

BLOCK II :
CONTENDING THEORIES
OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Unit 1 :
Classical, Structural and Defensive Realism

Unit Structure :

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Objectives
- 1.3 Understanding Realism
- 1.4 Classical Realism
 - 1.4.1 Morgenthau's Theory of International Politics
- 1.5 Structural Realism
 - 1.5.1 Evolution of Structural Realism
- 1.6 Defensive Realism
- 1.7 Summing Up
- 1.8 References and Suggested Readings

1.1 Introduction

Scholars have interpreted the term 'theory' in different ways. Indeed, the concept has been used so indiscriminately and imprecisely by social scientists in general that it is virtually in danger of losing any meaningful content'. What is central, however, is that a theory should always have scientific propositions which, when tested, are certified to be valid. Its predictive value should be rated high. Secondly, a theory should have universal applicability, and one should be able to make generalizations on it. As Thomas Jenkin opines, a theory about anything is an abstracted generalization. As such, it is primarily and initially a matter of mind rather than a matter of fact. Furthermore, a theory should be capable of guiding research. In the words of Stanley Hoffman, theory is understood as a systematic study of observable phenomena that tries to discover the principal variables, to explain the behaviour, and to reveal the characteristic types of relations among national units. The third module of this material focuses specifically on theories of international relations. This unit attempts to familiarise you with the theories of realism.

1.2 Objectives

Realism is a very important theory of international relations. After going through this unit you will be able to :

Space for Learners

- Discuss realism
- Understand various types of realism

1.3 Understanding Realism

In the discipline of International Relations (IR), realism is a school of thought that emphasises the competitive and conflictual side of international relations. Realism's roots are often said to be found in some of humankind's earliest historical writings, particularly Thucydides' history of the Peloponnesian War, which raged between 431 and 404 BCE. Thucydides, writing over two thousand years ago, was not a 'realist' because IR theory did not exist in named form until the twentieth century. However, when looking back from a contemporary vantage point, theorists detected many similarities in the thought patterns and behaviours of the ancient world and the modern world. They then drew on his writings, and that of others, to lend weight to the idea that there was a timeless theory spanning all recorded human history. That theory was named 'realism'.

As a political theory, realism's intellectual root can be traced to the following figures. Thucydides (460- 406 B.C.) and Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527). The insights that these figures provided have been grouped under the doctrine of *raison d'état* or reason of state. Writers associate *raison d'état* with providing a set of proposition to leaders on how to conduct their foreign policies so as to ensure the security of the state. According to the historian, Frieddrich Meinecke, *raison d'etat* is the fundamental principles of international conduct, the state first law of motion, it tell the statesman what he must do to preserve the health and strength of the state (Meinecke, 1957:1). Most importantly, the state which is identified as the key factor in international politics must pursue power, and it is the duty of the state to calculate rationally the most appropriate steps that should be taken so as to perpetuate the life of the state in a hostile environment. For realists, the survival of the state can never be guaranteed, because the use of force leading to war is a legitimate instrument of state craft.

The realist subscribe to the view that the state is the only actor in the international system. This is often referred to as state-centric. Statism is the term given to the idea of the state as a legitimate representative of the collective will of the people. Outside the boundaries of the state, realist argue that a condition of anarchy exists. By anarchy, what is often mean is that international politics takes place in an arena that has no overarching central authority above the individual collection of sovereign states. In a state of anarchy,

Space for Learners

states compete with one another for security, market influence, etc. And the nature of the competition is often seen in zero-sum terms; in other words, more for one actor, less for another. This competitive logic of power politics makes greener: on universal principles difficult. Given that the. First: move of the state is to organize power domestically. And the second is to accumulate power internationally, what then is power?

The basics of realism

The first assumption of realism is that the nation-state (usually abbreviated to ‘state’) is the principle actor in international relations. Other bodies exist, such as individuals and organisations, but their power is limited. Second, the state is a unitary actor. National interests, especially in times of war, lead the state to speak and act with one voice. Third, decision-makers are rational actors in the sense that rational decision-making leads to the pursuit of the national interest. Here, taking actions that would make your state weak or vulnerable would not be rational. Realism suggests that all leaders, no matter what their political persuasion, recognise this as they attempt to manage their state’s affairs in order to survive in a competitive environment. Finally, states live in a context of anarchy – that is, in the absence of anyone being in charge internationally. The often-used analogy of there being ‘no one to call’ in an international emergency helps to underline this point. Within our own states we typically have police forces, militaries, courts and so on. In an emergency, there is an expectation that these institutions will ‘do something’ in response.

Self Asking Questions

What do you mean by Realism? (50 words)

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

1.4 Classical Realism

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

Space for Learners

From the classical realists' paradigm, states are rational actors whose decisions to maximise power derive from rational calculations of risks and gains, and of the shifts in the power balance in the international system. The nature of the international system reflects this emphasis on power. To be sure, a handful of "great powers" and their military alliances define the world order. For instance, two superpowers with their allies defined the system during the Cold War, from 1945 to 1990. Against this background, realists ground themselves in a long tradition. Indeed, realists believe that power politics is timeless and cross-cultural. For instance, the Chinese strategist Sun Tzu, who lived 2,000 years ago, advised the rulers of states on how to survive in an era when war has become a systematic instrument of power. According to Sun Tzu, moral reasoning is not very useful to the state rulers who are surrounded with armed and dangerous neighbours. He showed rulers how to use power to advance their interests and protect their survival.

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

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

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

Space for Learners

modern realists, Hobbes concerned himself with the underlying forces of politics and with the nature of power in political relationships.

1.4.1 Morgenthau's Theory of International Politics

Since Hans Morgenthau is the chief priest of the realist school, it becomes pertinent to discuss in details his realist theory of international relations. After World War II, Hans Morgenthau argued that international politics is governed by objective, universal laws based on national interests defined in terms of power not psychological motives of decision makers. In his celebrated work, *Politics among Nations* (1948), the chief realist sets forth six principles of realist theory.

Morgenthau's Six Principles of Political Realism

Firstly, certain objective laws that have their roots in human nature govern politics. It maintains that human nature has not changed since classical times. Therefore, in order to improve society, it is first necessary to understand the laws by which society lives. The operations of these laws being impervious to our performances, men will change them only at the risk of failure. For realism, theory consists in ascertaining facts and giving them meaning through reason. It assumes that the character of a foreign policy can be ascertained only through the examination of the political acts performed and of the foreseeable consequences of these acts. Therefore, in theorising about international politics, it is necessary to employ historical data for examining political acts and their consequences. In systematising these vast amounts of historical data, the student of politics should empathise with the position of a statesman who must meet a certain problem of foreign policy under certain circumstances. Therefore, we must ask, what are the rational alternatives from which a statesman may choose who must meet this problem under these circumstances (presuming always that he acts in a rational manner), and which of these rational alternatives this particular statesman, acting under these circumstances, is likely to choose.

Secondly, Morgenthau posits that statesmen think and act in terms of interest defined as power and that historical evidence proves this assumption. This concept, central to Morgenthau's realism, gives continuity and unity to the seemingly diverse foreign policies of the widely separated nation-states. Moreover, the concept interest defined as power makes it possible to evaluate actions of political leaders at different points in history. To describe Morgenthau's framework in more contemporary phraseology, it is a model of interaction within an international system. Using historical data, Morgenthau

Space for Learners

compared the real world with the interaction patterns within his model. The concept of interest defined as power imposes intellectual discipline upon the observer, infuses rational order into the subject matter of politics, and thus makes the theoretical understanding of politics possible.

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

Thus, national interest is identified with national survival. Taken in isolation, the determination of its content in a concrete situation is relatively simple, for it encompasses the integrity of the nation's territory, of its political institutions, and of its culture. As long as the world is divided into nations, Morgenthau asserted, the national interest would remain the last word in world politics. In this regard, interest is the essence of politics.

Fourthly, political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action, it is also aware of the ineluctable tension between the moral command and the requirement of successful political action. Indeed, Morgenthau states that universal moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of states in their abstract, universal formulation, but that they must be filtered through the concrete circumstances of time and place. In pursuit of the national interest, nation-states are governed by a morality that differs from the morality of individuals in their personal relationships. To confuse an individual's morality with a state's morality is to court national disaster. Because the primary official responsibility of statesmen is the survival of the nation-state, their obligations to the citizenry require a different mode of moral judgment from that of the individual.

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

Lastly, the difference between political realism and other schools of thought is not only real but also profound. In Morgenthau's view, the political realist

Space for Learners

maintains the autonomy of political sphere just as the economists, the lawyer, and the moralist maintain theirs. In fact, he stresses the autonomy of the political sphere. In his view, political actions must be judged by political criteria. The economist asks, how does this policy affect the welfare of society, or a segment of it? The lawyer asks, is this policy in accord with the rules of law? The realist asks, how does this policy affect the power of the nation?

In power struggles, nations follow policies designed to preserve the status quo, to achieve imperialistic expansion, or to gain prestige. In Morgenthau's view, domestic and international politics can be reduced to one of three basic types: A political policy seeks either to keep power, to increase power, or to demonstrate power.

Stop to Consider
Offensive Realism

At the end of the Cold War in 1990, the international community experienced a lot of optimism. Many believed that “perpetual peace” among the great powers is finally at hand. That the world has entered a stage in which there is little chance that the major powers will engage each other in security competition, much less war, which has become an archaic enterprise. In the words of one famous author, the end of the Cold War signifies the “the end of history.” Indeed, this school of thought believes that great powers no longer view each other as potential military rivals, but instead as members of a family of nations, members of the “international community.”

1.5 Structural Realism

Structural realism, or neorealism, is a theory of international relations that says power is the most important factor in international relations. Defensive realism points towards “structural modifiers” such as the security dilemma and geography, and elite beliefs and perceptions to explain the outbreak of conflict.

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

Space for Learners

relationships among actors in an international system that is anarchical.

In this respect, drawing upon the paradigm of international politics of classical realism, Neorealism contains an emphasis on those features of the structure that mould the way in which the components relate to one another. According to Waltz, the term structure connotes the way in which the parts are arranged. In domestic politics, there is hierarchical relationship in which units stand in formal differentiation from one another by reference to the degree of authority or the function, which they perform. By contrast, the international system lacks comparable governmental institutions. Actors stand in a horizontal relationship with each other, with each state the formal equal (sovereignty) of the other. The focus of structural realism is the arrangement of the parts of the international system with respect to each other. According to Waltz, the concept of structure is because units differently juxtaposed and combined behave differently and interestingly produce different outcomes. Basic to an anarchic system, by virtue of its structure, is the need for member units to rely on whatever means or arrangements they can generate in order to ensure survival and enhance security. For structural realists, human nature has little to do with why states want power. Instead, it is the structure or architecture of the international system that forces states to pursue power. In a system where there is no higher authority that sits above the great powers, and where there is no guarantee that one will not attack another, it makes eminently good sense for each state to be powerful enough to protect itself in the event it is attacked. In essence, great powers are trapped in an iron cage where they have little choice but to compete with each other for power if they hope to survive.

Structural realist theories ignore cultural differences among states as well as differences in regime type, mainly because the international system creates the same basic incentives for all great powers. Whether a state is democratic or autocratic matters relatively little for how it acts towards other states. Nor does it matter much who is in charge of conducting a state's foreign policy. Structural realists treat states as if they were black boxes: they are assumed to be alike, save for the fact that some states are more or less powerful than others

1.5.1 Evolution of Structural Realism

Kenneth N. Waltz's Theory of International Politics profoundly affected international relations theory. Structural realism as developed by Waltz argues that the anarchic system and the distribution of capabilities are

Space for Learners

powerful constraints and inducements which produce “sameness” in the behavior of states. For Waltz, international relations is anarchic and not hierarchical, populated by functionally similar units, and the structure of the international system or polarity varies based on the distribution of capabilities. The anarchic nature of the international system, and the assumptions that states “at a minimum, seek their own preservation” and are socialized to imitate each other, allows Waltz to explain recurring international patterns and outcomes such as balances of power, war proneness of different distributions of power, and recurrent alliance formation (1979:118; for realist theories of foreign policy, see the literature on classical realism such as Gulick 1955; Wolfers 1962; Morgenthau 1963; Thucydides 1982; and neoclassical realism including Friedberg 1988; Snyder 1991; Wohlforth 1993; Christensen 1996; Elman 1996; Rose 1998; Schweller 2006; Rathbun 2008; Lobell et al. 2009). Waltz’s structural realism influenced many of the major debates in the field in the 1980s and 1990s including neoliberal institutionalism (Keohane 1984; Oye 1986; Baldwin 1993; Ruggie 1993); the agent–structure debate (Wendt 1987; Dessler 1989); the significance of non-state actors (Krasner 1983); and more recently, the new international hierarchy studies (Lake 2003; 2009; Hobson and Sharman 2005) and the degenerative research program controversy (Vasquez 1997; Legro and Moravcsik 1999). Criticism and dissatisfaction with Waltz’s structural realism (Ruggie 1983; Ashley 1986; Keohane 1986; Buzan et al. 1993) fueled the constructivist, cultural, ideational, and Innenpolitik research agendas (Wendt 1992; Goldstein and Keohane 1993; Rosecrance and Stein 1993; Katzenstein 1996; Adler and Barnett 1998; Guzzini 1998).

