948. When Israel was attacked by the Arab States, a cease-fire was ordered by the Security Council and a truce was brought about. The United Nations appointed Count Bemadotte and Dr. Ralph Bunche to act as mediators. The General Assembly appointed a Conciliation Commission. It also established the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine a refugee which has done a lot of useful work.

In 1946, India complained to the General Assembly against the discriminatory policies of the Government of South Africa which violated the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly took up the issue. Many resolutions have been passed

by the United Nations against the Government of South Africa. It has also recommended mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

In June 1950, North Korea attacked South Korea. The matter was brought before the Security Council which directed North Korea to withdraw her troops. North Korea refused to withdraw. The Security Council branded North Korea as the aggressor. The United Nations appointed General MacArthur as the Supreme Commander of the forces sent to fight against North Korea. The offensive of North Korea was halted. The United Nations took keen interest in bringing about peace. In July 1953, a truce agreement was signed and hostilities ended.

In 1948, a complaint was made that a serious situation had arisen as a result of the unilateral imposition of restrictions by the Soviet Union on transport and communication between Western Zones of occupation and Berlin. The President of the Security Council played an important part in the lifting of the Berlin blockade.

The United Nations played an important role in dii3using the situation created by the nationalisation of the Suez Canal in 1956. The General Assembly called upon France, Britain and Israel to withdraw their troops from the Egyptian territory. Ultimately, a cease-fire was arranged. Egypt agreed to the stationing of a United Nations force on her territory. The General Assembly authorised the Secretary- General of the United Nations to go ahead with the plan to clear the Canal area under the auspices of the United Nations and make the Canal ready for navigation. The United

Nations played an effective role in the Suez crisis of 1956.

When the Soviet Union sent her troops to Hungary in 1956, there was criticism of her action. The Soviet Union continued in Hungary in spite of protests from many countries. The General Assembly called upon the member states to recall their ambassadors and ministers from Franco's Spain. In spite of that, the United States entered into a treaty with Franco's Government on account of the strategic position of Spain in the world.

When there was trouble in the Congo after her independence in June 1960, the Secretary-General of the United Nations organised a United Nations operation in the Congo. The Congo question was referred to the General Assembly after its veto by the Soviet Union. The General Assembly directed the Secretary-General to continue his efforts "to assist the Central Government of the Congo" and created a Conciliation Commission of Asian and African representatives. A nominee of the Secretary-General of the United Nations visited the Congo. Dag Hammarskjold was killed while bringing about peace in the Congo.

The General Assembly authorised the establishment of the United Nations temporary executive authority under the ultimate authority of the Secretary-General to take over West Irian and hand over the same to Indonesia.

On the occasion of the Cuban crisis in 1962, U Thant, the Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations,

took the initiative and ultimately succeeded in diffusing the situation. Both the Security Council and the General Assembly took keen interest in maintaining peace in Cyprus after her independence. In December 1966, the Security Council applied selective mandatory economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. In May 1968, the Security Council imposed comprehensive military sanctions and also set up a Sanctions Committee to enforce them.

The Security Council condemned the Government of Southern Rhodesia when it declared herself a Republic in 1970. It also called upon its members to cut off all diplomatic, consular, trade, military and other relations with the Republic of Southern Rhodesia.

When Egypt closed the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping, Israel asserted her right of free navigation in those waters. The Security Council held an urgent meeting to consider the situation and was in almost continuous session for many days. It unanimously adopted a resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire.

Similar resolutions were passed again. The Security Council also adopted a resolution asking Israel to “ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the area where military hostilities have taken place and to facilitate the return of the Arab civilians in the areas occupied by her.” The United Nations played its part in the crisis of 1967.

The Soviet Union intervened in Czechoslovakia first in 1948 and then in 1968. On 22 August 1968, the Security Council met to consider the situation arising out of

Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia. A resolution condemning the Soviet Union was introduced in the Security Council but was vetoed by the Soviet Union.

When there was a war between Israel and the Arab countries in 1973, the Security Council called upon the parties to stop hostilities. The Soviet Union sent her troops into Afghanistan in December 1979. She vetoed a resolution of the Security Council calling for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan. In spite of its efforts, the Security Council failed to prevail upon the Soviet Union to withdraw from Afghanistan.

The Security Council adopted a resolution on 18 August 1982 for maintaining an international peace force in Lebanon. In September 1980, a war started between Iraq and Iran and the same is continuing even now. The United Nations has not succeeded in stopping it.

The United Nations is concerned not only with the maintenance of peace but also with promoting the conditions under which genuine peace is possible. In the words of Philip E. Jacob, “In the long run, the United Nations leadership in the struggle for world welfare holds the chief promise of creating the underlying conditions of social stability and human satisfaction essential to a lasting peace.”

The Charter specifically provides that the United Nations shall promote “higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development.” The responsibility for implementing these goals rests on the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. All

functional and regional commissions and specialised agencies and committees are seeking in various ways to carry out the mandate of the Charter in economic and social fields.

The United Nations is supplying vital information to various countries. It publishes annual reports on world economic conditions. Many agencies and commissions of the United Nations have prepared important studies in the field of technical assistance and economic development. The United Nations also provides funds and loans through the International Bank and the International Development Association. These loans are of great help to developing countries.

The Food and Agriculture Organisation has done a lot to meet the world food crisis. The International Labour Organisation has drafted scores of conventions and recommendations, collectively designated as the international labour code.

The United Nations is concerned with the furtherance of human welfare, social justice and aspirations of men for a better lot in life. It provides advisory and social welfare services such as public welfare administration, child welfare, social insurance, etc.

The United Nations is giving help to the physically handicapped. The World Health Organisation is the central directing and coordinating authority in international health work. It provides advisory and public health services to the member states. It administers health and sanitary regulations, maintains a medical library and an international centre for the

compilation and analysis of medical and health statistics from all countries.

A large number of persons who have been uprooted in various parts of the world have benefited from High Commissioner for Refugees. The UNESCO seeks to stimulate a world-wide attack on illiteracy and raises educational standards. It promotes international understanding. The Commission on Human Rights gives considerable attention to the right of self-determination. The United Nations has been successful in securing equality for women.