Derived from Waltz’s structural realism, structural realist theorists can be divided into two competing versions with competing assumptions and policy prescriptions: offensive realism and defensive realism (for reviews of this literature see Lynn-Jones and Miller 1995; Frankel 1996; Miller 1996; Brooks 1997; Taliaferro 2000/01; James 2002; Walt 2002; Schweller 2003; Nexon 2009; the terms “aggressive” and “defensive” realism originally appeared in Jack Snyder’s *Myths of Empire*). One distinction between these two versions of realism is the role of the anarchic international system and whether it encourages states to maximize their security or to maximize their power and influence. A second distinction is whether conquest and expansion pay, and more generally, the cause of pathological state behavior including overexpansion, self encirclement,

Space for Learners

and over extension. A final distinction is whether states are primarily revisionist in their intentions, or at least assumed to be, or whether states are primarily motivated by security-seeking behavior.

Check Your Progress :

1. What are the basics of Realism?
2. Discuss the contribution of Realism to the study of international Relation.
3. Point out the Morgenthau's Six Principles of Political Realism.
4. Analyse the concept of Structural Realism

1.6 Defensive Realism

In international relations, defensive neorealism is a structural theory derived from the school of neorealism. It finds its foundation in political scientist Kenneth Waltz's Theory of International Politics, in which Waltz argues that the anarchical structure of the international system encourages states to maintain moderate and reserved policies in order to attain security. In contrast, offensive realism assumes that states seek to maximize their power and influence to achieve security through domination and hegemony. Defensive neorealism asserts that aggressive expansion as promoted by offensive neorealists upsets the tendency of states to conform to the balance of power theory, thereby decreasing the primary objective of the state, which they argue is ensuring its security. While defensive realism does not deny the reality of interstate conflict, nor that incentives for state expansion do exist, it contends that these incentives are sporadic rather than endemic. Defensive neorealism points towards "structural modifiers", such as the security dilemma and geography, and elite beliefs and perceptions to explain the outbreak of conflict.

For defensive or positional realists (Joseph Grieco coined the term "defensive positionalists" in Cooperation Among Nations), security is plentiful. Major powers seek to maximize their security by preserving the existing balance of power through mostly defensive strategies (Jervis 1978; Waltz 1979; Posen 1984; Walt 1987; Grieco 1990; Snyder 1991; Glaser 1994/5; Layne 1997; Van Evera 1999). Defensive realists maintain that the international system encourages states to pursue moderate and restrained behavior to ensure their survival and safety, and provides incentives for expansion in only a few select instances. The rationale is that aggression, competition, and expansion to maximize power through primacy and preponderance are unproductive

Space for Learners

because they will provoke the security dilemma and counterbalancing behavior, and thereby thwart the state's effort to increase its security. As Christopher Layne concisely notes, "states balance against hegemons" (1993:87). For defensive realists, since the international system rarely provides incentives for expansion, "structural modifiers," including the offense–defense military balance and geography, and domestic and unit-level pathologies such as elite beliefs, perceptions, and logrolled imperial coalitions, explain over expansion, under balancing, self-encirclement, and over extension (Taliaferro 2000/01).

Check Your Progress

1. What is neorealism?
2. What is the best way for states to survive in a dangerous world?
3. What is defensive realism?

1.7 Summing Up

Realism is a theory that claims to explain the reality of international politics. It emphasises the constraints on politics that result from humankind's egoistic nature and the absence of a central authority above the state. For realists, the highest goal is the survival of the state, which explains why states' actions are judged according to the ethics of responsibility rather than by moral principles. The dominance of realism has generated a significant strand of literature criticising its main tenets. However, despite the value of the criticisms, which will be explored in the rest of this book, realism continues to provide valuable insights and remains an important analytical tool for every student of International Relations.

In this unit, we discussed realism. The realist paradigm explains international relations in power terms. Realism has its intellectual roots in the older political philosophy of the West and in the writings of non- Western ancient authors such as Sun Tzu in China, Kautilya in India, as well as Thucydides in ancient Greece. According to Sun Tzu, moral reasoning is not very useful to the state rulers who are surrounded with armed and dangerous neighbours. He showed rulers how to use power to advance their interests and protect their survival. Hans Morgenthau, who is the chief priest of the school of modern realism, authored his famous book, *Politics among Nations*, (1948), shortly after the World War II. In the book, Morgenthau sets forth six principles of realist theory and provocatively argued that international politics is governed by objective, universal laws based on national interests defined in terms of

Space for Learners

power not psychological motives of decision makers. Taking realism to a higher level of refinement, Kenneth Waltz developed the concept of Neorealism. He opines that, the structure shapes the political relationships that take place among its members. Similarly, John Mearsheimer has taken realism further by developing what he calls offensive realism. Overall, today's international relations operate on the famous dictum by Thucydides, "the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept." Indeed, realism prevails!

1.8 References and Suggested Readings

1. Goldstein, J.S. & Pevehouse, J. C. (2011). *International Relations*. (9th ed.). San Francisco: Longman, Pearson Education.
2. James, E. Dougherty & Robert, L Pfaltzgraff Jr. (1990). *Contending Theories of International Relations*. (3th ed.). New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
3. John, Mearsheimer (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton and Company.
4. Morgenthau, H. J.(1985). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. (4th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
5. Sun, Tzu (2005). *The Art of War*. Translated by Thomas Cleary, London: Shambhala.
6. Thucydides (1954). *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Translated by Rex Warner, London: Penguin Books.

Space for Learners

Unit 2 :**Liberalism and Neo-Liberalism**

Unit Structure

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Objectives
- 2.3 Liberalism
 - 2.3.1 The basics of liberalism
 - 2.3.2 The Evolution of Liberal Thought
- 2.4 Classical Liberalism
- 2.5 Neo-Liberalism
- 2.6 Summing Up
- 2.7 References and Suggested Readings

2.1 Introduction

Traditionally there have been two central theories of IR: liberalism and realism. Although they have come under great challenge from other theories, they remain central to the discipline. At its height, liberalism was referred to as a 'utopian' theory and to some degree is still recognised as such today. Its proponents view human beings as innately good and believe peace and harmony between nations is not only achievable, but desirable. In the late eighteenth century, Immanuel Kant developed the idea that states that shared liberal values should have no reason for going to war against one another. In Kant's eyes, the more liberal states there were in the world, the more peaceful it would become, since liberal states are ruled by their citizens and citizens are rarely disposed to go to war. This is in contrast to the rule of kings and other non-elected rulers who frequently have selfish desires out of step with citizens. His ideas have resonated and continue to be developed by modern liberals, most notably in the democratic peace theory, which posits that democracies do not go to war with each other.

This unit will dwell on one of the earliest theories of International Relations i.e. Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism.

2.2 Objectives

After going through this unit you will be able to

- Examine liberal thoughts in International Relation
- Understand Neoliberalism

2.3 Liberalism

Liberalism is a defining feature of modern democracy, illustrated by the prevalence of the term ‘liberal democracy’ as a way to describe countries with free and fair elections, rule of law and protected civil liberties. However, liberalism – when discussed within the realm of IR theory – has evolved into a distinct entity of its own. Liberalism contains a variety of concepts and arguments about how institutions, behaviours and economic connections contain and mitigate the violent power of states. When compared to realism, it adds more factors into our field of view – especially a consideration of citizens and international organisations. Most notably, liberalism has been the traditional foil of realism in IR theory as it offers a more optimistic world view, grounded in a different reading of history to that found in realist scholarship.

Liberalism is one of the early approaches to the study of International Relations. It was dominant from the early 1900s through to late 1930s. The approach was motivated by the desire to prevent war. However not all idealists believed that the economic principles of free trade would lead to peace. Hobson (1902) argued that imperialism — the control of foreign people and their resources was becoming the primary cause of conflict in International Politics. The outbreak of the First World War shifted Liberal thinking towards a recognition that peace is not a natural phenomenon, but is one that can be constructed. In a severe critique of the idea that peace and prosperity were part of a natural order. Luard (1992:465) argued that peace and prosperity required consciously devised machinery. But the most famous advocate of an international authority for the management of international relations was Woodrow Wilson, the former President of the United States of America. According to him peace could only be secured with the creation of an international institution to regulate international anarchy. Security should not be left to secret bilateral diplomatic deals and a blind faith in the balance of power. Like domestic society, international society must have a system of government which has democratic procedures for coping with disputes and international forces which could be mobilized if negotiations fail. In his famous fourteen points speech addressed to congress in January 1918, Wilson argued that: A general association of nations must be formed to preserve the coming peace (cited in Dunore, 200 1: 167).

All liberal theories place state-society relation as the core value of International relations. The argued that fundamental premise that state

Space for Learners

behavior reflects the relationship between it and the domestic and transnational society in which it is embedded. They believed on the influence of economic interdependence, varying conceptions of collective goods provision, or domestic representation. This basic insight can be restated more precisely in terms of three “hard core” assumptions, which specify, respectively, the nature of societal actors, the nature of the state, and the nature of the international system.

2.3.1 The basics of liberalism

Liberalism is based on the moral argument that ensuring the right of an individual person to life, liberty and property is the highest goal of government. Consequently, liberals emphasise the wellbeing of the individual as the fundamental building block of a just political system. A political system characterised by unchecked power, such as a monarchy or a dictatorship, cannot protect the life and liberty of its citizens. Therefore, the main concern of liberalism is to construct institutions that protect individual freedom by limiting and checking political power. While these are issues of domestic politics, the realm of IR is also important to liberals because a state’s activities abroad can have a strong influence on liberty at home. Liberals are particularly troubled by militaristic foreign policies. The primary concern is that war requires states to build up military power. This power can be used for fighting foreign states, but it can also be used to oppress its own citizens. For this reason, political systems rooted in liberalism often limit military power by such means as ensuring civilian control over the military.

The first assumption of Liberalist scholars was that national self-determination within Europe would remove one of the major sources of war. Each nationality should be organized as an independent state. A second assumption was that war often resulted from secret agreements between states, and that, if citizen of these states were aware of such agreements, they would not be tolerated. The liberalists called for an end to secret diplomacy and urged greater public participation in the conduct of foreign policy. Thirdly, the liberalists called for an end to balance of power in favour of a system of International Collective security that would require states to reduce their military preparedness to the lowest possible level and to rely on the combined military capability of the world community for their security against armed aggression. It also assumed that:

Space for Learners

- i. A world governing body would exist to determine whether aggression had occurred and to coordinate a global response.
- ii. States would automatically join in collective responses to aggression anywhere in the world (Maghooori, 2002:10).

Basically, the liberalist embraced a world view based on the follow belief:

- i. Human nature is essentially good or altruistic and people are, therefore, capable of mutual aid and collaboration;
- ii. The fundamental human concern for the welfare of others makes progress possible;
- iii. Bad human behavior is not a product of evil people, but of evil justifications and structural arrangement that encourage people to act selfishly and to harm others including making wars;
- iv. War is not inevitable and its frequency can be reduced by eradicating the institutional arrangement that motivate people to act selfishly, and to harm others;
- v. War is an international problem that requires collective or multilateral rather than national efforts to eliminate it;
- vi. International society must reorganize itself to eliminate the institutions that make war to likely occur

Self Asking Question :

Do you support the beliefs of the Liberalists? Give three arguments favour of your answer. (200 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

2.3.2 The Evolution of Liberal Thought

Liberal theory became prominent during the First World War. For Liberals like U.S. president, Woodrow Wilson, World War I was the war to end all war. He was convinced that another terrible war would erupt if states resumed practicing power politics. Liberals were set out to reform the international system. The Liberal or Idealist generally fell into three groups. The First Group advocated creating international institutions to reduce the struggle for power between states. The establishment of the League of Nations was the embodiment of this line

Space for Learners

of thought. Its founders hoped to prevent future wars by organizing a system of collective security that would mobilize the entire international community against any future aggressor. The League founders state that peace was indivisible; an attack on one member of the League would be considered an attack on all. (Kegley and Raymond, 2007:33). Because no state was more powerful than the combination of all other states, an aggressor would be deterred and war averted.