It is true, the United Nations has failed in tackling successfully the problem of collective security in the world, but that is a problem which is difficult to be tackled by any international organisation. Every state, whether big or small, seems to be determined to do all that it can to promote its own interests, regardless of the interests of other states or mankind as a whole.

In an atmosphere where there is violence all over the world and each state is spending recklessly to add to its armaments, regardless of its costs and repercussions on its own economy or that of the world, peace in the world is a dream which no international organisation can achieve.

All that can be done is to lessen the prevailing tension in the world and undoubtedly the United Nations has played its part. It is true that the United Nations is not a perfect organisation but its utility cannot be denied.

Relevance of UNO

United Nations' sole purpose is not to end all wars. It is created to provide a forum for countries to engage in diplomatic dialogue. It allows countries to mediate and bring compromise between two countries. There does not need to be an official delegation sent to the warring nation. UN headquarters allows talks of official and unofficial capacity.

The resolutions of General Assembly although non-binding, represents the will of the world with almost all countries being represented.

Within the corridors of UN a lot of foreign policies are sculpted unofficially, trade agreements are negotiated and international disputes resolved.

It gives a forum to discuss global problems like climate change, fishing & marine conservation, cyber safety, outer-space regulation, nuclear, chemical and biological disarmament, disease epidemics, archeological conservation and etc.

It gives a platform for the small countries to represent their view point.

It provides international pressure and even possible military intervention incase of sovereignty of a nation-state no matter how small is challenged.

And ultimately above other factors it has repeatedly declared ceasefires in war zones to minimize casualties and allow peace talks. This has alone saved thousands of lives making it worth it.

The **United Nations (UN)** is an intergovernmental organization to promote international co-operation.

As you know that failure of **League Of Nations** is the one of the factor of the World War II. And UN was established in order to prevent such types of conflict.

The United Nations role in world affairs is irreplaceable by any other international or regional organizations. The United Nations has made enormous positive contributions in maintaining international peace and security, promoting cooperation among states and international development. Today, people of the world still face the two major issues of peace and development. Only by international cooperation can mankind meet the challenges of the global and regional issues. The United Nations can play a pivotal and positive role in this regard. Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the new century and promoting the establishment of a just and reasonable international political and economic order goes along with the trend of history and is in the interest of all nations.

In order to strengthen the role of the United Nations, efforts should be made to uphold the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The authority of the Security Council in maintaining international peace and security must be preserved and role of the United Nations in development area should be strengthened. To strengthen the role of the United Nations, it is essential to ensure to all Member States of the United Nations the right to equal participation in international affairs and the rights and interests of the developing countries should be safeguarded.

The essential principles of UN:-

1. UN is based on the sovereign equality of its members
2. Disputes are to be settled by peaceful means.

3.Members are to refrain from the threat or use of force in contravention of the purposes of the UN.

4.Each member must assist the organization in any enforcement actions it takes under the Charter.

5.And states that are not members of the organization are required to act in accordance with these principles insofar as it is necessary to maintain international peace and security.

Module No 6. Regional Organizations

Regional organizations (ROs) are, in a sense, international organizations (IOs), as they incorporate international membership and encompass geopolitical entities that operationally transcend a single nation state. However, their membership is characterized by boundaries and demarcations characteristic to a defined and unique geography, such as continents, or geopolitics, such as economic blocs. They have been established to foster cooperation and political

and [economic integration](#) or dialogue among states or entities within a restrictive geographical or geopolitical boundary. They both reflect common patterns of development and history that have been fostered since the end of [World War II](#) as well as the fragmentation inherent in [globalization](#), which is why their institutional characteristics vary from loose cooperation to formal [regional integration](#).^[1] Most ROs tend to work alongside well-established multilateral organizations such as the [United Nations](#).^[2] While in many instances a regional organization is simply referred to as an international organization, in many others it makes sense to use the term *regional organization* to stress the more limited scope of a particular membership.

The post–Second World War period has seen a boom in regional organizations. They emerged to maximize the collective gains and are often based on the principle of proximity and affinity among their members. Regional organizations are formed to serve the following purposes: to promote human rights and democracy, to provide security and safeguard territorial integrity of member countries, and to secure economic alliances through trade and economic cooperation for rapid development. In addition, some regional organizations are established for more general reasons, such as to preserve cultural heritage (e.g., the Arab League and Organisation of Islamic Co-operation) or to address environmental issues (e.g., the Arctic Council is organized around environmental protection of the Arctic region).

Although in general parlance “regions” are considered to be contiguous geographical areas, international regional organizations are formed both with geographical contiguous and noncontiguous areas. Regional organizations based on economic, cultural, and environmental factors often conform to regional contiguity, but many of the regional organizations based on security factors have member countries that do not share borders with other member countries; that is, they are geographically noncontiguous. In addition, some regional groups based on geography may exclude nations for various reasons.

For instance, the League of Arab States rests on geographical factors but excludes Israel, Turkey, and Iran because they are not Arab. In contrast, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) is based mainly on identity rather than geography. This entry discusses regional organizations within the framework of categorizations based on purpose, explaining the conditions that facilitated their emergence and providing examples of relevant organizations, and then examines new challenges facing regional organizations, especially in the current era of a single superpower.

EUROPEAN UNION

European Union (EU), international organization comprising 27 European countries and governing common economic, social, and security policies. Originally confined to western Europe, the EU undertook a robust expansion into central and eastern Europe in the early 21st century.

The EU's members are Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden. The United Kingdom, which had been a founding member of the EU, left the organization in 2020. The EU was created by the Maastricht Treaty, which entered into force on November 1, 1993. The treaty was designed to enhance European political and economic integration by creating a single currency (the euro), a unified foreign and security policy, and common citizenship rights and by advancing cooperation in the areas of immigration, asylum, and judicial affairs. The EU was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 2012, in recognition of the organization's efforts to promote peace and democracy in Europe.

The EU represents one in a series of efforts to integrate Europe since World War II. At the end of the war, several western European countries sought closer economic, social, and political ties to

achieve **economic growth** and military security and to promote a lasting reconciliation between France and Germany. To this end, in 1951 the leaders of six countries—Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany—signed the **Treaty of Paris**, thereby, when it took effect in 1952, founding the **European Coal and Steel Community** (ECSC). (The United Kingdom had been invited to join the ECSC and in 1955 sent a representative to observe discussions about its ongoing development, but the Labour government of **Clement Attlee** declined membership, owing perhaps to a variety of factors, including the illness of key ministers, a desire to maintain economic independence, and a failure to grasp the community's impending significance.) The ECSC created a free-trade area for several key economic and military resources: coal, coke, steel, scrap, and iron ore. To manage the ECSC, the treaty established several supranational institutions: a High Authority to administrate, a Council of Ministers to legislate, a **Common Assembly** to formulate policy, and a Court of Justice to interpret the treaty and to resolve related disputes. A series of further international treaties and treaty revisions based largely on this model led eventually to the creation of the EU.

Creation Of The European Economic Community

On March 25, 1957, the six **ECSC** members signed the two **Treaties of Rome** that established the **European Atomic Energy Community** (Euratom)—which was designed to facilitate cooperation in atomic energy development, research, and utilization—and the **European Economic Community** (EEC). The EEC created a common **market** that featured the elimination of most barriers to the movement of goods, services, capital, and labour, the prohibition of most public policies or private agreements that inhibit market competition, a **common agricultural policy** (CAP), and a common external trade policy.

The treaty establishing the EEC required members to eliminate or revise important national laws and regulations. In particular, it

fundamentally reformed tariff and trade policy by abolishing all internal tariffs by July 1968. It also required that governments eliminate national regulations favouring domestic industries and cooperate in areas in which they traditionally had acted independently, such as **international trade** (i.e., trade with countries outside the EEC). The treaty called for common rules on anticompetitive and monopolistic behaviour and for common inland transportation and regulatory standards. Recognizing social policy as a fundamental component of **economic integration**, the treaty also created the European Social Fund, which was designed to enhance job opportunities by facilitating workers' geographic and occupational mobility

Goals of the EU

The goals of the European Union are:

- promote peace, its values and the well-being of its citizens
- offer freedom, security and justice without internal borders
- sustainable development based on balanced economic growth and price stability, a highly competitive market economy with full employment and social progress, and environmental protection
- combat social exclusion and discrimination
- promote scientific and technological progress
- enhance economic, social and territorial cohesion and solidarity among EU countries
- respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity
- establish an economic and monetary union whose currency is the euro.

From economic to political union

The European Union is a unique economic and political union between 27 EU countries that together cover much of the continent.

The predecessor of the EU was created in the aftermath of the Second World War. The first steps were to foster economic cooperation: the idea being that countries that trade with one another become economically interdependent and so more likely to avoid conflict.

The result was the European Economic Community (EEC), created in 1958, and initially increasing economic cooperation between six countries: Belgium, Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

Since then, 22 other members joined and a huge single market (also known as the 'internal' market) has been created and continues to develop towards its full potential.

On 31 January 2020 the United Kingdom left the European Union.

What began as a purely economic union has evolved into an organization spanning policy areas, from climate, environment and health to external relations and security, justice and migration. A name change from the European Economic Community (EEC) to the European Union (EU) in 1993 reflected this.

Stability, a single currency, mobility and growth

The EU has delivered more than half a century of peace, stability and prosperity, helped raise living standards and launched a single European currency: the euro. More than 340 million EU citizens in 19 countries now use it as their currency and enjoy its benefits.

Thanks to the abolition of border controls between EU countries, people can travel freely throughout most of the continent. And it has become much easier to live, work and travel abroad in Europe. All EU citizens have the right and freedom to choose in which EU country they want to study, work or retire. Every EU country must treat EU citizens in exactly the same way as its own citizens for employment, social security and tax purposes.

The EU's main economic engine is the single market. It enables most goods, services, money and people to move freely. The EU aims to develop this huge resource to other areas like energy, knowledge and capital markets to ensure that Europeans can draw the maximum benefit from it.

Transparent and democratic institutions

The EU remains focused on making its governing institutions more transparent and democratic. Decisions are taken as openly as possible and as closely as possible to the citizen.

More powers have been given to the directly elected European Parliament, while national parliaments play a greater role, working alongside the European institutions.

The EU is governed by the principle of representative democracy, with citizens directly represented at Union level in the European Parliament and Member States represented in the European Council and the Council of the EU.

European citizens are encouraged to contribute to the democratic life of the Union by giving their views on EU policies during their development or suggest improvements to existing laws and policies. The European citizens' initiative empowers citizens to have a greater say on EU policies that affect their lives. Citizens can also submit complaints and enquiries concerning the application of EU law.

Functions of the EUROPEAN Union

Trade

The European Union is the largest trade block in the world. It is the world's biggest exporter of manufactured goods and services, and the biggest import market for over 100 countries.

Free trade among its members was one of the EU's founding principles. This is possible thanks to the single market. Beyond its borders, the EU is also committed to liberalising world trade.

Humanitarian aid

The EU is committed to helping victims of man-made and natural disasters worldwide and supports over 120 million people each year. Collectively, the EU and its constituent countries are the world's leading donor of humanitarian aid.

Diplomacy and security

The EU plays an important role in diplomacy and works to foster stability, security and prosperity, democracy, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law at international level.

The **IBSA Dialogue Forum** ([India](#), [Brazil](#), [South Africa](#)) is an international tripartite grouping for promoting [international cooperation](#) among these countries. It represents three important poles for galvanizing [South-South cooperation](#) and greater understanding between three important continents of the developing world namely, Africa, Asia and South America. The forum provides the three countries with a platform to engage in discussions for cooperation in the field of agriculture, trade, culture, and defence among others.

The IBSA Dialogue Forum plays an increasingly important role in the foreign policies of [India](#), [Brazil](#) and [South Africa](#). It has become instrumental for promoting ever closer coordination on global issues between three large multicultural and multiracial democracies of Asia, South America and Africa, and contributed to enhancing trilateral India-Brazil-South Africa cooperation in sectoral areas.

Origin

After the failperation between India (South Asia), Brazil (South America) and South Africa. The Declaration at the trilateral meeting in [Brasilia](#), called for removing protectionist policies and trade distorting practices by improving the multilateral trade system.