A second group called for the use of legal procedure to settle disputes before they escalated to armed conflict. Adjudication is a judicial procedure for resolving conflict by referring them to a standing court for a binding decision. Immediately after the war several governments drafted a statute to establish a permanent Court of International Justice. A liberal advocate of the court argued that the permanent Court of International Justice would replace military retaliation with a judicial body capable of bringing the facts of a dispute to light and giving a just verdict. A third group of liberal thinkers followed the biblical injunction that states should beat their swords into plowshares and sought disarmament as a means of avoiding war. Their efforts led to the 1921 and 1922 Washington Naval Conference which tried to reduce maritime competition among the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France and Italy by placing limitations on battleships. The aim of this group was to reduce international tensions by promoting general disarmament which led them to convene the Geneva Disarmament conference in 1932.

Stop to Consider

MAIN CHARACTERISTICS of LIBERALISM

As we know Liberals have strong faith in human reason. This characteristic can be traced back to the ideas of John Locke (1632-1704) who argued that 1. reason is necessary for arriving at truth and right action. Reason is necessary for understanding and shaping nature and society.

2. liberals believe in the possibility of historical progress. Human reason and processes of social learning make progress possible. In the liberal conception therefore, mankind is not doomed to live in a state of perpetual conflict, but can choose political strategies to avoid it.

3. liberals focus on state-society linkages and claim the existence of a close connection between domestic institutions and politics on the one hand and the international politics on the other.

Space for Learners

2.4 CLASSICAL LIBERALISM

Classic liberalism is the name given to liberal thought in the pre-Second World War years. As we saw, liberalism bestowed importance on the idea of human reason. It believes that all individuals are rational creatures. Hence, they are in a better position to decide what is for their own good. It is precisely because human beings are driven by the logic of reason that they have a tendency to cooperate with one another, especially in areas where they have common interest. Such cooperation can occur both domestically and internationally (Jackson and Sorensen 2008: 98). Liberalism focuses on the idea of individual liberty. basics of classical liberalism can be found in the ideas of Adam Smith, John Locke and Jeremy Bentham.

John Locke (1688) is known as the father of classical liberalism. He argued that government should rule by the consent of the governed. Locke argued the case of limited government. The main responsibility of the government is to protect the rights and liberties of its citizens.

Adam Smith (1776) believed in the idea of ‘economic man’. Smith believed that if every individual tries to maximize their self-interest, it will lead to overall economic prosperity in the society. Smith coined the term laissez faire economy. According to this idea, the market the state shall not interfere in the activities of the market. Smith visualized that a free market can bring about overall national prosperity.

Bentham introduced the concept of the ‘greatest happiness of the greatest number’. Thus, individuals should focus on those activities which maximizes pleasure and minimizes pain. Bentham also proposed that there should be an international court. The spirit of Bentham’s idea can be observed in the structures and functions of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) (Sutch and Elias 2010). (<https://egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/71847/1/Unit-8.pdf>)

Though, liberalism was success in influencing policy making process but failed in avoiding conflict and war. Finally it lead to the ‘Twenty Years’ crisis (E.H. Carr, 1939) and eventually to the World War II. During these years, with the United States not joining the League and the emergence of Nazism and Fascism in Europe, liberal ideas and strategies could not be popularized.

Space for Learners

Stop to Consider

Republican Liberalism

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) is the founder of Republican Liberalism. His ideas inspired the rise of this thought along with and contemporary American scholar, Michael Doyle. It argued that as the democratic governments possess and followed positive features so they do not go to war with one another. This is the core idea of the democratic peace theory. This thought poses a challenge to the realist claims that peace depends on the systemic balance of power rather than the domestic nature of the governments. Republican liberalism, advocates and argued for the promotion of democracy worldwide to achieve peace. In this sense, it is one of theories with a strong normative element.

Space for Learners

2.5 Neoliberalism

In the 1980s a new Liberal critique of Realism became dominant. The approach stressed the importance of international institutions in reducing international conflict and tension. The argument is based on the core liberal idea that seeking long. Term mutual gain is often more rational than maximizing individual short term gains. The approach became known as neo-liberal institutionalism or Neo Liberalism.

The neo-Liberal concedes to realism several important assumptions — among them, that states are unitary actors rationally pursuing self-interest. However, the neo-liberalist argued that states do cooperate with one another, because it is in their interest to do so. States can also use institutions to facilitate the pursuit of Mutual gain (Goldstein, 2001:113).

In spite of many sources of conflict in International Relations, states do find ways to cooperate with one another. States can create mutual rule, expectations and institutions to promote behavior that enhances the possibilities for mutual gain.

Neo-Liberalists acknowledge that cooperation between states is likely to be fragile, particularly where enforcement procedures are weak. However in an environment of increasing regional and global integration, states, can often find out without any external force — a coincidence of strategic and economic interest which can be turned around into a formalized agreement determining the rules of conduct. In such areas such as environmental degradation and the threat of terrorism, the necessity for formalized cooperation between states is evident.

Space for Learners

Liberal Institutionalism suggest that the way to peace and prosperity is to have independent states pool their resources and even surrender some of their sovereignty to create integrated societies to promote economic growth or respond to regional challenges. The European Union is one such institution that started as a regional community for encouraging multi-lateral cooperation in the production of coal and steel in the 1950s. The European Union today is a model of success in regional integration.

Another key aspect of liberal institutional scholarship was the trans-nationalism and complex inter-dependence of the 1970s (Keohane, Nye 1972, 1977). Scholars in this camp argued that the world had become more pluralistic in terms of actors involved in international interactions and that these actors had become more dependent on each other. Complex inter-dependence presented a world with four characteristics. (i) increasing linkages among states and non-state actors (ii) a new agenda of international issues with no distinction between low and high politics (iii) a recognition of multiple channels for interaction among actor across national boundaries; (iv) the decline of the efficacy of military force as a tool of statecraft. Complex inter-dependence scholars would argue that globalization represents an increase in linkages and channels for interaction (Lamy, 200 1:188).

Self Asking Question :

How neo-liberalism is different from classical liberalism. (80 words)

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

Sociological Liberalism

Another neo-Liberal variant is known as sociological liberalism. Scholars in this group argued that the notion of community and the process of interdependence are important elements. As trans-national activities increase, people, in distant lands are linked and their governments become more interdependent As a result it becomes more difficult and more costly for states to act alone and to avoid cooperation with neighbors. The cost of war or other unwholesome behavior increase for all states and eventually, a peaceful international community is built (Lamy, 2001:189).

Trade and Inter-Dependence or Commercial Liberalism

This type of Liberal theory holds that, it is in a state’s best interest to pursue

free trade and economic interdependence; doing so increases levels of wealth and security. Normal Angell made the first definitive statement of this Liberal Approach in his 1913 work *The Great Illusion*. The illusion to which Angell referred is that war making is the best means to achieve power, wealth and security. Among Angell's points were that you cannot destroy people and resources without destroying the wealth that you are trying to obtain, that internationalization and interdependence have made war unprofitable, and that regular and permanent gains from cooperation and trade more than offset the losses of foregoing empire, occupation and war booty.

A more recent (1980) statement of trade and interdependence theory argues that this view is even more appropriate now than in Angell's day. Richard Rosecrance (*The Rise of the Trading State*) reiterates Angell's assertion that the benefits of trade outweigh those of war and conquest. This is especially so in the post-1945 period. Technological and industrial developments — especially the advents of nuclear weapons — have made war more dangerous and destructive than ever before. Advances in technology and industry have simultaneously made free global trade and interdependence more profitable than ever before. According to Rosecrance, the primary objective of the nation-state is exchange and trade. A state does not need a large population, tract of land, or army to achieve this. States are wisest to pursue technological and commercial specialization that give them important, wealth-generating riches in an inter-dependent world.

Stop to Consider

Democratic Peace Theory

Democratic Peace Theory is an extension of Liberal theory. It is perhaps the most widely known Liberal theory of International Relations. It holds that democracies do not go to war with one another, and a more democratic world is therefore a more peaceful world. Democratic Peace theory is a core idea underpinning national security policies of democracy promotion. Democratic Peace theory works in two ways. First and most simply, war is often considered to be inconsistent with Liberal-democratic values. Democracies do not fight one another because it is morally/ethically the wrong thing to do. Secondly, the structure of democratic governments makes it more difficult for leaders to wage war. Unlike dictators, democratic leaders face governmental checks and balances, require some level of public support, and worry about the electoral consequences of their actions. Democracies are believed to be more peaceful countries because of these constraints on leaders.

Space for Learners

2.6 Critics of Liberalism

Contemporary liberal philosophy is fundamentally flawed despite the appeal of its seemingly more grounded orientation to real world cultural differences. In recent developments have prompted a revival of interest in liberal theories of international relations, among them the spread of democratic institutions, economic liberalisation and the increasing significance of international institutions in many aspects of our life. Many viewed liberal international relations theory as over impressed by and promoted by Western governments. This is the time of rethinking the challenges of liberalism in a ‘globalising’ world order characterised by extreme economic inequality, social upheavals and the reassertion of cultural differences and the questions whether and how liberal values can at all be realised in such a world have been left to political theorists, whose struggles with these issues attract little interest in an international relations discipline still largely committed to the idea of a purely empirical social science.

Even, among the Liberals there is no philosophical justification which enjoys general acceptance. For practical political purposes, however, there is no insuperable problem in endorsing liberalism as a universal ideal while acknowledging that others may legitimately support different ideals. Alasdair MacIntyre remarks ‘liberalism has become the kind of social and cultural tradition in which incoherence is at home’. MacIntyre attributes liberalism’s incoherence to the co-presence in liberal culture of logically incompatible and incommensurable modern individualist values and the virtues of pre-modern cultural and intellectual traditions, such as competing conceptions of justice and desert. He suggests that this incoherence is socially and politically protected because the survival of the liberal tradition depends on it. Distinguishing between the liberal intellectual tradition and the wider social and cultural tradition in which the former is embedded, he also suggests that this protection is partly afforded by the liberal intellectual tradition, that is, by liberalism’s various traditions of inquiry—such as utilitarianism, natural rights theory and contractarianism. (MacIntyre, ‘A Partial Response to my Critics’, pp. 291-).

Harvard law professor Adrian Vermeule argued that, Liberalism “constantly disrupts deeply cherished traditions among its subject populations, stirring unrest, animosity, and eventually political reaction and backlash.

Left anti-liberals, by contrast, pinpoint liberal economic doctrine as the source

Space for Learners

of the current woes. Liberalism’s vision of the economy as a zone of individual freedom, in their view, has given rise to a deep system of exploitation that makes a mockery of liberal claims to be democratic — an oppressive system referred to as “neoliberalism.”

Nancy Fraser, a professor at the New School, said “Neoliberalism in any guise is not the solution but the problem,”. “The sort of change we require can only come from elsewhere, from a project that is at the very least anti-neoliberal, if not anti-capitalist.”

To criticise liberalism is not merely engage in ordinary political argumentation. It is to call into question the entire existing system that defines the world’s democracies. It is, by its nature, a radical claim. But these are radical times. Several trends and shock events have combined to create a sense of rolling crisis. This certainly traces back to the Great Recession; arguably, it began as far back as the 9/11 attacks. But what’s clear is that liberalism’s peril became acute in 2016, when the twin shocks of Brexit and Trump proved that illiberal right-wing populism had emerged as a serious challenge to liberal hegemony.

Check Your Progress

1. Explain the Evolution of Liberal Thought .
2. What do you mean by Neoleberalism. Explain.
3. Discuss articulately the theories of Liberalism and neo liberalism.
(500 words)

2.7 Summing Up

A core argument of liberalism is that concentrations of unaccountable violent power are the fundamental threat to individual liberty and must be restrained. The primary means of restraining power are institutions and norms at both domestic and international level. At the international level institutions and organisations limit the power of states by fostering cooperation and providing a means for imposing costs on states that violate international agreements. Economic institutions are particularly effective at fostering cooperation because of the substantial benefits that can be derived from economic interdependence. Finally, liberal norms add a further limitation on the use of power by shaping our understanding of what types of behaviour are appropriate. Today, it is clear that liberalism is not a ‘utopian’ theory

Space for Learners

describing a dream world of peace and happiness as it was once accused of being. It provides a consistent rejoinder to realism, firmly rooted in evidence and a deep theoretical tradition.

2.6 References and Suggested Readings

1. A I Johnston *Cultural Realism, Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History* (Princeton University Press Princeton 1995).
2. A Moravcsik , *Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics* (1997) *IntlOrg* 513–53.
3. A Wendt, *Constructing International Politics*‘ (1995) 20(1) *International Security* 71–81.
4. B Koremenos (ed), *The Rational Design of International Institutions* (2001) *IntlOrg* 761–1103.
5. BA Ackerly M Stern and J True (eds), *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations* (CUP Cambridge 2006).
6. D A Baldwin (ed) *Neorealism and Neoliberalism, The Contemporary Debate* (Columbia University Press New York 1993).
7. David A. Baldwin, *Power Analysis and World Politics: New trends versus Old Tendencies*, *World Politics*, vol. 31, no. 2, (January 1979)

Space for Learners

Unit 3 :
Regime Theory

Unit Structure :

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Objectives
- 3.3 The Regime Theory
 - 3.3.1 Regime Theory and the State
 - 3.3.2 Evolution of Regime Theory
- 3.4 Critical Appreciation
- 3.5 Summing Up
- 3.6 References and Suggested Readings

3.1 Introduction

John Locke continues to have a large following in international relations. His ideas about the social contract and the responsibilities of rulers towards their subjects have contributed to a number of the theories that you have studied in unit 2, particularly Liberalism. Locke is also credited with popularising the idea of natural rights – today referred to as human rights and certainly one of the main interests of modern IR. Finally, Locke’s view that human nature can be improved by the use of reason to learn from past mistakes has found a voice in regime theory, which seeks to solve international problems through cooperation between international actors.

3.2 Objectives

After going through this unit you will be able to

- Discuss the Regime Theory of international relation.
- Trace the evolution of regime theory.
- Analyse the relationship between regime theory and the state.

3.3 The Regime Theory

Regime theory is an approach within international relations theory, a sub-discipline of political science, which seeks to explain the occurrence of co-operation among States by focusing on the role that regimes play

in mitigating international anarchy and overcoming various collective action problems among States. Different schools of thought within international relations have emerged, and various analytical approaches exist within the regime theory itself.

However, typically regime theory is associated with neoliberal institutionalism that builds on a premise that regimes are central in facilitating international co-operation and constraining the behaviour of States. Thus, in international relations literature, regime theory is often used interchangeably with the terms 'institutionalism' or 'neoliberal institutionalism'.

Regimes are sets of principles, procedures, norms, or rules that govern particular issue areas within international relations. Regimes are important because they facilitate some form of global governance in an anarchical realm. They reflect the fact that states often have converging interests and are willing to cooperate to achieve certain outcomes. As a consequence, some scholars believe that regimes play a significant role in reducing the level of international conflict between states and facilitating cooperation at the international level.

Regimes can take the form of conventions, international agreements, treaties, or international institutions. They can be found in a variety of issue areas, including economics, the environment, policing, transport, security, communications, human rights, arms control, even copyright and patents. Indeed, they exist in most issue areas where states have similar interests. The World Trade Organisation (WTO), the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) are all examples of firmly established regimes.

A regime can be bilateral, multilateral, regional or global in scope. It can also be formal and highly institutionalised or quite loose and informal. The WTO is a good example of a formal and institutionalised regime, while UNCLOS and the CWC have fewer institutional structures underpinning them. Yet they are similar in the sense that each requires compliance from states. States that have accepted the conditions set out by the regime are under an obligation to act according to its principles.

The notion of convergence is crucial to understanding the character of regimes. Regimes presuppose that states have similar interests across a range of issues and that these interests can best be served by coordinated action. In other words, regimes provide a regulatory framework for states

that facilitates a semblance of global governance. Imagine, for example, the difficulty in getting mail to someone on the other side of the world without a formal agreement governing the distribution of mail. Think for a moment about the chaos in the skies if there were no rules or procedures regulating airline traffic. Who would risk overseas flight under such circumstances?

Some scholars have argued that regimes function best when power is concentrated in the hands of a preponderant state. Hegemonic stability theory suggests that the presence of a hegemon makes it possible (and easier) to enforce rules and norms across an issue area. The role of the United States in putting in place an open trading system in the aftermath of the Second World War is often cited as an example of the importance of power in determining the success of regimes.

In short we can summarise this theory as, the term “international regime” was originally used to describe formal agreements between states, but the concept has since evolved after going through considerable critique and reformulation. A universal agreement on the precise nature or elements of a regime has remained elusive, despite a general consensus on the definition. Nevertheless, the concept of regime offers a unique opportunity to better understand international relationships by underscoring the importance of specific attributes of international, multinational, and nongovernmental groups, sets of behavioral or epistemic practices, and processes of learning. As a heuristic device, regime theory helps to explain the rise of complex interaction between states, organizations, corporations, and other institutions as well as the potential for ideas or behavior to shape the international system. Regime theory has supplemented traditional explanations of international order, including hegemonic stability theory or neorealism, by explaining the emergence of cooperation and organization within what would traditionally be considered anarchical or highly unpredictable conditions. Common approaches to regime theory include realism, neoliberalism, cognitivism, and constructivism. Part of the strength of regime theory is that it has remained an elastic concept and has been used to analyze a huge diversity of issues, with many promising results. Regime theory should continue highlighting both the ideational and material dimensions of organization and bringing together positivist, inductive, and critical approaches to understanding power, interest, and identity so as to generate a series of new conversations or trajectories for exploring the creation of international order.

Space for Learners

Stop To Consider

Power-Based Approach

There are different bases of regime theory. We can divide the study of regime theory into a power-based approach, an interest-based approach, and a knowledge-based approach. Let's have a look at the Power based Approach.

The power-based approach, sometimes referred to as neorealism, of regime theory attempts to explain international regimes in terms of the distribution of power among the most relevant actors of particular international policy. It assumes that states and other actors act rationally. Hegemonic-stability theory (HST) is one of the most well-known power-based approaches in international regime theory. In a nutshell, HST suggests that a hegemon, a country that dominates all others, will encourage the development of regimes that are consonant with its interests to develop support for its policies without the expense of forcing its will on other states using more costly means, such as economic sanctions or force. For example, the United States has played a large role in fashioning a global financial and economic system that aligns with its interests and values. Of course, the hegemon will not permit the formation of any regime contrary to its interests. In our example, the U.S. will not permit an economic regime that discourages free trade.

Space for Learners

Theoretical foundations

While realism predicts that conflict should be the norm in international relations, regime theorists say that there is cooperation despite anarchy. Often they cite cooperation in trade, human rights, and collective security, among other issues. These instances of cooperation are regimes. The most commonly cited definition comes from Stephen Krasner, who defines regimes as "institutions possessing norms, decision rules, and procedures which facilitate a convergence of expectations". Thus, the concept of regimes is broader than that of a formal organization.

Not all approaches to regime theory, however are liberal or neoliberal; some realist scholars like Joseph Grieco developed hybrid theories which take a realism-based approach to this fundamentally liberal theory. (Realists do not say cooperation never happens, just that it's not the norm—a difference of degree).

Self Asking Questions

How do you define regime theory in your own words. (50 words)

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

Space for Learners

Different Types of Regimes

Regimes exist in various domains of international politics. There are, for example, Collective security regimes (including United Nations [UN] norms, principles, and procedures constraining the use of force in foreign affairs; Use of Force, Prohibition of), economic regimes (including international trade regime and international monetary regime; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development [IBRD]; International Monetary Fund [IMF]; World Trade Organization [WTO]), human rights regimes (including the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms [1950] and various international treaties and customary norms protecting civil, political, economic, and social rights), and environmental regimes (including regimes protecting biodiversity or regulating emissions; Biological Diversity, International Protection ;Environment, International Protection)

Regimes are traditionally thought of as being composed of States. More recent studies of regimes, however, acknowledge that regimes comprising non-governmental organizations or individuals can also guide and regulate the behaviour of States and various non-State actors (firms, groups, individuals).

Since the 1970s, theoretical inquiry into regimes has developed into a growth industry. Today, there are at least three main divisions within contemporary regime theory:

- Realist theories stress the role of power in generating cooperation between states.
- Interest-based theories highlight the value of regimes in promoting the common interests of states.
- Knowledge-based theories focus primarily on the way that ideas and norms shape perceptions of international problems and the role of regimes in this process.

Despite the differences of emphasis in these approaches, all agree that regimes are an important source of stability in the international arena, particularly as states increasingly confront problems that do not respect territorial boundaries and require international cooperation.

Stop to Consider

Interest-Based Approach

Like the power-based approach, the interest-based approach also assumes that actors are rational. However, according to the interest-based approach, rational states will engage in long-term cooperation to achieve absolute gains. Importantly, this means that a state may give up a short-term advantage to cooperate with another state or group of states to maintain cooperation with each other for a larger, long-term gain.

3.3.1 Regime Theory and the State

Regime theory regards states as principal actors in world politics. States are assumed to be rational, unitary actors who seek to maximize their national self-interest. Rationality means that States have ordered and consistent preferences that lead them to pursue policies that maximize their individual utility. These assumptions are shared with a realist paradigm of international relations.

Unlike realism, regime theory emphasizes that States' interests are not necessarily conflictual. International politics is not a zero-sum game where a gain for one State would necessarily mean a loss to another State. States are assumed to be motivated by absolute instead of relative gains. States often have common interests with other States and engage in co-operation with one another to pursue joint gains. Common interests do not mean that States' interests would be identical. Instead, co-operation takes place when States mutually adjust their policies in situations where they have both conflicting and common interests. States consider future consequences of their present actions and adopt a long-term view to interaction with other States. When States perceive that there are benefits from co-operation, they are sometimes willing to forego their short-term interests to accomplish their common interests in the long term.

Regime theory acknowledges that regimes are significant in facilitating co-operation among States, and capable of exerting independent influence on them. The presence of regimes modifies anarchy that would otherwise prevail in international relations. The distribution of capabilities

Space for Learners

among States, while not irrelevant, is not the only determinant of international outcomes. In addition to power, regimes matter.

Check your progress

1. Discuss the meaning and definition of Regime Theory.
2. What are the types of Regime Theory.
3. Write a note on Regime Theory and the State.

3.3.2 Evolution of Regime Theory

International institutions have been studied extensively since their proliferation, especially following World War II. In the post-war world, the studies focused first on formal international organizations. By the 1970s international relations scholars turned their attention to international regimes more generally. This shift in the research agenda represented an attempt to analyse international co-operation and governance more broadly. In the 1980s, the work of Robert Keohane and his neoliberal, functional explanations for the creation and maintenance of regimes provided lasting contributions to the debate on international regimes.

Regime theory emerged as a challenge to the realist school of international relations. Following two world wars, States' inability to limit war in their international relations had become obvious, heightening the need for increased international co-operation. Regime theorists viewed the realists' focus on State power and interest as too narrow, emphasizing common interests shared by all States and their growing interdependence among one another.

The mainstream regime theory is firmly rooted in the rationalist tradition. Thus, throughout its evolution, economic theories focusing on the role of information and transaction costs have influenced the work of regime theorists. Regime theory also draws on various game-theoretic models developed in economics to illustrate different strategic situations and to predict and explain the likelihood of international co-operation.

Stop to Consider :

Difference between regime theory & Realist Theory

Regime theory shares many of the analytical assumptions of realism, which also builds on the presumption that States are rational, unitary actors that act in pursuit of maximizing their individual national interests. Both theories hence reflect a commitment to a rationalist

Space for Learners

research agenda. Realists are, however, considerably more pessimistic about the prospects of international co-operation among egoistic States that operate in an anarchic system. Realists believe that international outcomes reflect the distribution of power among States. Unlike regime theorists, who believe that States engage in international co-operation largely in pursuit of absolute gains, realists have stressed that States are most concerned with relative gains. In other words, while regime theory claims that States care only about their own gains and losses from international co-operation, realists argue that States' willingness to co-operate depends on whether they achieve more gains relative to other States by co-operating.