On 6 June 2003, [Yashwant Sinha](#) (External affairs minister of India), [Celso Amorim](#) (Foreign minister of Brazil) and [Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma](#) (Foreign minister of South Africa) met in Brasilia, where the IBSA Dialogue forum was formalized through the adoption of the "Brasilia Declaration".^[1] The IBSA Dialogue forum facilitates regular consultations at senior officials level, government (summit) levels as well as amongst academics, intellectuals and other members of the [civil society](#).^[1] By some experts, it is also seen as an endeavor to challenge the international system by Pivotal Middle Powers through peaceful convincing, instead of other means

Basilia Declaration

Indian PM [Manmohan Singh](#) with South African President [Thabo Mbeki](#) and Brazilian President [Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva](#) during the IBSA Summit, 2007.

On 6 June 2003, the Brasilia declaration was signed by the foreign ministers of India, Brazil and South Africa. They agreed on the urgent need for reforms in the United Nations, especially the [Security Council](#). The declaration was of the view that the United Nations Security Council should reflect the current world scenario. It also touched upon the subjects of [international terrorism](#), trans-national crime and illegal arms dealing, stating that such threats to international peace must effectively tackled with respect for the sovereignty of States and for International Law.

The Ministers highlighted their priorities on promotion of social equity and inclusive growth by reiterating the need for tackling hunger and poverty by means of effective implementation of government schemes. The declaration also highlights the need for promoting family-run farms, [food security](#), health, education, human rights and [environmental protection](#). They recalled that social empowerment makes better use of human potential, contributing to economic development in a significant manner.^[3] The ministers also stressed the importance of elimination of [racial discrimination](#) and [gender bias](#) while framing.

Objectives

The IBSA Dialogue Forum aims to promote South-South cooperation and build consensus on issues of international importance. It also aims at increasing the trade opportunities among the three countries, as well as facilitate the trilateral exchange of information, technologies and skills to complement each other strengths. Subsequently, it promotes the international [poverty alleviation](#) and [social development](#) with main focus being on equitable development. It also aims to explore avenues to promote cooperation in broad range of areas, which include agriculture, [climate change/global Warming](#), culture, [defence](#), education, energy, health, [information society](#), [science and technology](#), [social development](#), trade and investment, tourism and transport.¹

IBSA summits

	Date	Host country	Host leader	Location held
2006	September, 2006	 Brazil	Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva	Brasilia
2007	October, 2007	 South Africa	Thabo Mbeki	Pretoria
2008	October, 2008	 India	Manmohan Singh	New Delhi
2010	15 April 2010	 Brazil	Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva	Brasília

2011	18 October 2011	 South Africa	Jacob Zuma	Pretoria
2013	16 May 2013 (canceled)	 India	Manmohan Singh	New Delhi
2017	17 October 2017	 South Africa	Maite Nkoana-Mashabane	Durban

Areas of cooperation

Agriculture

A Joint Development Project has been undertaken in [Guinea Bissau](#). It aims to improve production, promote and develop small-scale agro-industry. It also seeks to improve and diversify horticultural crops. IBSA Ministers of Agriculture met in Rome on 22 November 2005 on the margins of a [FAO](#) Conference. This was followed by a meeting of IBSA Senior Officials in Agriculture in New Delhi on 18 & 19 January 2006. The meeting discussed a preparation of a draft [Memorandum of Understanding](#) which provides for development of plans for research and capacity building.

Education

The three countries have recognised Education as a vital instrument for achieving social equity. India is the lead country in the education sector. Three major areas of cooperation have been identified for collaboration namely, Open and [distance education](#), higher and professional education and finally, universal education with focus on [gender equality](#). Each of the three countries are to host one Round Table conference on one of the themes. India chose universal education, Brazil chose higher and professional education while South Africa chose open and distance education.

Energy

The working group aims to promote clean and efficient sources of energy such as [bio-fuels](#). It also gives an opportunity to exchange information about renewable energy and use of [non-conventional energy](#) sources.

Science & technology

Science & technology has been identified as one of the key areas of tri-lateral cooperation. The following is a list of approved areas of research cooperation and the corresponding lead countries:

- HIV/AIDS and [Nanotechnology](#)- India
- [Malaria](#) and [Oceanography](#)- Brazil
- [Tuberculosis](#) and [Biotechnology](#)- South Africa

Activities in each area are implemented by Area coordinators, who are experts in their respective disciplines. Workshops in the above-mentioned disciplines have been held in the three countries regularly.^[4]

Trade

The IBSA economic ministers met in New Delhi in March 2005 and agreed on a mechanism to identify and eliminate non-tariff barriers which impede mutual trade. Some of the mechanisms considered include customs cooperation, sharing of expertise in the field of energy, agriculture, [food processing](#), tourism and financial and banking services. It has been decided to promote cooperation in the [SME](#) sector. For this purpose, common terms of reference have been developed which can aid in development of this sector. As, all the three countries have a large number of small-scale enterprises, it is expected that cooperation in this sector can have profound development implications.

Transport

The Working group aims at cooperation between the three countries in the areas of air link expansions, training and knowledge exchange in airports and airspace management, port management, including capacity building in [shipbuilding](#). Discussions on air and maritime agreements are also being considered. Development of trans-shipment facilities for creation of a South-South highway, which integrates sub-

regional connection between [Mercosur](#), [Southern African Customs Union](#) and Indian regions, is a priority area for the Working group.

BRICKS

BRICS is the [acronym](#) coined for an association of five major [emerging national economies](#): [Brazil](#), [Russia](#), [India](#), [China](#) and [South Africa](#). Originally the first four were grouped as "[BRIC](#)" (or "the BRICs"), before the induction of South Africa in 2011.^[5] The BRICS members are known for their significant influence on regional affairs; all are members of [G20](#).^[6] Since 2009, the BRICS nations have met annually at formal summits. China hosted the [9th BRICS summit](#) in [Xiamen](#) on September 2017,^[7] while South Africa hosted the most recent [10th BRICS summit](#) in July 2018. The term does not include countries such as [South Korea](#), [Mexico](#) and [Turkey](#) for which other acronyms and group associations were later created.

In 2015, the five BRICS countries represent over 3.1 billion people, or about 41% of the world population; four out of five members (excluding South Africa at #24) are in the [top 10 of the world by population](#). As of 2018, these five nations have a combined nominal [GDP](#) of US\$18.6 trillion, about 23.2% of the [gross world product](#), combined GDP (PPP) of around US\$40.55 trillion (32% of World's GDP PPP) and an estimated US\$4.46 trillion in combined foreign reserves.^{[8][9]} Overall the BRICS are forecasted to expand 4.6% in 2016, from an estimated growth of 3.9% in 2015. The World Bank expected BRICS growth to increase to 5.3% in 2017.^[10] The BRICS have received both praise and criticism from numerous commentators.^{[11][12][13]} Bilateral relations among BRICS nations have

mainly been conducted on the basis of non-interference, equality, and [mutual benefit](#).

History

The term "BRIC" was coined in 2001 by then-chairman of [Goldman Sachs](#) Asset Management, [Jim O'Neill](#), in his publication *Building Better Global Economic BRICs*.^[15] The [foreign ministers](#) of the initial four BRIC states (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) met in [New York City](#) in September 2006 at the margins of the General Debate of the UN General Assembly, beginning a series of high-level meetings.^[16] A full-scale diplomatic meeting was held in [Yekaterinburg](#), Russia, on 16 June 2009.^[17]

First BRIC summit

The BRIC grouping's [first formal summit](#), also held in Yekaterinburg, commenced on 16 June 2009,^[18] with [Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva](#), [Dmitry Medvedev](#), [Manmohan Singh](#), and [Hu Jintao](#), the respective leaders of Brazil, Russia, India and China, all attending.^[19] The summit's focus was on means of improving the [global economic situation](#) and reforming [financial institutions](#), and discussed how the four countries could better co-operate in the future.^{[18][19]} There was further discussion of ways that [developing countries](#), such as 3/4 of the BRIC members, could become more involved in global affairs.^[19]

In the aftermath of the Yekaterinburg summit, the BRIC nations announced the need for a new [global reserve currency](#), which would have to be "diverse, stable and predictable".^[20] Although the statement that was released did not directly criticise the perceived "dominance" of the [US dollar](#) – something that Russia had criticised in the past – it did spark a fall in the value of the dollar against other major currencies.^[21]

Entry of South Africa[[edit](#)]

In 2010, South Africa began efforts to join the BRIC grouping, and the process for its formal admission began in August of that year.^[22] South Africa officially became a member nation on 24 December 2010, after being formally invited by the BRIC countries to join the group.^[22] The

group was renamed BRICS – with the "S" standing for South Africa – to reflect the group's expanded membership.^[23] In April 2011, the [President of South Africa, Jacob Zuma](#), attended the [2011 BRICS summit](#) in [Sanya](#), China, as a full member.

Developments[

The BRICS Forum, an independent international organisation encouraging commercial, political and cultural cooperation between the BRICS nations, was formed in 2011.^[27] In June 2012, the BRICS nations pledged \$75 billion to boost the lending power of the [International Monetary Fund](#) (IMF). However, this loan was conditional on IMF voting reforms.^[28] In late March 2013, during the fifth BRICS summit in Durban, South Africa, the member countries agreed to create a [global financial institution](#) which they intended to rival the western-dominated IMF and World Bank.^[29] After the summit, the BRICS stated that they planned to finalise the arrangements for this [New Development Bank](#) by 2014.^[30] However, disputes relating to burden sharing and location slowed down the agreements.

At the BRICS leaders meeting in [St Petersburg](#) in September 2013, China committed \$41 billion towards the pool; Brazil, India and Russia \$18 billion each; and South Africa \$5 billion. China, holder of the world's largest foreign exchange reserves and who is to contribute the bulk of the currency pool, wants a greater managing role, said one BRICS official. China also wants to be the location of the reserve. "Brazil and India want the initial capital to be shared equally. We know that China wants more," said a Brazilian official. "However, we are still negotiating, there are no tensions arising yet."^[31] On 11 October 2013, Russia's Finance Minister [Anton Siluanov](#) said that a decision on creating a \$100 billion fund designated to steady currency markets would be taken in early 2014. The Brazilian finance minister, [Guido Mantega](#) stated that the fund would be created by March 2014.^[32] However, by April 2014, the currency reserve pool and development bank had yet to be set up, and the date was rescheduled to 2015.^[33] One driver for the BRICS development bank is that the

existing institutions primarily benefit extra-BRICS corporations, and the political significance is notable because it allows BRICS member states "to promote their interests abroad... and can highlight the strengthening positions of countries whose opinion is frequently ignored by their developed American and European colleagues."

In March 2014, at a meeting on the margins of the [Nuclear Security Summit](#) in The Hague, the BRICS Foreign Ministers issued a communique that "noted with concern, the recent media statement on the forthcoming [G20 Summit](#) to be held in [Brisbane](#) in November 2014. The custodianship of the G20 belongs to all Member States equally and no one Member State can unilaterally determine its nature and character." In light of the tensions surrounding the [2014 Crimean crisis](#), the Ministers remarked that "The escalation of hostile language, sanctions and counter-sanctions, and force does not contribute to a sustainable and peaceful solution, according to international law, including the principles and purposes of the [United Nations Charter](#)."^[34] This was in response to the statement of Australian Foreign Minister [Julie Bishop](#), who had said earlier that Russian President [Vladimir Putin](#) might be barred from attending the G20 Summit in Brisbane.^[35]

In July 2014, the Governor of the Russian Central Bank, [Elvira Nabiullina](#), claimed that the "BRICS partners the establishment of a system of multilateral swaps that will allow to transfer resources to one or another country, if needed" in an article which concluded that "If the current trend continues, soon the dollar will be abandoned by most of the significant global economies and it will be kicked out of the global trade finance."^[36]