Space for Learners

Regimes: Dimensions of variance and change

Regimes may change over time in at least four ways: strength, organizational form, scope, and allocation mode.

a. Strength

The majority of "regime change" studies try to explain why regimes eventually weaken or decay." Strength is measured by the degree of compliance with regime injunctions, particularly in instances where short term or "myopic" self-interests collide with regime rules.

b. Organizational form

In its quest to move beyond the study of concrete international organizations, recent regimes literature has largely ignored problems of organizational design and operation. Some issues are conducive to decentralized regulation: regime injunctions may only call on states to share information, or to refrain from certain actions, such as polluting, over-fishing, nuclear testing, or raising tariffs.

c. Scope

Scope refers to the range of issues the regime covers. Though changes in regime scope have attracted little theoretical attention, its neglect can cause misleading characterizations. The failure to comply with certain GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) provisions signaled a weakening of the trade regime in the 1970s.

d. Allocational mode

Regimes can endorse different social mechanisms for resource allocation. A market-oriented regime supports the private allocation of resources, discourages national controls, guarantees property

rights, and facilitates private contracting. As Oran Young states, "free enterprise systems are not institutional arrangements operating outside or in the absence of any regime. Such systems clearly require explicit structures of property or use rights."

Apart from these in terms of basic theoretical orientations to the concept of international regimes, Krasner has identified three positions.

1. **Structuralism:** argues that regimes are epiphenomena, manifestations of the distribution of power, rather than having a significant independent existence or effect. In such a formulation, regimes are variables dependent on power. This position is readily identifiable as realist.
2. **Grotianism:** the opposing position, one that argues the significant existence and effects of regimes: that regimes are independent variables in their own right, permeating international life. The very concept of regimes, as Krasner notes, tends to favour this position, since it argues their importance for study as causal factors, whereas the structuralist position would see them primarily as outcomes, and perhaps only as incidental outcomes at that.
3. **Modified structuralism:** the classic, uneasy middle ground. This position incorporates elements of realism, including a focus on states and a concern for state power, while arguing that regimes do have effects on international behaviour that make them worth studying.

3.4 Critical Appreciation

At the time of globalization and transnationalization, we have seen changes in the organization of economic activity, particularly the of productive processes and the growing power, mobility and political influence of financial capital pave the way for a new patterns of political-economic relations are emerging both within and across national borders. In such situation, where structural changes in the international economy open up new opportunities for domestically-based actors to access global markets, it is the time to recognize that even countries with little historical enthusiasm for neoliberalism, like Japan or Korea, were experiencing significant transformations of domestic relations and a diminution of state capacities even before the crisis (Leysdon 1994, Woo-Cumings 1997). It has been observed that, over the past 10 years, regime theory has become the dominant paradigm for studying urban politics in liberal democracies. Yet there is disagreement about how far it can help us to

understand urban political processes. Regime theory is best understood as a theory of structuring with limits in its analysis of the market economy. These limits undermine its ability to explain the importance of political agency—the scope of individual or collective choice in political decisions and the impact of those choices in the evolution of US cities. It is also noticed that there are important normative dimensions to regime theory, most fully articulated in Elkin’s commercial republic, which academic commentaries have not acknowledged. However, the empirical analysis developed in regime theory contradicts its normative objectives. The absence of a conceptualization of market dynamics, in the light of pessimism about the prospects for equitable regime governance, not only limits it as a theory of structuring but it also renders it unable to explain how the commercial republic can be realized. Regime theory is, therefore, unconvincing for two reasons. It cannot explain how much local politics matter, and it fails to demonstrate that its normative goal—more equitable regime governance—can be achieved, given the realities of the US market economy. Regime theory needs a more developed understanding of structuring. It may be fruitful, therefore, for regime theorists to re-engage critically with variants of Marxism, which unlike Structuralism, recognize the possibility of agency.

We have found some central problems currently facing by regime theory and to a direction for a response. On the one hand, regime theory could challenge structural realism, which seems to offer little grasp on social or community phenomena because of its fixation on power and on a theory that is hamstrung by an unreasonable parsimony. The international world, it seems, may not be, or at least may not necessarily be, a Hobbesian state of nature; indeed, the whole "state of nature/state of war" formulation may be not only highly conditional but also seriously misleading. Simplistic realism and structural realism is simplistic simply will not do. Thus, and conversely, too ready and uncritical an adoption of realist devices and reasoning, in an attempt to protect the concept of regimes from realist attacks, could be harmful. On the other hand, the defects of a liberal analysis, as well as of an analysis assuming that American concerns, attitudes, and perceptions are synonymous with those of everyone else (or, at least, of all right-thinking actors), are also clear, however attractive such analyses may become when writers turn from theory to prescription. One fundamental problem of regime theory, then, is that it has been placed in a continuum between a simplistic realism and an apologetic and hopeful liberalism.

Space for Learners

However, Regime theory gives us a chance to build on the insights of realism while escaping the restrictions of its structuralist formulation. It gives us a chance to move beyond the old liberal-realist debate, to draw on philosophical, sociological, and other sources of insights that could liberate us from this debate, and thus possibly to grapple more successfully with a world that fits neither a narrow realist nor a liberal perspective.

Check your progress

1. Discuss briefly the evolution of regime theory.
2. Write a note on different dimensions of regime.
3. Make a critical analysis of regime theory.

3.5 Summing Up

From the above discussions we have learnt that, Regime theory focuses on descriptive questions instead of a normative analysis. The theory seeks to explain and predict State behaviour and international outcomes, leaving aside questions such as what is a legally justifiable way for States to act. It adopts an external as opposed to an internal perspective on law, and its ability to answer normative questions about the content and validity of international law is therefore limited. Regime theory cannot replace a legal analysis of the international system but its explanatory powers can be harnessed to generate both theoretical and practical insights that can lead to a richer and more comprehensive understanding of the role international law plays in international relations.

3.6 References and Suggested Readings

1. RMA Crawford Regime, Theory in the Post-Cold War World: Rethinking Neoliberal Approaches to International Relations (Dartmouth Aldershot 1996).
2. A Hasenclever, P Mayer, and V Rittberger, Theories of International Regimes (CUP Cambridge 1997).
3. AP Rubin, Ethics and Authority in International Law (CUP Cambridge 1997).
4. A Moravcsik, 'Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics' (1997) 51 IntlOrg 513–53.
5. BA Simmons and LL Martin, 'Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions' (1998) 52 IntlOrg 729–57.
6. A.M Slaughter, AS Tulumello, and S Wood 'International Law and International Relations: A New Generation of Interdisciplinary Scholarship' (1998) 92 AJIL

Space for Learners

Unit 4 :
The English School

Unit Structure :

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Objectives
- 4.3 The English School : The concept
 - 4.3.1 The basics of the English school
 - 4.3.2 Order and Justice in International Relations
- 4.4 The English school and the European Union
- 4.5 Critical appreciation of English School
- 4.6 Debates within the English school
- 4.7 Summing Up
- 4.8 References and Suggested Readings

4.1 Introduction

The thinking of the English school is often viewed as a middle ground between liberal and realist theories. Its theory involves the idea of a society of states existing at the international level. Hedley Bull, one of the core figures of the English school, agreed with traditional theories that the international system was anarchic. However, he insisted this does not mean the absence of norms (expected behaviours), thus claiming a societal aspect to international politics. In this sense, states form an 'Anarchical Society' (Bull 1977) where a type of order does exist, based on shared norms and behaviours. The English school provides the basis for the study of international and world history in terms of the social structures of international orders. Unlike many theories that claim a certain sector of the subject of International Relations, the English school provides a holistic approach to the subject, attempting to see the world as a whole. English school theory is built around establishing distinctions between three key concepts: international system, international society and world society. By doing so it opens up a new space in IR theory and offers a middle ground between the opposing theories of realism and liberalism. In this unit we are going to discuss English school, its basis and relationship with European Union.

4.2 Objectives

English school stands between liberal and realist theories.

After going through this unit you will be able to

- Explain the basis of English School in International Relation
- Analyse its role in international relations.

4.3 The English School : The concept

The English school is a term that became popular in the 1970s, to describe a group of predominantly British or British-inspired writers for whom International Society is the primary bases of analysis (Jorres, 1971; Linklater and Suganami, 2006). Its most influential members include; Hedley Bull, Martin Wight, John Vincent and Adam Watson. The English School remains one of the most important approaches to International politics.

The international society approach to IR theory, often referred to as the “English school” or the Grotian School exists outside the mainstream social science debates that dominate US international studies. Its own rich history characterises its attempts to avoid the polarisation seen in the debates between realists and liberals and by its commitment to the study of what Hedley Bull, one of the school’s chief contributors calls “the anarchical society.”

The main argument of the English School is that sovereign states form a society, even though an anarchic one in that they do not have to submit to the will of a higher power. The fact that states have succeeded in creating a society of sovereign equals is for the English School one of the most interesting dimensions of International Relations. There is they argue, a surprisingly low level of violence between states given that their condition is one of anarchy (in the sense of the absence of a higher political authority).

The English School, however do not ignore the phenomenon of violence in relations between states. Its members regard violence as part and parcel of the international system. They also stressed that violence is controlled to a reasonable level by International Law and morality. Members of the English school maintain that the International political system is more civil and orderly than realists and neo-realists suggest.

In other words we can describe English School of thought as that approach which recognises that anarchy is a structural feature of international relations and that sovereign states form a society that uses conceptions of order and justice in its rhetoric and its calculations. Therefore, the approach looks at balance of power and international law, great power politics and the spread of cosmopolitan values. The great strength of the approach is its refusal to

Space for Learners

engage with the positivist methodological turn in international relations.

Self Asking Questions

What is your opinion on the thoughts of English School. (50 words)

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

Space for Learners

4.3.1 The basics of the English school

The English school is built around three key concepts: international system, international society and world society. Hedley Bull (1977, 9–10) defined the international system as being formed ‘when two or more states have sufficient contact between them, and have sufficient impact on one another’s decisions to cause them to behave as parts of a whole.’ According to this definition, the international system is mainly about power politics among states whose actions are conditioned by the structure of international anarchy. An international society exists when a group of like-minded states ‘conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions’ (Bull 1977, 13). In other words, international society is about the creation and maintenance of shared norms, rules and institutions. Finally, world society is more fundamental than international society because ‘the ultimate units of the great society of all mankind are not states ... but individual human beings’ (Bull 1977, 21). Thus, world society transcends the state system and takes individuals, non-state actors and ultimately the global population as the focus of global societal identities and arrangements. It is important to note here that in the English school the term ‘institution’ is different to the term ‘organisation’.

According to English school thought, ‘institutions’ refer to long-term practices among states (such as diplomacy, law and war) rather than to international bureaucratic structures (organisations) that may be established to facilitate state interaction. To refer to international organisations, the English school uses the term ‘pseudo-institutions’ or ‘secondary institutions’ to show that the effectiveness of international organisations depends on the function of an international society’s primary institutions.

According to English School, there are three distinct spheres at play in international politics, and these three elements always operate

simultaneously. They are, first, the international system; second, international society; and third, world society. Barry Buzan provides an explanation of each sphere :

- 1. International System (Hobbes/Machiavelli) :** is about power politics amongst states, and Realism puts the structure and process of international anarchy at the centre of IR theory. This position is broadly parallel to mainstream realism and structural realism and is thus well developed and clearly understood.
- 2. International Society (Grotius) :** is about the institutionalisation of shared interest and identity amongst states, and Rationalism puts the creation and maintenance of shared norms, rules and institutions at the centre of IR theory. This position has some parallels to regime theory, but is much deeper, having constitutive rather than merely instrumental implications. International society has been the main focus of English School thinking, and the concept is quite well developed and relatively clear.
- 3. World Society (Kant) :** takes individuals, non-state organisations and ultimately the global population as a whole as the focus of global societal identities and arrangements, and Revolutionism puts transcendence of the state system at the centre of IR theory. Revolutionism is mostly about forms of universalist cosmopolitanism.