Over the weekend of 13 July 2014, when the final game of the [FIFA World Cup](#) was held, and in advance of the BRICS [Fortaleza](#) summit, Putin met fellow leader [Dilma Rouseff](#) to discuss the BRICS development bank, and sign some other bilateral accords on air defence, gas and education. Rouseff said that the BRICS countries "are among the largest in the world and cannot content themselves in the middle of the 21st century with any kind of dependency."^[37] The Fortaleza summit was followed by a BRICS meeting with the [Union of South American Nations](#) president's in [Brasilia](#), where the

development bank and the monetary fund were introduced.^[38] The development bank will have capital of US\$50 billion with each country contributing US\$10 billion, while the monetary fund will have US\$100 billion at its disposal.^[38]

On 15 July, the first day of the BRICS 6th summit in [Fortaleza](#), Brazil, the group of emerging economies signed the long-anticipated document to create the US\$100 billion [New Development Bank](#) (formerly known as the "BRICS Development Bank") and a reserve currency pool worth over another US\$100 billion. Documents on cooperation between BRICS export credit agencies and an agreement of cooperation on innovation were also inked.^[39]

At the end of October 2014, Brazil trimmed down its US government holdings to US\$261.7 billion; India, US\$77.5 billion; China, US\$1.25 trillion; South Africa, US\$10.3 billion.^[40]

In March 2015, [Morgan Stanley](#) stated that India and Indonesia had escaped from the 'fragile five' (the five major emerging markets with the most fragile currencies) by instituting economic reforms. Previously, in August 2013, Morgan Stanley rated India and Indonesia, together with Brazil, Turkey and South Africa, as the 'fragile five' due to their vulnerable currencies. But since then, India and Indonesia have reformed their economies, completing 85% and 65% of the necessary adjustments respectively, while Brazil had only achieved 15%, Turkey only 10%, and South Africa even less.^[41]

After the 2015 summit, the respective communications ministers, under a Russian proposal, had a first summit for their ministries in Moscow in October where the host minister, [Nikolai Nikiforov](#), proposed an initiative to further tighten their information technology sectors and challenge the monopoly of the United States in the sector.^[42]

Since 2012, the BRICS group of countries have been planning an [optical fibre submarine communications](#) cable system to carry telecommunications between the BRICS countries, known as the [BRICS Cable](#).^[43] Part of the motivation for the project was the spying of the [National Security Agency](#) on all telecommunications that flowed across the US.

Summits

The grouping has held annual summits since 2009, with member countries taking turns to host. Prior to South Africa's admission, two BRIC summits were held, in 2009 and 2010. The first five-member BRICS summit was held in 2011. The most recent BRICS summit took place in South Africa from 25 to 27 July 2018 .

OAS- Organization of American States

The **Organization of American** is a continental organization that was founded on 30 April 1948, for the purposes of regional solidarity and cooperation among its member states. Headquartered in the United States capital Washington, D.C.,^[1] the OAS's members are the 35 independent states of the Americas.

The notion of an international union in the New World was first put forward during the liberation of the Americas by José de San Martín and Simón Bolívar^[3] who, at the 1826 Congress of Panama (still being part of Colombia), proposed creating a league of American republics, with a common military, a mutual defense pact, and a supranational parliamentary assembly. This meeting was attended by representatives of Gran Colombia (comprising the modern-day countries of Colombia, Ecuador, Panama and Venezuela), Argentina, Peru, Bolivia, The United Provinces of Central America, and Mexico but the grandly titled "Treaty of Union, League, and Perpetual Confederation" was ultimately ratified only by Gran Colombia. Bolívar's dream soon floundered with civil war in Gran Colombia, the disintegration of Central America, and the emergence of national rather than New World outlooks in the newly independent American republics. Bolívar's dream of American unity was meant to unify Hispanic American nations against external powers.

The pursuit of regional solidarity and cooperation again came to the forefront in 1889–1890, at the First International Conference of

American States. Gathered together in Washington, D.C., 18 nations resolved to found the International Union of American Republics, served by a permanent secretariat called the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics (renamed the International Commercial Bureau at the Second International Conference in 1901–1902). These two bodies, in existence as of 14 April 1890, represent the point of inception to which the OAS and its General Secretariat trace their origins.

At the Fourth International Conference of American States (Buenos Aires, 1910), the name of the organization was changed to the Union of American Republics and the Bureau became the Pan American Union. The Pan American Union Building was constructed in 1910, on Constitution Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

In the mid-1930s, U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt organized an inter-American conference in Buenos Aires. One of the items at the conference was a "League of Nations of the Americas", an idea proposed by Colombia, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic.^[4] At the subsequent Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 21 nations pledged to remain neutral in the event of a conflict between any two members.^[5] The experience of World War II convinced hemispheric governments that unilateral action could not ensure the territorial integrity of the American nations in the event of external aggression. To meet the challenges of global conflict in the postwar world and to contain conflicts within the hemisphere, they adopted a system of collective security, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Treaty) signed in 1947 in Rio de Janeiro.

The Ninth International Conference of American States was held in Bogotá between March and May 1948 and led by United States Secretary of State George Marshall, a meeting which led to a pledge by members to fight communism in the western hemisphere. This was the event that saw the birth of the OAS as it stands today, with the signature by 21 American countries of the Charter of the Organization of American States on 30 April 1948 (in effect since December 1951). The meeting also adopted the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, the world's first general human rights instrument.

The transition from the Pan American Union to OAS would have been smooth if it had not been for the assassination of Colombian leader [Jorge Eliécer Gaitán](#). The Director General of the former, [Alberto Lleras Camargo](#), became the Organization's first [Secretary General](#). The current Secretary General is former Uruguayan minister of foreign affairs [Luis Almagro](#).

Significant milestones in the history of the OAS since the signing of the Charter have included the following:

- 1959: [Inter-American Commission on Human Rights](#) created.
- 1959: [Inter-American Development Bank](#) created.
- 1960: First application of the [Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance](#) against the regime of [Rafael Trujillo](#) in [Dominican Republic](#)
- 1961: Charter of Punta del Este signed, launching the [Alliance for Progress](#).
- 1962: OAS suspends [Cuba](#).
- 1969: [American Convention on Human Rights](#) signed (in force since 1978).
- 1970: [OAS General Assembly](#) established as the Organization's supreme decision-making body.
- 1979: [Inter-American Court of Human Rights](#) created.
- 1991: Adoption of Resolution 1080, which requires the Secretary General to convene the [Permanent Council](#) within ten days of a [coup d'état](#) in any member country.
- 1994: First [Summit of the Americas \(Miami\)](#), which resolved to establish a [Free Trade Area of the Americas](#) by 2005.
- 2001: [Inter-American Democratic Charter](#) adopted.
- 2009: OAS revokes 1962 suspension of [Cuba](#).
- 2009: OAS suspends Honduras due to the [coup](#) which ousted president [Manuel Zelaya](#).
- 2011: OAS lifts the suspension of Honduras with the return of Manuel Zelaya from exile.
- 2017: [Venezuela](#) announces it will begin the process to leave the OAS in response to what it alleged was OAS interference in [Venezuela's political crisis](#).