Stop to Consider

International Relations and International Society

The present nation-state system emerged in 1648 when European diplomats and princes congregated in Westphalia to sign a peace treaty that ended the 30 Years War. This vital feature of our political landscape continues to shape the international system 365 years after. Before this time, the groups and individuals in Western Europe existed with loyalty to a few feudal Lords or central monarch and not to the state. The modern European states system has been hugely successful and influential. What started as a political settlement to a European problem eventually spread across the globe. Thereafter, the Westphalian system became the universal system of international politics. Until date, this trend still underpins contemporary international relations. Functioning international system requires a high degree of interaction, and it is most effective when safeguarded by a supporting community structure. The international society provides the platform for interaction between states that remain the principal actor in international relations. Integration is one of the

Space for Learners

central themes in the interdisciplinary approach to international relations. Studies of past and present tendencies towards integration as well as towards conflict in the international community suggest factors that have important bearing on contemporary diplomacy and political behaviour.

Space for Learners

4.3.2 Order and Justice in International Relations

The English school is interested in the process which transforms systems of states into societies of state and the norms and institutions which prevent the collapse of law and order. There are various theories on how to ensure order and justice in International Relations one of the theories' is the Solidarist International Society theory as espoused by Nicolas Wheeler (2000) in his classic work *Saving Strangers* to explain intervention in states be deviled with crises.

The Solidarist theory of International Society falls within the English School of thought. Interestingly, the English School offers the concept of international society as an alternative to both the realist concentration of power as- the defining force in international relations and the utopian demand to revolutionize the state-based international system. According to English School theorists, the structure of international society is shaped by recurrent patterns of state interactions that are embodied in rules and often expressed as common interest and common values. (Bull, 1966).

Disagreement about the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention reflect two different conceptions of international society that were first identified by Hedley Bull; pluralism and solidarism. Both conceptions agree that the state system is actually a society of states, which includes commonly agreed values, rules and institutions. There is disagreement, however about the normative content of this society. A society of states (or international society) exists when a group of state, conscious of certain common interest and common value, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions (Bull, 1979:13).

Pluralists insist that international society is founded on acceptance of a plurality of actors and the existence of a constitution as the best guarantor of the protection of the actors (Rengger, 2000:105). International Society permits, the diffusion of power to peoples via the plurality of states allowing each nation and state to develop its way of life. The normative content of

such an international society is limited to a mutual interest in the continued existence of the society. Thus, pluralist international society rests on mutual recognition of state sovereignty and the norm of non-intervention. For pluralists, states are unable to agree about substantive issue such as human rights but do recognize that they are bound by the rules of sovereignty of non-intervention (Dunne, 1998:106; Linklater, 2000:20).

A key debate within the English school revolves around pluralism and solidarism. Pluralism refers to international societies with a relatively low degree of shared norms, rules and institutions. Solidarism refers to types of international society with a relatively high degree of shared norms, rules and institutions. The pluralist/solidarist debate is basically about how international society relates to world society or, in other words, to people. The main question has been how to reduce the tension between the needs and imperatives of states and the needs and imperatives of humankind. These are regularly in conflict both in real world situations and in the theory. Most English school scholars operate within this debate, taking the tension between the imperatives of order and justice as the core problem to be addressed.

Stop to Consider

Solidarism

Solidarism agrees with realism that state have a responsibility to protect the security and well being of their citizens, but it parts company with it on the question of whether this obligation obligation to non-citizens. The debate within Solidarist international society theory is over the character of these obligations. Solidarism argues that states committed to these principles of good international citizenship are not required to sacrifice vital interest in defence of human rights but they are required to forsake narrow commercial and political advantage when this conflict with human rights. The hard question is whether solidarism requires state leader to risk and lose soldiers' lives to save non-citizens, Solidarist battle cry that leaders are burdened Me defence of human rights begs the question to hw this balances against their responsibility protect the lives of citizens (Jackson, 100).

4.4 The English school and the European Union

Following the end of the Second World War in 1945, six European states formed a regional international system in the sense that they had 'sufficient contact between them, and had sufficient impact on one

Space for Learners

another's decisions to cause them to behave as parts of a whole' (Bull 1977, 9–10). Applying Bull's definition of international society, relatively soon an international society was formed in the sense that 'they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions' (Bull 1977, 13). In other words, these European states that today are associated with the European Union (EU) created a set of rules and institutions to govern and manage their affairs. As time progressed, the integration process gained strength, breadth and depth, resulting in the creation of supranational institutions (legal powers existing beyond the state), law and policies. This, in turn, led, among other things, to the creation of an EU world society that underpins the EU international society. At the same time, EU law and policies seek to regulate the relations between the Union and, on the one hand, its member states and, on the other, its people. In this way, the tension between the needs and imperatives of states and the needs and imperatives of people, as well as the tension between the imperatives of order and justice, which constitute the core of the pluralist/solidarist debate, are addressed.

The process of the EU enlargement as it went from six members in 1951 to 28 in 2013 is not very different from the process of the historical expansion of European international society. As in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, EU member states had to define the conditions under which they would admit candidate states. As a result, European states that aspire to EU membership need to meet specific political and economic criteria. Like the historical standard of 'civilisation', the EU's membership conditions are an expression of the assumptions used to distinguish those that belong to the expanding Union from those that do not. Those that fulfil the political and economic conditions set by the EU states will be brought inside while those that do not conform will be left outside. Like the non-European states before, EU candidate states had to learn to adjust themselves to new realities, sometimes at significant cost to their own societies.

Self Asking Questions

Relate thought of English School with the formation of European Union.
(100 words)

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

Space for Learners

4.5 Critical appreciation of English School

As we have learnt that, The English school approach recognises that anarchy is a structural feature of international relations and that sovereign states form a society that uses conceptions of order and justice in its rhetoric and its calculations. Therefore, the approach looks at balance of power and international law, great power politics and the spread of cosmopolitan values. The great strength of the approach is its refusal to engage with the positivist methodological turn in IR. But, the English School has been criticized for taking the nexus of morality and politics as an unexamined assumption. I without analyzing centrally important issues; exploring the origin and exact nature of this nexus determining who benefits from moral discourse in the political sphere, when, and why; and addressing possible critiques of the view that morality substantively informs the structure of international society (Berta Esperanza, 2002).

More so, the English School has been criticized reifying existing international norms, values a institution in a way that obscures their social and. politically contested nature, and which there for obscures the significant role of social movement the reproduction of world politics (Alejandro Colas. 2001). International nongovernmental organizations are also largely overlooked in English School analysis. as is their role in the construction of the structure and norms of international society (Boli and Thom 1999).

However, it is often said that, the English school provides the basis for the study of international and world history in terms of the social structures of international orders. Unlike many theories that claim a certain sector of the subject of International Relations, the English school provides a holistic approach to the subject, attempting to see the world as a whole. English school theory is built around establishing distinctions between three key concepts: international system, international society and world society. By doing so it opens up a new space in IR theory and offers a middle ground between the opposing theories of realism and liberalism.

Stop to Consider

Standard of Civilisation

The standard of civilisation included such elements as the guarantee of basic human rights and the maintenance of a domestic legal system guaranteeing justice for all. Thus, by definition, countries unwilling or unable to guarantee such rights could not be considered 'civilised'.

Space for Learners

Consequently, non-European candidate states were judged not only by how they conducted their foreign relations but also by how they governed themselves. The process also led to the creation of hierarchical relations between two new categories of states: the 'civilisers' and the 'civilisees'. Or to put it another way, the 'teachers' and the 'pupils'.

Space for Learners

4.6 Debates within the English school

Two important debates have taken place within the English school. First, whether the distinction between an international system and an international society is valid and, if yes, then where does the boundary line between the two forms of international order lie. The second turns on pluralist versus solidarist understandings and the relationship between international society and world society. The first debate has resulted in the acceptance of the premise that an international system constitutes a weak/thin form of an international society. Although the pluralist/solidarist debate is still ongoing, one should recognise that certain changes in international society (e.g. a shift from a world of perpetual war pre-1945 to a world of relative peace post 1945) are accompanied by some other important developments in world society. For example, there has been a growing demand for human rights as people increasingly understand that they are embedded in a single global economy and a single global environment. At the same time, technology and social media enable widely shared experiences. These developments have led to an increased interplay between international society and world society that has the potential of stabilising international society by embedding ideas not just in the minds of political and economic elites but also in the minds of ordinary citizens.

Check Your Progress

1. Critically examine the notion of English School.
2. What are the basic principles of English School.
3. Write a note on the importance of Order and Justice in the study of English School.

4.7 Summing Up

After going through this unit we come to know that, most of the theories which examine the global arena focusing on either one, or a small number of, issues or units of analysis to make their case about the nature or character of the International politics. While some theorists may desire alterations or a decline in the power of the state, states have not

declined so far as to be removed from their place as the central actors in international relations. In this context, the English School, provides us a three-fold method for understanding how the world operates. In its original articulations, the English School was designed to incorporate the two major theories which were trying to explain international outcomes, namely realism and liberalism. In order to come to a better, more complete, understanding of IR, English School theorists sought to answer an essential question: “How is one to incorporate the co-operative aspect of international relations into the realist conception of the conflictual nature of the international system.” As from the above discussions it is cleared that, in English School there are three distinct spheres at play in international politics, and these three elements are always operating simultaneously. They are first, the international system; second, international society; and third, world society. However, the world society element of English School theory is able to allow for a wide array of theorists to discuss various critical elements and their effects on the society of states. Whether these come in the form of emancipation theory, globalisation theory, neo- or postcolonial theory or even postmodern thinking, the critical thinkers who choose to adopt an English School method are forced to ground their work in some understanding of the state or international society. Making sure that any contemporary efforts to examine the international arena can maintain traditional elements is an essential component of modern IR.

Space for Learners

4.8 References and Suggested Readings

1. Bull, H. (1995). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. (3rd ed.). New York: Palgrave Books.
2. Deutsch, K. (1968). *The Analysis of International Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
3. Goldstein, J. S. (2008). *International Relations*. (6th ed.). Patpaganj, Delhi: Longman, Pearson Education.
4. A Wendt *Social Theory of International Politics* (CUP Cambridge 2000)
5. Alan C. Isaak, *Scope and Methods of Political Science*, (4th edition), Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1985
6. D A Baldwin (ed) *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate* (Columbia University Press New York 1993).
7. Dunne, T. (1998) *Inventing International Society: A History of the English School*, New York, St Martin’s Press.

Unit 5 :
Marxism and dependency theory

Unit Structure :

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Objectives
- 5.3 Marxism in International Relations
- 5.4 Different types of Dependency Theory
 - 5.4.1 Moderate school of thought
 - 5.4.2 Radical school of thought
 - 5.4.3 World System Theory
- 5.5 Other Marxist theories of International Relations and Dependency Theory
 - 5.5.1 Gramscianism
 - 5.5.2 Robert Cox on ‘world order’
- 5.6 Major Concepts in Dependency Theory
 - 5.6.1 Criticism to Modernization Theory
 - 5.6.2 It is a Historical Process
 - 5.6.3 Divided into Core, Periphery, and Semi-Periphery
 - 5.6.4 Dependency as Criticism to Liberal Theories
 - 5.6.5 Globalization Promoting Dependency
- 5.7 Criticism of Marxist and Dependency theory
- 5.8 Summing up
- 5.9 References/ Suggested Readings

5.1 Introduction

Marxism is a set of idea of political, social, and economic theory originated by Karl Marx which focuses on class struggle between the capitalist and the working class. The idea insists that power relation between the capitalists and workers eventually create class conflict. Marxism which is social, economic and political idea later included in the field of international relations.

Dependency theory on the other hand, is an approach to understand economic underdevelopment which is caused by restrictions imposed by the global political and economic order. It tries to bring out the real picture of economic interdependence and resource flow from a “periphery” or a poor states to a “core” or rich states, exploiting the resources of

underdeveloped countries. Dependency theory emerged in Latin America during 1950s to criticize the liberal understanding of economic and political development. Dependency is a condition when a country is dependent on another country for development and expansion of its economy. Therefore, dependency theory tries to understand and explore the reasons for economic backwardness and underdevelopment of countries mostly in global south, how it is different from global north and how the system of dependency can be resolved.

When we talk about dependency theory, writings of two scholars are very relevant. First, it is Immanuel Wallerstein and second, Andre Gunder Frank who put forward the idea of World System Theory or Dependency Theory. Along with that there are other scholars which contributed to the ideas of dependency theory. Therefore, we can state that dependency is a view of the relationship between developed and underdeveloped countries which has its origin from Lenin's theory of imperialism and emphasize on penetration of the capitalist states to the Third World countries, especially to the Latin America. In this unit we are going to discuss the theory in detail.

5.2 Objectives

The Marxian approach/ Dependency theory is very relevant in understanding international relations. Different theories of Marxism played an important role to understand the gap between the rich and poor nations which is influenced by the global market structure. This unit is an attempt to bring out relevance of Marxism in international relations and how a system of dominance of the rich to the poor continues. After reading this unit you will be able to:

- Explain Marxist theories of international relations
- Discuss dependency theory
- Explain the process of world-system
- Examine and compare different perspectives of Marxism
- Relate exploitation to contemporary times

SAQ

Give a brief introduction of dependency theory. (100 words)

.....

.....

.....

.....

Space for Learners

5.3 Marxism in International Relations

The Marxist approach to study international relations is distinct compared to other approaches to study international relations. It is different because it argued for the change that need to bring in the international system. According to Marxist, the definition given by other theories to international relations such as war, treaties, economic cooperation take place in a structure which always influence the event in international system. The structure which is focused by Marxist is the global capitalist system which favours the rich countries and discriminate the poor nations. The core idea of Marxist theory is the process of exploitation by the rich countries to the poor countries.

Marxism has its root in the 19th century after the name of economist Karl Marx. Marx and Engels published their famous book The communist Manifesto (1848) which is a critique of Europe's capitalist economic and political system. The period when this theory emerged was a transition period from traditional feudal system to industrialized society where landless people had to migrate to cities in search of jobs in factories. However, the capitalist class exploited the poor section and suppressed any uprisings from the working class. The idea of Marxism is bit similar to realism in terms of power struggle to dominate others. But, Marxism does not believe that states as unit of analysis, rather than that gave priority to the socio economic classes. Marxists also supported the idea of neo-liberalism which argues that non-state actors are also influential actor in international relations. It also believed the idea of interdependence among the nations but critical about who benefits out of this. According to Marxists, the international bourgeoisies and rich countries takes benefit and exploits the poor nations. There are some core elements of Marxist approach to international relations which will help you to understand Marxism in international relations.

Core elements of Marxist Approach to international relations

1. The political structure cannot give total understanding of the world system. Along with political, social world must be understood and analyzed in totality along with the political understanding.
2. Another element of the Marxist approach is the materialist conception of history. It tries to understand the process of economic development of a society from historical point of view, i.e., how the means of production changes according to time. The central idea is to understand the tension between the means of production (land, labor and capital) and relations of production (the way the means of

Space for Learners

production are arranged in any given society) which formed the economic base of a given society.

3. Marxist understanding gave importance to class structure to analyze the society and international structure. According to Marxist approach, society is prone to class conflict and similarly in international relations as well, conflict is inevitable.
4. Marxists are critique of the capitalist structure and argued that capitalism is a mechanism to exploit the poor (whether it is individuals or states).
5. Marxist believes that capitalism will be withered away and one day it will be replaced by socialism.
6. The whole world can be analyzed by inequalities prevails in terms of rich and the poor countries. Marxists believed that rich countries exploit the poor countries, controlling the means of production.
7. Marxism in international relations aims to analyze the how capitalism works in the world. They argue that structure of capitalism works under a hidden strategy and Marxists have explored the hidden structure.

Marx provided very little understanding on international relations. But, Marxist scholars interpreted his ideas of class structure and exploitations to understand the structure of international relations. The different understanding which emerged post-Marx is the results of Marx's writing in different times.

Stop to Consider:

Marxism:

Key books of Marxism:

- The Communist Manifesto (1848) by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels
- Karl Marx: his life and environment (1963) by Isaiah Berlin
- Karl Marx: His Life and Thought (1973) by David McLellan
- Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence (1978) by G. A. Cohen

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels formulated the original ideas, concepts and theories which later known as the Marxism, but Marx and Engels termed their theory as 'scientific socialism'. Marx and Engels analyzed the historical forces and development taken in

Space for Learners

different stages. They believe that the structure of capitalism will collapse as a result of revolutions of the working class and will bring about a socialist transformation and eventually full communism. They used 'material' factor to define the social and economic relations and also the state and the distribution of political power. Marx and Engels believed that society is divided into mainly two classes which are proletariat (working class) and bourgeoisie (capitalist). The economic relations between these classes are that bourgeoisie exploits the proletariat by taking control on means of production.

Space for Learners

5.4 Different types of Dependency Theory

Dependency theory is not a single theory which explains the economic dependence, but it is a set of theories or approaches to understand continued economic dependency and underdevelopment especially in the global south. Theorists who favour the dependency structure are divided into different schools including moderate which is represented by Raul Prebisch, radical school by Andre Gunder Frank and World System theory by Immanuel Wallerstein.

5.4.1 Moderate School of thought

The works of Raul Prebisch (1901-1986) are very relevant in formulating the dependency theory. He was an Argentine economist and served at different posts such as professor of economics, Director-General of the Argentine Central bank, headed the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). His study *The Economic Development of Latin America and Its Principal Problems* (1950) focused on the economic backwardness of Latin American countries and a contributing study towards dependency theory.

Prebisch argued that the adverse conditions of trade with the developed countries have contributed to economic exploitation and underdevelopment of the Latin American countries. The developed nations exploited the Latin American countries by low export prices of primary commodities and high import prices of the finished products. The underdeveloped countries including Latin America are a great source for primary/raw materials which are exported to the industrially advanced countries. However, the finished products produced in the advanced countries have to be imported to the underdeveloped nations by a huge margin of price. The differences between the price of export and import

are very high which adversely affect the economy the underdeveloped nations. Thus, from the study of export and import process and its impact in the economy of Latin America laid foundations for the dependency theory.

He criticized the liberal economic structure and the theory of comparative advantage of developing countries. The liberal theorists tries to argue that by means of free market the underdeveloped countries are benefitting, however Predisch argue that free market structure is the main cause of underdevelopment. The developed nations are getting richer and underdeveloped nations are getting poorer. Therefore, to overcome such situations he urged for state intervention, land reforms, economic integration and to reduce import by promoting domestic industrialization.

5.4.2 Radical School of thought

Radical dependency theory is the outcome of Marxism and Lenin's view of imperialism. Andre Gunder Frank, James Cockcroft, and Dale Johnson are the prominent scholars of radical school of thought of dependency theory. The main idea of this school is that the force behind any dependency is the structure of capitalism. The developed countries treat the developing countries as the market for their finished products and also consider it as place for investment. In the process the developing nations borrow capital from the developed nations and as a result the process of loan repayment deteriorates the economic conditions of the developing countries. Moreover, the developing countries experienced colonialism, exploitation from their colonial masters and had to be dependent on colonial powers which forced them into peripheral region. As a result, because of economic instability the countries in periphery have to depend on the core of developed countries for capital, technology and final products.

The peripheral regions supply the primary goods and cheap labour to the core countries. The process of development and underdevelopment of the peripheral regions fully depends on the core/developed countries. In this situation, the developing countries are fully dependent on the wish and whims of the core. Here, periphery states do not have any control on their economy, and therefore, they always try to satisfy the core states. The radicals believed that the division and differentiation of core and periphery is because of exploitations during the days of colonialism which created an unequal economy between core and periphery. Therefore, Frank argued that socialist revolution is the only

Space for Learners

solution to come out of exploitation and dependency towards the core states.

5.4.3 World System Theory

The world-system theory emerged when Marx's ideas were first implemented to understand international relations. Many scholars including Hobson, Bukharin, Hilferding, Luxemburg and Lenin criticized the policies of imperialism which ultimately gave rise to idea of world system theory. Lenin accepted Marx's ideas that class conflict is inevitable. But in the modern world the structure of capitalism is different which is a new monopoly capitalism with two-tier structure had developed in the world economy with strong core exploiting the less-developed periphery. Lenin's views were also supported by the Latin American Dependency School which focuses on core and periphery in depth. As we have already discussed that Raul Prebisch argued that periphery was suffering from the process of exploitation of the core by means of trade. The prices of manufactured goods are higher compared to raw materials for which periphery are becoming poorer relative to the core. This idea was also supported by different scholars such as Andre Gunder Frank and Henrique Fernando Cardoso. From this understanding the world-system theory can be said to be emerged.

The most known scholar which contributed to the idea of world-system theory is Immanuel Wallerstein. Wallerstein termed the social organizations that dominate the structure and running of the world is as 'world-system'. He gave two perspectives of world-system: world-empires and world-economies. The main difference between these two ideas is that how distribution of resource is done and who gets what. The world-empire is a central political system which decides the procedure to redistribution of resources from peripheral to core areas. On the other hand, world-economy is not a central authority to decide, but shows multiple competing centers of power which is based on the market. However, if we compare the two processes we could witness that they are same as resources are transferred from periphery to the core. Wallerstein argued that modern world-system is an example of a world-economy. Wallerstein introduced the 'semi-periphery' as another category between the 'core' and 'periphery'. So, according to the world-system theory wealth or resources are transferred from periphery to semi-periphery and then to centre in an exploitative nature. The semi-peripheral states are the developing economies of the world such as India, China, South Africa, and Brazil which are featured by modern

Space for Learners

industries and large peasantry. The world system theory scholars believe that world is divided on the basis of a principle of division of labor. On that basis Marxists tries to understand the world dividing into (i) core countries, (ii) semi-core countries, (iii) periphery or peripheral countries and (iv) semi-periphery countries. According to their understanding, the core and the semi-core countries possess the skilled labor and infrastructure for production process and on the other hand periphery and semi-periphery countries with low skilled labor which concentrate on extraction of raw materials. On the basis of the division of labor and production of countries, the resources go from periphery to semi-periphery then to core. The established structure of coercion and exploitation cannot be changed which the Marxist termed as ‘World System Theory’. However, the theory also believes that capitalist global economy will be replaced by socialism due to contradiction within the capitalist structure.

Stop to Consider:

Indicators of world inequality

- World’s one-fifth population is living under poverty.
- Average income of the developed countries is more than 30 times than the poor countries.
- Tariff on manufactured goods on the developing countries are higher than the manufactured goods of developed countries.
- Women and children are the most vulnerable in scale of inequality.
- Children of African countries are mostly illiterate.
- Education, health, and basic facilities of the poor countries are vulnerable because of low investment and welfare fund.
- One billion people lack access to clean water.
- The developing countries are still under debt to be repaid.

5.5 Other Marxist theories of International Relations and Dependency Theory

After discussing different dependency theories let us discuss some other theories related to it.

5.5.1 Gramscianism

Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937), was one of the founders of Italian Communist Party, said to be most creative Marxist thinker of the

Space for Learners

twentieth century has contributed his ideas by his remarkable Prison Notebooks which is a combinations of long essays written when he was in captivity. His writing focuses on political ideas, economics, philosophy, history, and literacy criticism. The question he dealt with was why it is difficult to promote revolution in Western Europe and he answered the question by introducing the idea of hegemony. Hegemony depicts the most powerful state in the international system where the system or the economy is controlled by the hegemonic country. For example, at contemporary time we can state that USA is the hegemony.

Gramsci's concepts were based on his own reflections of history and from his personal experience of political and social struggle. According to him the state is the basic entity in international relations and the place where social conflicts take place and where hegemonies of social classes are built. Hegemony at the international level is not merely an order among states. It is an order within a world economy with a dominant mode of production which penetrates into all countries and links into other subordinate modes of production. It is also a complex of international social relationships which connect the social classes of the different countries. World hegemony is describable as a social structure, an economic structure, and a political structure; and it cannot be simply one of these things but must be all three. World hegemony, furthermore, is expressed in universal norms, institutions and mechanisms which lay down general rules of behaviour for states and for those forces of civil society that act across national boundaries- rules which support the dominant mode of production.

5.5.2 Robert Cox on 'World Order'

Robert Cox developed a Gramscian approach that combines both a critique of prevailing theories of international relations and international political economy and the development of an alternative understanding of world politics. He argued with him famous sentence, 'Theory is always for someone and for some purpose'. The theories such as realism and the contemporary neo-realism are to serve the interests of those who can prosper under such order that may be inhabitants of developed nations or may be for ruling elites. The main motive of such theory is to dominate the inferior or the poor nations to establish a proper hegemony. Cox draws Gramsci's notion of hegemony and implemented it into the international relations. According to Cox, successive dominant powers in the international system have shaped a world order that suits their interests, and have done this not out of their capabilities, but also as

Space for Learners

they have managed to get consent of exploitation from the disadvantaged group of states. Cox argued that the idea of 'free trade' is so widely popularized that all the nations will prosper under such conditions. However, the reality is that free trade is only for the benefit of hegemonic state and benefits for peripheral states are negligible. This is a way to exploit the world by the liberal capitalist states and to form their hegemony.