Goals and purpose

In the words of Article 1 of the Charter, the goal of the member nations in creating the OAS was "to achieve an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence."

Article 2 then defines eight essential purposes:

- To strengthen the [peace](#) and security of the continent.
- To promote and consolidate [representative democracy](#), with due respect for the [principle of non-intervention](#).
- To prevent possible causes of difficulties and to ensure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the member states.
- To provide for common action on the part of those states in the event of aggression.
- To seek the solution of political, judicial, and economic problems that may arise among them.
- To promote, by cooperative action, their [economic, social, and cultural development](#).
- To [eradicate extreme poverty](#), which constitutes an obstacle to the full democratic development of the peoples of the hemisphere.
- To achieve an effective limitation of conventional weapons that will make it possible to devote the largest amount of resources to the economic and social development of the member states.

Over the course of the 1990s, with the end of the [Cold War](#), the return to democracy in [Latin America](#), and the thrust toward [globalization](#), the OAS made major efforts to reinvent itself to fit the new context. Its stated priorities now include the following:

- Strengthening democracy: Between 1962 and 2002, the Organization sent multinational observation missions to oversee free and fair elections in the member states on more than 100 occasions. The OAS also works to strengthen national and local government and electoral agencies, to promote democratic practices and values, and to help countries detect and defuse official corruption.
- Working for peace: Special OAS missions have supported peace processes in [Nicaragua](#), [Suriname](#), [Haiti](#), and [Guatemala](#). The

Organization has played a leading part in the removal of landmines deployed in member states and it has led negotiations to resolve the continents' remaining border disputes ([Guatemala/Belize](#); [Peru/Ecuador](#)). Work is also underway on the construction of a common inter-American counter-terrorism front.

- [Defending human rights](#): The agencies of the inter-American human rights system provide a venue for the denunciation and resolution of human rights violations in individual cases. They also monitor and report on the general human rights situation in the member states.
- Fostering free trade: The OAS is one of the three agencies currently engaged in drafting a treaty aiming to establish an [inter-continental free trade area](#) from [Alaska](#) to [Tierra del Fuego](#).
- Fighting the drugs trade: The Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission was established in 1986 to coordinate efforts and crossborder cooperation in this area.
- Promoting [sustainable development](#): The goal of the OAS's Inter-American Council for Integral Development is to promote economic development and combating poverty. OAS technical cooperation programs address such areas as river basin management, the conservation of biodiversity, preservation of cultural diversity, planning for global climate change, [sustainable tourism](#), and natural disaster mitigation.

Organizational structure

US Secretary of State [Mike Pompeo](#) speaks at the OAS Permanent Council in January 2019

The Organization of American States is composed of an Organization of American States General Secretariat, the Permanent Council, the Inter-American Council for Integral Development, and a number of committees.

The General Secretariat of the Organization of American States consists of six [secretariats](#).

- [Secretariat for Political Affairs](#)
- [Executive Secretariat for Integral Development](#)
- [Secretariat for Multidimensional Security](#)
- Secretariat for Administration and Finance

- Secretariat for Legal Affairs
- Secretariat for External Relations

The various committees of the Organization of American States include:

- The Committee on Juridical and Political Affairs
- The Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Affairs
- The Committee on Hemispheric Security
- The Committee on Inter-American Summits Management and Civil Society Participation in OAS Activities

General Assembly

The General Assembly is the supreme decision-making body of OAS. It convenes once every year in a regular session. In special circumstances, and with the approval of two-thirds of the member states, the Permanent Council can convene special sessions.

The Organization's member states take turns hosting the General Assembly on a rotating basis. The states are represented at its sessions by their chosen delegates: generally, their ministers of foreign affairs, or their appointed deputies. Each state has one vote, and most matters—except for those for which the Charter or the General Assembly's own rules of procedure specifically require a two-thirds majority—are settled by a simple majority vote.

The General Assembly's powers include setting the OAS's general course and policies by means of resolutions and declarations; approving its budget and determining the contributions payable by the member states; approving the reports and previous year's actions of the OAS's specialized agencies; and electing members to serve on those agencies.

OAU-Organization of African Unity

The (OAU) [Organization of African Unity](#) was postcolonial Africa's first continent-wide association of independent states. Founded by thirty-two countries on May 25, 1963, and based in [Addis Ababa, Ethiopia](#), it became operational on September 13, 1963, when the OAU Charter, its basic constitutional document, entered into force. The OAU's membership eventually encompassed all of Africa's fifty-three states, with the exception of Morocco, which withdrew in 1984 to protest the admission of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, or [Western Sahara](#). The OAU was dissolved in 2002, when it was replaced by the [African Union](#).

The process of decolonization in Africa that commenced in the 1950s witnessed the birth of many new states. Inspired in part by the philosophy of Pan-Africanism, the states of Africa sought through a political collective a means of preserving and consolidating their independence and pursuing the ideals of African unity. However, two rival camps emerged with opposing views about how these goals could best be achieved. The Casablanca Group, led by President [Kwame Nkrumah](#) (1909–1972) of [Ghana](#), backed radical calls for political integration and the creation of a supranational body. The moderate Monrovia Group, led by Emperor [Haile Selassie](#) (1892–1975) of Ethiopia, advocated a loose association of sovereign states that allowed for political cooperation at the intergovernmental level. The latter view prevailed. The OAU was therefore based on the “sovereign equality of all Member States,” as stated in its charter.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Article 2 of the OAU Charter stated that the organization's purposes included the promotion of the unity and solidarity of African states; defense of their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence; and the eradication of all forms of colonialism from Africa. Member states were to coordinate and harmonize their policies in various areas, including politics and diplomacy, economics, transportation, communications, education, health, and defense and security. Article 3

of the OAU Charter included among its guiding principles the sovereign equality of all member states, noninterference in the internal affairs of states, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the emancipation of dependent African territories. Although the organization's primary motivation initially was the liberation struggle and the defense of the independence and territorial integrity of African states, the OAU later expanded its scope of activities to encompass economic cooperation and the protection of [human rights](#).

PRINCIPAL INSTITUTIONS

The OAU's Assembly of Heads of State and Government was the organization's supreme organ. It normally met once a year, in a different capital city, although it could also meet in extraordinary session. Although each state had one vote, the assembly tended to operate by consensus. Except for internal matters, its resolutions were nonbinding.

The Council of Ministers, composed of government ministers (usually foreign ministers), normally met twice a year or in special session. Subordinate to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, the council's principal responsibility was preparing the assembly's agenda. The council implemented the assembly's decisions and adopted the budget. In practice it emerged as the OAU's driving force.

The General Secretariat was headed by a secretary-general, appointed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government. The secretariat was responsible for the administration of the OAU. The secretary-general was initially envisaged as an apolitical administrator, but over time the office assumed a proactive role, including acquiring the power under the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention to resolve disputes. The General Secretariat became mired in controversy in 1982 when the decision was taken to admit the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic to the organization. Morocco challenged the legality of this decision as it claimed that the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic was not a state.

Since 1975 Morocco had occupied most of [Western Sahara](#), a former Spanish colony, and was engaged in a war against the Polisario Front, which had declared the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic an independent state in 1976 and was fighting for its liberation. The [United Nations](#) is still trying to settle this dispute.

The Commission of Mediation, Conciliation, and Arbitration, established as the OAU's dispute settlement mechanism, had jurisdiction over disputes between member states only. Member states, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, and the Council of Ministers could refer disputes to the commission, but only with the prior consent of the states concerned. The commission never became operational because African governments were distrustful of third-party adjudication.

ADDITIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, established under the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1982), became operational in 1987. Based in Banjul, [Gambia](#), and composed of eleven individuals, the commission is a treaty monitoring body with the specific mandate of promoting and protecting human and peoples' rights. Particularly important is its competence to hear complaints from individuals and nongovernmental organizations concerning alleged violations by parties to the Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. After an uncertain beginning, the commission is becoming a more effective defender of human and peoples' rights. The commission now functions under the auspices of the [African Union](#) and shares responsibility for the protection of [human rights](#) with the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights.

The African Court on Human and Peoples' rights was established under a protocol to the Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights in 1998 that came into force in 2004. The court's jurisdiction over human rights treaties is broad in scope. The Commission, African Intergovernmental Organizations, and participating states can submit cases to the Court,

as can individuals and nongovernmental organizations with the permission of the accused state. Its judgments are binding, but it can also give advisory opinions.

The Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, and Resolution was founded in 1993 with the task of finding political solutions to disputes between OAU member states. Its primary objective was the anticipation and prevention of conflicts, with emphasis on the adoption of anticipatory and preventative measures, especially confidence-building measures. The mechanism operated subject to the fundamental principles of the OAU, especially with regard to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of member states and the principle of noninterference in their internal affairs. The mechanism's role was therefore subject to the consent and cooperation of the warring parties. The mechanism was able to mediate in various civil conflicts and participate in election monitoring, but it never acquired the capacity to provide peacekeeping forces.

EVALUATION

The OAU had a mixed record. Its greatest success was in relation to decolonization. Other achievements included making significant contributions to the development of [international law](#), especially in the fields of refugee law and human rights law, where several important treaties were adopted under OAU auspices, although in practice progress was slow and uneven. A court of human rights was envisaged, but the OAU was dissolved before it was established. Efforts were made to promote economic cooperation, and in 1991 it was decided to set up an African economic community, which in time was intended to lead to a customs union, a [common market](#), and African monetary union. Little progress was made.

Overall, the failures of the OAU outweighed its successes. Arguably, its major failing was its inability to bring peace, prosperity, security, and stability to Africa. The OAU was found wanting in its responses to the tyrannies and kleptocracies ruining Africa, a deficiency that

undermined its credibility. Its powers were too weak and its influence inadequate to deal with the internal and external conflicts, poor governance, human rights abuses, poverty, and underdevelopment from which much of Africa suffered. The OAU was also considered incapable of meeting the challenges of globalization. By the end of the century, reform so comprehensive was required that it was decided to start afresh with a new organization, the African Union, devoted to the political and economic integration of Africa based on respect for democratic values, good governance, the rule of law, and human rights.

Difference between International Organizations and Regional Organizations

International organisation is a formal institution that has a structure established by agreement among sovereign states with the aim of pursuing the common interest of the members.

- A region is a segment of the world bound together by a geographical, social, cultural, economic or political tie.
- A regional organisation is a formal arrangement made up of voluntary association of sovereign states within a certain area for a joint purpose.

Regional organizations, as it may be implied, have a more limited scope than International Organizations. An example of a well known, if not really effective organization, is the OAS, (Organization of American States), whose members do not necessarily share the same views or political, certainly not economic interest. Therefore, in my personal opinion, these organizations are more symbolic than effective, politically speaking.

International Organizations have a much wider scope of action, I.E the United Nations Organization, but, as stated above, and in this case even more, the larger number of countries which integrate them have a wide array of interests that are often in open contradiction, not to mention completely opposite interests, both political and economic

Regional organization” often refers to a subset of international (intergovernmental) organizations. An international organization is basically one that is primarily formed by agreement by the governments of at least three countries and which possesses its own legal personality.

The United Nations and World Trade Organization are examples of global international organizations, while the European Union and African Union are examples of regional organizations. There are also “sub-regional” organizations such as the Economic Community of West African States.

NGO

“Non-governmental organization” often refers to organizations created to achieve humanitarian goals or social good, that are created under the laws of a country or subdivision of a country, and not under government control.

.Prof. D.B.More

New Lwa College Ahmednagar