Check Your Progress

1. Define Marxism.
2. How would you account for the continuing vitality of Marxist thought?
3. Explain the dependency theory.
4. How useful is the Wallerstein's understanding on semi-periphery?
5. How do you relate Gramsci's notion of hegemony to the contemporary international politics?
6. What is Robert Cox's understanding on world order?

5.6 Major Concepts in Dependency Theory

Now let us discuss major concepts of dependency theory

5.6.1 Criticism to Modernization Theory

Modernization theory is an approach which insists that less developed countries can develop their economy by concentrating on economic growth, replacing traditional methods by modern technology and adopting socio-political and economic system like the developed countries. The theory try to argue that there should be mass industrialization, economic growth, and adopting liberal institutions. One of the famous scholars who put forwarded the modernization theory is Walt Whitman Rostow. According to Rostow, the process of economic development for the countries goes stage by stage. The first stage is the 'traditional' stage in which people do not think about improving their living standard. The second is 'take-off' state, when the states think about improvement. During third stage, countries improves their technology, get industrialized and at the last stage countries could be witnessed with highest economic growth, consumption and high living standard.

The theory is severely criticized by dependency theory. Dependency

Space for Learners

theorists argue that modernization theory cannot be generalized as it has not understood the historical experiences of colonized countries which set conditions for restricting development. The modernization theory ignored the exploitation carried out by the colonizers and its relations to the development of the underdeveloped countries. Therefore, we can say that dependency theory also emerged as the criticism of modernization theory.

5.6.2 It is a Historical Process

Dependency is not newly emerged process, but it is the result of continuous historical process. Through the process of colonialism and rule, the colonial capitalist structure moved the socio-economic environment of the colonized countries in such a way that after independence as well these countries have to be dependent on capitalist rulers and work on wish and whims on the requirement of the capitalism. As a result, the colonies and underdeveloped regions supplied the primary goods/raw materials to the capitalist masters and import the finished products which were produced by the capitalist economies. The trend of export and import continued after the end of colonialist structure as well. Dependency theorists argue that the trend cannot be changed until and unless the economic difference exists between the developed and underdeveloped countries. The countries which were under colonialism and at present developing or underdeveloped falls under the category of periphery and the core structure is retained by Europe earlier which has transferred to USA later on because of economic development. Though the theory of dependency existed in the 20th century, but the process of dependency is a historical origin.

5.6.3 Divided into Core, Periphery, and Semi-Periphery

Dependency theorists divided the world-economy in two categories, the core and the periphery. The core countries are the developed economies in the global north (e.g. Europe, USA, and Japan) which are technologically advanced and industrially developed, powerful governments, a strong middle class and large working class. Core countries are also characterized by their democratic governments, high wages of labourers, import raw materials, export manufactures, high investment and their welfare services. The core is also known as metropolitan or centres to denote the industrially developed countries of the world. On the other hand periphery is the countries which are developing or the least developed countries which falls in the global south such as Africa, South Asia, and Latin America. These countries

Space for Learners

are mostly agrarian in nature with low middle class and large number of unskilled workers. It is also characterized by the non-democratic governments of the countries which export the raw materials and import manufacture goods, below subsistence wages and no welfare services. In addition to the core and periphery, Immanuel Wallerstein introduced a middle position which is known as semi-periphery because of stratified economic conditions of the world. The semi-periphery countries are the emerging economies such as India, China, South Africa, and Brazil which are characterized by growing industries, emerging cities and large agricultural development. Semi-periphery countries are said to be authoritarian governments which export 'mature' manufactures raw materials, import manufactures raw materials, provide low wages to workers, and low welfare services. The contribution of Wallerstein is a major development towards understanding of the world economic structure and process of dependency.

5.6.4 Dependency as Criticism to Liberal Theories

Dependency theory emerged as the critique to the liberal thinkers in international relations. According to liberal thinkers of economic development, economic activities among the countries should be spontaneous and should be promoted by means of interdependence which should be free from any regulations. Liberal economist such as Adam Smith argued that economic activities should be left free to regulate with its own rule and to bring progress accordingly. In the similar line Jean-Baptiste Say also supported the free functioning of the capitalist structure of economy without much intervention of the government. Other scholars such as David Ricardo, Jeremy Bentham emphasized on the free trade policies which will promote development of the economies of all the countries. One country can produce the commodities which will bring comparative advantage to their countries. By means of free market each nations will be interdependent and goods will be available at cheapest prices as possible. Bentham argued that this will maximize their pleasure and minimize their pain. Toward the end, it will bring greatest happiness of the greatest number.

On the other hand, if we understand the new socio-political and economic system which emerged in Europe and colonies, are not free from problems. It created a problem of class division in the society and conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The condition is in favour to exploitation of the proletariat and it is degrading. However, the liberals argue that this will be resolved by the process of free market. The growing

Space for Learners

inequality between the classes gave rise to working class movements and formation of Marxism following the ideas of Karl Marx (1818-1883). The ideas of liberals were not supported by the Marxist because of exploitative nature of the capitalist structure. They argue that, in the name of liberalism, the developed countries are exploiting the developing/ underdeveloped countries and creating a condition of dependency. The idea of comparative advantage put forwarded by the liberals seems to be a myth rather than reality. Therefore, the dependency theory is said to be a theory of criticism toward liberal theories.

5.6.5 Globalization Promoting Dependency

The dependency theorists hold that the process of globalization is also responsible for the process of dependency. According to them, the present phase of globalization is ‘neoliberal globalization’ which is dominated by the transnational corporations (TNCs). Few of the TNCs form hegemony in the process of import and export in the entire world. The production and distribution is done on the wish of such oligarchic market structure. Therefore, the periphery countries are dependable more on the core countries for capital and finished products. The institutional laws made by International Monetary Fund (IMF) make the periphery states to withdraw the welfare schemes and to adopt free market policies. Many empirical studies have been done to understand the relation between globalization and dependency and most of the studies argued that they have a great relation. The process of globalization has created conditions for more dependency among the core and periphery in terms of capital, investment, good production, and on import and export. The process of globalization will further deteriorate the conditions of the underdeveloped/developing countries enlarging the gap between the core and the peripheries.

SAQ

Make a comparative analysis of the Liberal, Modernist and Dependency theories. As per your view which one the best suited theory to understand contemporary international relations? (50+50 words)

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

Space for Learners

5.7 Criticism of Marxist and Dependency theory

The Marxist depicted a different perspective of international relations which shows exploitation of poor nations by the developed nations by means of capitalism and free market. The Marxist, especially the dependency theory emerged as the critique of liberal and modernization approach of development in the international relations. But, the idea/theory is not out of criticism. The liberals and modernization theorists targeted the dependency theory and criticised on many aspects. Here are some of the criticisms.

1. The Marxist theory emphasized on the class conflict which was also used to understand the behavior of the states in the international relations. However, the critics argue that Marxist depict a negative scenario to understand international relations rather than showing the positive aspect of international relations.
2. The liberals and modernists argued that the success of the Asian Tigers such as Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong actually nullify the claims made by dependency theory. These countries are successful in achieving targets of industrialization and high economic growth. But, the dependency theory is unable to explain the process of development of these countries from their perspective.
3. The Marxist also put forwarded a framework to understand the unfairness of the world. It shows the division of the world into core and periphery where core exploits the peripheral nations by means of trade. Critics argued that rather than unifying the world the Marxist are trying to divide the world by bringing up the issues of inequality, economic dependency, exploitation and unfairness.
4. The dependency theory argues that core is not interested in development of the periphery countries. However, the liberal criticized this idea and argues that core always seek to develop the periphery to find new spaces for investment and new market.
5. Bill Warren, a British Marxist rejected Lenin's view and argued that capitalism was fulfilling its historic role in the periphery by rapidly developing the means of production and framing the phase for future socialism. According to him colonialism brought about a marked improvement in material welfare in the world politics. It put forwarded better health facilities, better education and access to consumer goods. After the colonialism, capitalism has developed in the third world

Space for Learners

countries and Neo-Marxist argued that it is a good sign as it is a way forward for socialism.

Despite the criticism put forwarded by the critics, the understanding of dependency theory in the contemporary world politics cannot be denied as world is totally divided on the basis of wealth and power they possess. The Marxist brings forth the problem of dominance and hegemony of the powerful nations and reason behind why poor nations fail to progress economically and politically.

Stop to Consider

Development of Neo-Marxism

The idea of Neo-Marxism is directly linked to the ideas of Karl Marx as Neo-Marxist derived their ideas directly from the writings of Marx. The Neo-Marxist returned to the fundamental tenets of Marxist thought and sought to implement in the international relations. On the basis of Marx's understanding they criticized other developments within Marxism and other theories of international relations to make their own understanding contribution to understand contemporary world politics.

Key Neo-Marxists and their works

- Marx at the Margins (2010) by Kevin B. Anderson
- A Companion to Marx's Capital, The Complete Edition (2018) by David Harvey
- The "Philosophical Premises" of Uneven and Combined Development (2013) in Review of International Studies by Justin Rosenberg

5.8 Summing up

Marxism and dependency theory has emerged as the critique of liberal and modernization theories of development. Liberal theorists hold that by means of dependency in economic sphere, the countries will get mutual benefit and ultimately will lead to process of all the nations. However, the dependency theory challenged the idea by arguing that the process of dependency has become a breeding ground for the process of exploitation of the poor nations by the rich. The relations between the core and periphery led to exploitations of natural resources of the periphery and selling the final products at high prices for which the economic conditions of peripheries are deteriorating. According to the dependency theory, emergence of such condition is because of capitalist

Space for Learners

structure and historical exploitation of colonies by their masters. Dependency also argues that after the formal end of colonialism, the former masters are retaining power on the periphery in economic activities and force them to be dependent on the core.

While discussing the Marxist theory of international relation we have discussed the fundamental principles of Marxism and dependency theory. In the era of globalization the trend of integration of national economics, economic interdependence, social movements, communication revolution are growing in a faster rate which helped in development of consciousness among people of the states. According to Marxist understanding, the globe has been dominated by single dominating entity which is global capitalist system which has gradually degraded the humanity to lower level. Marxist also believes that the process of globalization is extending capitalism and making a platform for exploitation of poor nations by the developed or rich nations. However, they argue that there is nothing natural or inevitable about world order based on a global market. The current organization of global capitalism is in a constant state of change and crisis which will be transformed to socialism in near future.

Space for Learners

Check Your Progress

1. What are the core elements of dependency theory?
2. Examine the causes of dependency among the countries.
3. Critically examine the other Marxist theories towards understanding international relations.
4. Examine the critiques of dependency theory.
5. Examine how globalization promotes dependency in the international relations.
6. Very short questions :
 - a) Marxism explains international relations in terms of conflict and class war between ----- and ----- states.
 - b) What is the nature of Marxist approach to international relations?
 - c) According to Marxists, evolution and expansion of capitalism leads to what?
7. **Short questions :**
 - a) What is Marxism?
 - b) What is dependency theory?

- c) How Marxist approach views and projects the future of world?

8. Brief questions :

- a) Discuss the basic tenets of dependency theory in international relations.
- b) How do you differentiate between Liberal and Marxist understanding in international relations?
- c) How dependency explains exploitation of poor developing countries?

9. Long questions :

- a) How would you justify for continuing vitality of dependency theory?
- b) Discuss world-system theory.
- c) What is hegemony? How Gramsci defined hegemony in international relations.

5.9 References/ Suggested Readings

1. Basu, R. (ed), (2012) International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues New Delhi, Sage.
2. Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds), (2008) The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations, New York: Oxford University Press
3. Brown, C., (1985) "Development and Dependency" in Margot Light and A.J.R.Groom.ed., International Relations, A Handbook of Current Theory, London: Frances Pinter, pp.60-73
4. Jackson, R. and Sorensen, R. (2007) Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approches, 3rd Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press
5. Wallerstein, Immanuel. (2004). World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction, Durham: Duke University Press.